



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 04 July 2024

by D Cleary MTCP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25th July 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Z4310/D/24/3341841

3 Rockhill Road, Liverpool L25 8RB

- 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 Greslow against the decision of Liverpool City Council.
 - The application Ref is 23H/2454.
 - The development proposed is described as a double storey side extension with single storey extension to the rear
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a double storey side extension with single storey extension to the rear at 3 Rockhill Road, Liverpool L25 8RB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23H/2454, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans referenced, A100 – Existing and Proposed Site and Location; A103 – Proposed Floor Plans; and, A104 – Proposed Elevations.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the walls of the development hereby permitted shall be as detailed in the application and approved plans.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties with particular regard to overbearing.

Reasons

3. No.3 Rockhill Road is a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling, with hipped roof and modest single storey lean-to projection to the side. The appeal dwelling is set away from its side boundary, beyond which are the rear gardens of No.8 and No.10 Woodrock Road (No.8 and No.10). No.8 and No.10 are a pair of two-storey, semi-detached dwellings which have rear elevations that face towards the appeal site. A full width conservatory is located to the rear of No.8 and a single storey projection is located to the rear of No.10. A detached outbuilding is located to the rear of No.8, which defines part of the boundary with the appeal site. The remainder of the side boundary is defined by close board

fencing. Rockhill Road rises up from Woodrock Road and, as such, the appeal dwelling is sited at a higher land level than No.8 and No.10.

4. The proposed two-storey side extension would be provided above the existing single storey lean-to, which is modest in width. As such, the extent of projection towards No.8 and No.10, at first floor level, would not be significant, with the existing gap from the side boundary retained. This spacing would ensure that the development would not appear overly cramped or erode the sense of spaciousness between dwellings. The extension would include a hipped roof, to match the existing property, meaning the roof would slope away from Woodrock Road. This would help to limit the extent of additional mass above ground floor level. The limited projection and proposed roof design, coupled with the retention of the spacing between the dwelling and the side boundary, would ensure that the additional built form would not be visually prominent.
5. The existing outlook from the rear of No.8 and No.10 is towards the flank elevation of the appeal site. No.10 is off-set from the flank elevation meaning that the modest extension would not be visually dominant from its rear garden space. No.8 has a more direct relationship with the appeal site, although the existing outbuilding occupies much of the rear boundary, creating additional separation from the garden space. I acknowledge that the appeal site sits higher than No.8 and, as such, much of the dwelling is visible above the boundary line. However, as I have observed above, the spacing of the development from the boundary, along with the modest scale and design of the development would mean that the extension would not be visually dominant on the rear garden, or to views from within the conservatory.
6. The development would not adhere to the spacing guidelines set out in the Liverpool Unitary Development Plan Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 10 (New Residential Development) (the SPG). However, I am mindful that this is guidance only and the SPG confirms that the application of the standards will vary depending upon the character and spaciousness of the surrounding area. I consider that the development would respect the existing spaciousness in a manner that the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties would not be adversely diminished.
7. For the above reasons, the development would not result in an adverse effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No.8 and No.10 Woodrock Road with particular regard to overbearing. Therefore, the development accords with Policy H8 of the Liverpool Local Plan (2022) which, amongst other things, requires that extensions do not result in an overbearing or over-dominant effect on the habitable rooms or outdoor amenity space of neighbouring properties.

Conditions

8. I have imposed standard conditions relating to the commencement of development and to require compliance with the submitted plans to define the terms of the permission. A condition for the development be carried out in accordance with the materials detailed in the application is also necessary in the interest of the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

9. For the above reasons the appeal is allowed.

D Cleary

INSPECTOR