



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 February 2025

by **F P Tinsley MA (Hons) MBA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20<sup>th</sup> February 2025

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/M4320/D/25/3358712**

**26 Little Crosby Road, Crosby, Sefton, L23 2TG**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Mr Steven Maddocks against the decision of Sefton Metropolitan Borough Council.
  - The application Ref DC/2024/01693, was refused by notice dated 8 November 2024.
  - The development is described as 'proposed single-storey garage to side of a corner plot dwellinghouse'.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issue

2. The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

### Reasons

3. The appeal site lies in an established residential area. Dwellings are generally two storeys in height and are mostly semi-detached. Whilst there is some variation in style, there is a pleasing consistency found in the massing and height of dwellings. The general pattern of development in the area is residential streets, including Willow Way, linking to the main distributor road which is Little Crosby Road. Dwellings generally conform with the established building line. This includes the side elevations of dwellings on corner plots not projecting forward of the established building line of dwellings located on perpendicularly positioned streets. This adds to an impression of spaciousness and softens the built form particularly at the access point from residential streets to the main distributor road. Overall, these aspects result in a pleasant, spacious suburban area.
4. The appeal property is a large semi-detached two-story dwelling located on a corner plot that respects the prevailing character of the area. The boundary treatment and flat roofed timber and glazed structure to the side of the dwelling do not detract from the openness of the intersection of Little Crosby Road and Willow Way. The apparent spacious gap between the main dwellings and the respective property boundary on both sides of Willow Way makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area.
5. The introduction of the proposed development, by projecting significantly forward of the established building line on Willow Way, to a point close to the property boundary, would significantly alter the character and appearance of the

relationship between Willow Way and Little Crosby Road. This is a key feature of the character and appearance of the area as described above and for this reason it will cause significant harm.

6. I have had regard to the fact that the proposed development would be single storey in height and that materials to match the existing dwelling would be used. However, the design and location of the development including a hipped roof and the proximity to the site boundary will mean that it would be visually prominent when viewed from Willow Way. Additional boundary planting would not reduce this impact at least in the short to medium term and the space for this would be limited. As such, the scale and massing would erode the consistency of build form and therefore undermine the character and appearance of the area.
7. Accordingly, the proposal would conflict with guidance in the House Extensions Supplementary Planning Document May 2003 (the SPD) which requires that extensions and alterations to residential properties should be in keeping with the appearance, scale, design and character of the local area and the street scene. It further states that corner plot side extensions should not encroach beyond the established building lines on either street and should not normally occupy more than half the available width between the side of the house and the highway. For similar reasons the proposal would run counter to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), which requires proposals to be sympathetic to local character.
8. Several examples of side extensions have been brought to my attention. Whilst I have not been provided with full details of those developments, I was able to observe them on site. Given the unique nature of each development plot, the configuration and nature of each example cited is inevitably different to the appeal proposal. I am not persuaded that any of the examples cited by the appellant, owing to their respective differences, are directly comparable to the appeal scheme. I also note that the example referred to under Ref: DC/2016/01327 was approved prior to adoption of the current Local Plan for Sefton 2017 (the LP). Planning decisions are made on their respective merits as assessed against policies in the development plan rather than following a system of precedent. Hence, whilst these examples attract limited favourable weight, they do not lead me to a different view on this main issue.
9. I conclude that the proposal conflicts with Policy HC4 of the LP which states that amongst other things extensions and alterations to dwelling houses will be approved where they are of a high-quality design that matches the style of the surrounding area and, the size and scale of the development are in keeping with the surrounding area.

#### Other Matters

10. The proposal would result in some benefits, including enhanced secure car parking provision, a reduction in pressure for on-street parking and allow for easier on-site EV charging. These matters carry some but limited weight but ultimately do not outweigh my concerns about the scheme's harm to the character and appearance of the area. The absence of harm relating to living conditions of surrounding occupiers and highway safety is also highlighted. Nevertheless, the absence of harm in these respects is not a tangible benefit that weighs in favour of

the proposal, rather it is an expectation of other local and national planning policies.

### **Conclusion**

11. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no material considerations that indicate that the development should be determined otherwise than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

*F P Tinsley*

INSPECTOR