



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 February 2024

by J D Westbrook BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5TH March 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Z4310/D/23/3335589
82 Bankfield Road, LIVERPOOL, L13 0BG

- 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 Steven Callister against the decision of Liverpool City Council.
 - The application Ref: 23H/1881, dated 7 July 2023, was refused by notice dated 5 October 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as the erection of a first-floor extension to side, carry out external alterations to single-storey roof, convert loft space, and carry out internal alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed side extension on the character and appearance of the area around Bankfield Road and Richland Road.

Reasons

3. No 82 is a semi-detached house situated on a corner plot at the junction of Bankfield Road with Richland Road. It currently has a hipped roof and a wrap-around, single-storey extension to the rear, side and front with pitched roofs. The proposed development would include the construction of a first-floor above the existing side extension. This would have a gable end and a pitched roof set with a ridge level a little below that of the main ridge of the house.
4. Policy UD1 of the Council's Local Plan (LP) indicates that development proposals should demonstrate that certain aspects of local character and distinctiveness have been taken into account. These include the local grain and pattern of development; any intrinsic rhythms and patterns established by streets and built form; and the building line and frontages. Policy H7 indicates that development will be permitted provided that there is no adverse impact on the character of the area. Policy H8 indicates that extensions and alterations to dwelling houses will be approved where they are of a high quality of design that matches or complements the style of the dwelling and surrounding area.
5. The Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance Note on House Extensions (SPG) indicates that, in order to respect the character of residential areas through protection of the street scene, extensions should be subordinate in scale, and first-floor side extensions to semi-detached houses should normally

- be set back from the front wall of the original house by a minimum of 1 metre. In addition, two-storey side extensions should not normally exceed half the width of the existing house while, on corner plots, to ensure that they do not detract from the street scene, they should not extend beyond the established building line to the return street frontage.
6. The Council contends that, by reason of its scale, siting and projection forward of the return street building line, the proposal would have a detrimental impact upon both the street scene and the character of the host property.
 7. The appellant contends that the proposed extension would be subservient to the main house; that surrounding properties display varying scales, designs and forms; that the SPG predates the NPPF and should be accorded only limited weight; that the extension would be of only limited visibility; and that there are already other examples of what is proposed in the wider area.
 8. The appeal property is located on the western side of Bankfield Road. This side of the road is characterised almost entirely by semi-detached houses with hipped roofs. On the opposite side of the road, houses are largely gable-ended, but the road has a wide, tree-lined landscaped strip between the highway and the frontages of the houses on the western side, such that the appeal property clearly forms part of the character of that side of the road rather than the opposite side. The proposal would result in a large two-storey side extension that would be set back very little from the main front elevation, and down very little from the roof ridge of the main body of the house. The extension would project out along the whole of the length of the side elevation, and would form a prominent and bulky gable end that would not complement the style of the host dwelling or the style of houses in the vicinity.
 9. The houses behind No 82 on Richland Road are all semi-detached houses with hipped roofs. In addition, the front elevations of these houses form a common established building line, which is continued by the main side elevation of the appeal property. The proposed extension would project out from this building line by over 3 metres at first-floor level. I accept that the impact of this extension would only be fully appreciated from positions at or directly opposite the junction of Bankfield and Richland Roads, but nevertheless, the building line is a characteristic feature of the area, and the proposed extension would significantly break this line to the detriment of that character. It would appear as a prominent and unsympathetic feature in the street scene.
 10. The appellant has made note of other gable-ended extensions on corner plots in the vicinity, namely at No 66 Bankfield Road and No 66 Rockbank Road. With regard to the example on Rockbank Road, it would appear that this was granted permission over 20 years ago and before the adoption of the SPG. Whilst the SPG predates the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the guidance in it on this matter does not conflict with the general policy thrust on design in the NPPF and I, therefore, accord it significant weight. The example given here conflicts with some elements of the SPG, although I note that the property retains a hipped roof and there is, in this case, no established building line to the rear of No 66. With regard to the example at No 66 Bankfield Road, I have no details of any permission for this extension and, in any case, I consider that it is an unsympathetic addition to the street scene that should not be seen as a precedent for the current proposal, which would be similar in general style.

11. In conclusion, I find that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area around Bankfield Road and Richland Road by virtue of its projection well beyond the established building line formed by the frontages of the houses on Richland Road and its own main side elevation, and also by virtue of its unsympathetic and bulky gable-ended appearance on a prominent corner plot. For these reasons it would conflict with Policies UD1, H7 and H8 of the LP and with guidance in the SPG. Accordingly, I dismiss the appeal.

J D Westbrook

INSPECTOR