
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 April 2024

by S. Hartley BA (Hons) Dist.TP (Manc) DMS MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 May 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Z4310/D/24/3339104

2 Marrow Drive, Liverpool, Merseyside L7 0AD.

- 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 Murad Al Soufi the decision of Liverpool City Council.
 - The application ref 23H/1634 dated 28 June 2023 was refused by notice dated 9 February 2024.
 - The development proposed is a single storey extension to the side and rear of the dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a single storey extension to the side and rear of the dwelling at 2 Marrow Drive, Liverpool, Merseyside, L7 0AD in accordance with the terms of the application ref 23H/1634 dated 28 June 2023 and subject to the following conditions: -
 - i. The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - ii. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: drawing no.2b (proposed ground floor plan and elevations); drawing no.3 (existing and proposed elevations from 123 Marrow Drive) and the site plan/location plan submitted with the application.
 - iii. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the host property and area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is located in an established residential area constructed to an overall plan and with a consistent design, characterised by two storey, detached, gable ended properties with front amenity spaces, often given over to off-street parking and with hedging along the front boundaries and between the properties. Most of the dwellings include integral single garages. The overall

design provides a pleasant and attractive environment, and which adds positively and distinctively to the character and appearance of the area.

4. The appeal property occupies a corner position with both roads being called Marrow Road. The appellant considers that the front elevation of the property faces No's 123/125 Marrow Drive. However, the main entrance to the house faces onto the other road and faces No's 15/17 Marrow Drive and which I consider, for the purposes of the appeal, to be the front elevation. This is compatible with the description of the appeal proposal which is for a single storey side and rear extension.
5. The host property has a single storey part to its rear elevation and where its width with its monopitch roof, as opposed to its length, is visible from the environs of 123 Marrow Drive. However, the proposed rear extension would be to the back of the existing single storey part of the dwelling, and as such would be largely hidden by it.
6. The proposed rear extension would have a maximum width of approximately 4.7 metres and so would not accord with the Council's House Extensions Supplementary Planning Guidance 1996 (SPG) which states that planning permission will not normally be granted for extensions which project in excess of 3 metres from the original rear main wall of the dwelling where it abuts the party boundary. Its purpose is to protect the living conditions of the occupiers of adjoining properties by overshadowing or any overbearing effect.
7. The proposed rear extension facing the side elevation to no. 35 Marrow Road would have a length of approximately 7.5 metres.
8. However, in this instance, much of the proposed extension, when seen from the adjoining property, would be hidden by its own detached garage. I agree with the local planning authority's (LPA) conclusion that the proposed extension, neither by its width nor its length, would significantly affect the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring property in terms of overlooking, outlook or the loss of light.
9. The proposed extension would wrap around the rear of the property to extend to the side of the host dwelling by approximately 7 metres, and it would have a hipped roof. Its length at the side of the house would be greater than the front elevation of the existing property.
10. However, when seen from the environs of no's 15/17 Marrow Drive, the extension would be set back from the road and also some metres behind the front elevation of the host dwelling. It would be sited behind a robust and attractive brick post and pillar fence with infill wooden panelling, set on the boundary with the footpath, and with a height of between one and two metres. This, plus the set back of the proposed extension, would mean that it would not cause harm to the design of the host property or appear dominant or out of place in the area.
11. Therefore, I conclude that, while there would be some conflict with the SPG, overall, the proposed development would accord with the aims of policies UD1 and H8 of the Liverpool Local Plan (2022) which require that all development achieves good quality design which respects the character and appearance of the area and does not significantly reduce the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties.

Conditions

12. I have imposed the standard time condition and a condition to ensure that the development is in accordance with the approved plans. The latter is for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of certainty. In the interests of good design, it is necessary to impose a condition relating to external materials.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons outlined above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

S. Hartley

INSPECTOR