



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 February 2025

by A Hartley LLB (Hons) Solicitor MBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z4310/D/24/3355258

51 Speke Hall Road, Liverpool L25 0PS

- 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 Ms Donna Hughes against the decision of Liverpool City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24H/1507.
 - The proposed development is for a first-floor extension to the rear and single-storey garage to side.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the **first-floor extension to the rear**.
2. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to a single-storey garage to the side and planning permission is granted for **a single-storey garage to the side** at 51 Speke Hall Road, Liverpool L25 0PS in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24H/1507, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans insofar as they relate to the single-storey garage to the side only:
Drawing No. 1 and Site Location Plan.
 - 3) 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.

Preliminary Matters

3. 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.
4. The appellant indicates a willingness to change the design of the roof to the rear extension. However, there are no amended plans before me. For the avoidance of doubt, I have considered the submitted plan marked Drawing No. 1 dated June 2024 in determining this appeal.

Main Issue

5. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

6. The appeal property is one half of a pair of two-storey semi-detached dwellings, finished in facing red brick. It is situated at the corner of Barford Road and Speke Hall Road. It is set back from Speke Hall Road and in addition to a deep highway verge and wide footway has a lengthy front garden of approximately 10 metres. It has an existing side extension and the whole property is forward of the consistent building line along Barford Road. Therefore, although the property is well set back from Speke Hall Road, the rear elevation is highly visible from Barford Road.
7. The surrounding area comprises a mix of house styles and finishes both along Barford Road and Speke Hall Road. The wide grass verge and long gardens distinguish the housing from the commercial buildings opposite the Speke Hall Road frontage. Save for the host dwelling, there is a consistency of building line along Barford Road that contributes positively to the character of the immediate area and the view towards the prominent junction at which the host property is situated.

First-Floor Rear Extension

8. The first-floor rear extension would be constructed above the existing single storey rear extension and thus utilise the existing footprint. It would therefore not impinge on the existing rear outdoor amenity space. It would also be of suitable faced brick materials to complement the host dwelling.
9. However, despite being set in from the party boundary and following the building line established by the host dwelling and existing single-storey extension, the dual pitched, rear facing gabled roof design would be large in relation to the host dwelling and would create a highly prominent feature. The large expanse of brickwork within the gable end of the proposed extension would project across the roof plane of the host dwelling. This would make the first-floor rear extension appear overly dominant and would detract from the well-proportioned design of the host dwelling. Overall, it would not appear as a subservient addition and would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling.
10. The disproportionate scale and massing of the first-floor rear extension would result in a poor design at a prominent corner location forward of the consistent building line along Barford Road. The additional built form would appear visually jarring due to its dominance when viewed from Barford Road and would thus fail to successfully assimilate within the street scene. Consequently, it would cause harm to the character and appearance of the immediate surrounding area.
11. My attention has been drawn to an example of a two-storey house extension to the side at 12 Leafield Road. While I do not have full details of this extension before me, I find that it differs from the appeal proposal in terms of both the nature of the development and the position of that dwelling in the street scene. I therefore afford it very limited weight in my decision.

12. For the reasons given above, the first-floor rear extension element of the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area. As such, this element would conflict with Policies H8 and UD1 of the Liverpool Local Plan (2022), which seek high quality design appropriate to its context and wider setting.

Single-Storey Garage to the Side

13. I find this element of the appeal proposal to be clearly severable both physically and functionally from the aforementioned first-floor rear extension.
14. The single-storey garage would be constructed of facing brickwork to complement the host dwelling. The hipped roof results in an appropriate scale and design that would appear as a subordinate addition to the host dwelling and would not detract from the overall design of the property. Although this element of the proposal would be forward of the building line on Barford Road, due to its scale and design it would read as a subtle addition that would not appear unduly prominent in the surrounds.
15. For the reasons given, the single-storey garage element of the proposal would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area. As such, this element would comply with Policies H8 and UD1 of the Liverpool Local Plan (2022), which seek high quality design appropriate to its context and wider setting.

Conditions

16. I have considered the conditions proposed by the Council against the tests set out in Paragraph 57 of the Framework and the advice in the Planning Practice Guidance. I have not imposed the suggested wording relating to mandatory biodiversity net gain as this householder proposal is exempt and so it is not necessary. In the interests of clarity and certainty, I have imposed a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans insofar as they relate to the single-storey garage to the side. In the interests of the visual amenity of the area I have also imposed a condition requiring matching materials.

Conclusion

17. For the above reasons, having regard to all material considerations, I conclude that the first-floor rear extension element of the proposal conflicts with the development plan when read as a whole. As I have found the single-storey garage element of the proposal acceptable and physically and functionally severable, I shall issue a split decision. There are no material considerations that would justify determining the appeal otherwise.
18. Therefore, insofar as the appeal relates to the single-storey garage to the side, I conclude the appeal should be allowed but should be dismissed insofar as the appeal relates to the first-floor rear extension.

A Hartley

INSPECTOR