



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 February 2025

by A Hartley LLB (Hons) Solicitor MBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/V4305/D/24/3356829

43 Buxted Road, Southdene, Kirkby, Knowsley L32 6SG

- 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 Mrs Marcela Darii against the decision of Knowsley Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00390/FUL.
 - The proposed development is for the conversion of the existing external front canopy to form a habitable room and Installation of External Insulation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Issue

2. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) has been updated since the appeal representations were made. However, as the revisions do not affect the matters under consideration in this appeal, (other than paragraph references) it was not considered necessary to seek further comment.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is an end terrace situated at the corner of Buxted Road and Lindby Road, with part brick and part rendered finish. Opposite the property on Lindby Road are open playing fields. The existing dwelling has a rear single-storey extension and a canopy roof that extends from the roof of the rear extension to wrap around the Buxted Road and Lindby Road elevations. The canopy is supported by a brick pillar at the corner within the plot and is also connected to three brick pillars that sit on the boundary wall fronting Lindby Road. Wooden trellis fills the gaps between the three pillars above the boundary wall and three full height obscure PVC panels are located at the boundary with No. 61 Lindby Road. It was used as a car port.
5. Within the immediate surrounding area, dwellings are typically modest terraced houses of uniform design, with consistent building lines and low boundary walls to the road frontage. There is no built development forward of the front elevations of

the terrace along Lindby Road other than the car port. The existing car port does not make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the surrounding area as it disrupts the building line and uniformity of design of the surrounding properties, appearing incongruous in the street scene.

6. The proposal does not increase the footprint of the canopy and car port. However, the introduction of solid blank walls with no windows to the front elevation of Lindby Road would materially change the appearance of the structure and there would no longer be views through it. This would give the appearance of increasing the bulk and mass of the host dwelling, as the structure would no longer be viewed as an external canopy. Experienced alongside the otherwise uniform design and scale of properties in the immediate vicinity, it would read as even more incongruous and unduly bulky in context, failing to successfully assimilate within the street scene. The proposal would therefore fail to respect or reflect the pattern of surrounding built form.
7. For these reasons the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. As such, it would conflict with saved Policies H5 and H8 of the Knowsley Replacement Unitary Development Plan (2006); Policies CS2 and CS19 of the Knowsley Local Plan Core Strategy (2016); the Householder Development Supplementary Planning Document (2016) and the Framework, all of which seek high quality design of a scale and character appropriate to its context and wider setting.

Conclusion

8. In conclusion, having regard to all representations made, I find that the appeal development conflicts with the development plan as a whole and with the provisions of the Framework. There are no material considerations that would justify a decision other than one in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

A Hartley

INSPECTOR