
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 January 2024

by Les Greenwood MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13.02.2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Z4310/D/23/3334766

35 Craven Lea, West Derby L12 0NF

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr John Gosling against the decision of Liverpool City Council.
 - The application Ref 23H/2300, dated 7 September 2023, was refused by notice dated 6 November 2023.
 - The development proposed is a single storey flat roof extension to the rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey flat roof extension to the rear in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 23H/2300, dated 7 September 2023, subject to the following condition:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out other than in accordance with the following approved plans: 'Existing Site Location Plan' and 01 'Full Working Drawings'.

Preliminary matters

2. The proposed extension has been constructed already, as I saw at my site visit.
3. A revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published on 19 December 2023, during consideration of the appeal. Having regard to the changes in the Framework and to the comparatively minor scale and nature of this appeal proposal, I consider that further consultation on this matter is not necessary.

Main issues

4. The main issues are the effects of the proposal on: (i) the character and appearance of the local area; and (ii) living conditions at 33 Craven Lea next door, in terms of the outlook from that property.

Reasons

Character and appearance

5. 35 Craven Lea is a modern 2 storey detached house set at the end of a cul-de-sac, within a residential estate of similar houses. A single storey flat

roofed extension has been built to the rear, using red bricks to match the existing house plus contrasting dark grey trim. It cannot readily be seen from Craven Lea but its upper section appears in views from the nearby Fir Tree Drive North, over garden fences.

6. This is a low, good quality, attractive structure that sits comfortably within the reasonably large garden, seen in the context of sheds, fences and other extensions. In height and scale it is proportionate and visually subservient to the house. The use of the flat roof is appropriate to the rear of the property and helps to minimise visual impact.
7. I conclude that the proposal does not harm the character or the appearance of the local area. It accords with the relevant provisions of Liverpool Local Plan 2013-2033 (LLP) policies UD1, UD7 and H8, which aim to ensure that extensions are of a high quality of design that matches or complements the style of the dwelling and the surrounding area, taking into account the form, materials and character of the existing building.

Living conditions

8. This line of houses is staggered, with No 33 next door sitting well forward of No 35 so that part of No 35's 2 storey side wall sits much further back than No 33's main rear wall. A conservatory to the rear of No 33, near to the shared boundary, has a blank side wall so that its windows do not face directly towards No 35. The appeal extension stands up about a metre above the existing garden fence and is about a metre away from that fence. It is low enough, and set far enough away from the conservatory windows and main garden area at No 33, so that it has little impact on the outlook from that property. No 33 continues to have a largely open, southerly aspect. Again, the flat roof design helps to minimise visual impact.
9. I note that the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 1 *House Extensions* (SPG1) advises that single storey rear extensions should not normally extend more than 3m beyond the neighbour's original rear wall in situations like this. Each proposal must, however, be assessed on its own merits and in this case I find no significant impact.
10. I conclude that the proposal does not harm living conditions at No 33 next door. It accords with the relevant provisions of LLP policy H8, which together with SPG1 aims to ensure that extensions do not have an overbearing or over-dominant effect on the habitable rooms or outdoor amenity space of neighbouring properties.

Conditions

11. I impose a condition specifying the relevant plans to provide certainty. I note that one of the submitted plans (JC/0918/01) is inaccurate in that it shows a previously proposed extension that does not exist. That plan not needed to define the proposal so I have not included it in the condition. The proposed development has been carried out acceptably, so no other conditions are necessary.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

Les Greenwood

INSPECTOR