



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 September 2025

by A Caines BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z4310/W/25/3370115

325 Hunts Cross Avenue, Liverpool L25 8SY

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant approval required under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A, Paragraph A.4 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (the GPDO).
 - The appeal is made by Mr Farnan against the decision of Liverpool City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25PH/0008.
 - The development proposed is single-storey rear extension with flat roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Council's decision notice referred to paragraph A.1(j) of Class A in the GPDO. Its statement clarifies that the refusal should have referred to paragraph A.1(ja). The appellant has addressed this matter and there is no procedural unfairness in determining the appeal on that basis. I have proceeded accordingly.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the proposal would constitute permitted development under Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the GPDO, having particular regard to the cumulative limitation in paragraph A.1(ja).

Reasons

4. Class A of the GPDO permits the enlargement, improvement or other alteration of a dwellinghouse subject to limitations and conditions. Paragraph A.1(ja) requires that any total enlargement, being the proposed enlarged part together with any existing enlargement of the original dwellinghouse to which it would be joined, must not exceed the limits in sub-paragraphs (e) to (j). In this case, the relevant limitation is set out in Paragraph A.1(j), which restricts an enlargement that would extend beyond a wall forming a side elevation of the original dwellinghouse where, amongst other things, it would have a width greater than half the width of the original dwellinghouse.
5. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling with an attached garage. Although the garage projects beyond the original rear wall, its side wall is part of the original dwellinghouse and is treated as a side elevation for Class A purposes. An existing single-storey rear extension projects from that side wall, and the proposed extension would adjoin it. The combined effect would therefore be a total enlargement joined to an original side elevation.

6. The parties provide measurements for the original dwelling width of about 9.82m and for the combined width of the existing and proposed enlargement of around 6.6m to 6.8m. This would clearly exceed half the width of the original dwellinghouse. Although the appellant emphasises that the new element alone would be less than half the original width, paragraph A.1(ja) requires the assessment to be carried out on the basis of the total enlargement to which the proposal would be joined. In that cumulative context the limit in paragraph A.1(j) would be exceeded.
7. The appellant's submissions regarding visual impact and the purpose of the limitation do not affect this conclusion. The prior approval process under paragraph A.4 applies only where the development first meets the requirements of Class A. Those requirements are expressed in clear terms, and when assessed cumulatively in accordance with paragraph A.1(ja), the proposal does not comply. Accordingly, matters of appearance or broader planning judgment carry no weight in this context.
8. I have had regard to the cited decision at 321 Hunts Cross Avenue. Each case turns on its own facts and on the statutory criteria. Even if another decision were made on different facts or in error, that would not justify permitting development that does not meet the express limitations of the GPDO in this case.
9. For these reasons, the proposal would not constitute permitted development under Class A because the total enlargement would exceed the limit in paragraph A.1(j), contrary to paragraph A.1(ja) of the GPDO.

Conclusion

10. The proposal would not be permitted development under Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the GPDO. It follows that the appeal should be dismissed.

A Caines

INSPECTOR