



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 August 2025 by S Jamieson BA(Hons) MPlan

Decision by B Plenty BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z4310/D/25/3366895

2 Gressingham Road, Liverpool L18 6JT

- 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 Daphna Landoy against the decision of Liverpool City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25H/0137.
 - The development proposed is first floor extension over bungalow to form house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:

a) the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of occupiers of the host dwelling, with particular regard to amenity space and outlook.

b) the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area; and

c) whether or not the proposal would give rise to highway safety issues and/or inconvenience for road users arising from any additional demand for on-street parking.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Living conditions

4. The appeal scheme would result in a substantially larger dwelling than the existing bungalow. Given the number of bedrooms proposed, this would be likely to attract a family and there is therefore a reasonable likelihood of children occupying the property.
5. The existing amenity space is limited to two very narrow areas at the front and rear of the appeal property and a larger, rectangular shaped garden at the side of plot, fronting Mather Avenue. This space might be sufficient to allow occupiers to carry

out activities such as hanging out washing and sitting out. However, given its modest size and significantly constrained position close to a well-trafficked route, it would not provide a relaxing outdoor environment for children to play in or for other occupiers of the property to enjoy. Consequently, I find that the appeal scheme would not provide adequate amenity space, which would be harmful to the living conditions of future occupiers.

6. Internally, the use of obscure glazing to a bedroom window, when there are no other windows serving that room, would result in a bedroom which would have no outlook. This would result in oppressive living conditions for its occupiers. I understand that obscure glazing has been proposed to protect the privacy of neighbouring occupiers and that the appellant would be willing to consider other design solutions in relation to this window. However, no alternative plans are before me and so I must consider the appeal on its own merits.
7. For the above reason, the proposed development would therefore have a harmful effect on the living conditions of future occupiers due to inadequate amenity space and poor outlook. Consequently, the proposal would be contrary to Policies UD1, UD7 and H8 of the Liverpool Local Plan (LLP) (2022) which require development proposals to take plot sizes into account; to be of high-quality design; and for alterations and extensions to existing dwellings to retain adequate amenity space for the occupiers of the building.

Character and appearance

8. 2 Gressingham Road (No 2) is a semi-detached bungalow. It occupies a corner plot at the junction of Gressingham Road and Mather Avenue and has a modest wrap-around garden. There is variety in house types and designs in the area, including detached and semi-detached dwellings, many of which have been extended to varying degree. Even so, dwellings are mainly two-storey in scale and have similar facing materials. Overall, these characteristics give local distinctiveness to the area.
9. The proposal is primarily to raise the height of the appeal property. Whilst the extended dwelling would be taller than the adjoining bungalow, due to the set back of the front elevation from No 2's façade, and the staggered set down of the roof, the single-storey dwelling would appear suitably subordinate to the appeal property and a comfortable relationship between the two houses would be maintained.
10. Furthermore, due to the orientation of the appeal site, views of the two properties would be limited to a small area of Gressingham Road, with the majority of passers-by experiencing views of the side of the appeal site from Mather Avenue, where the adjoining bungalow would be largely obscured from view.
11. No increase in footprint is proposed, and the existing garden would be retained, thus the extended dwelling would sit comfortably within its plot. The finished house would also better reflect the height of properties in the vicinity of the site and the proposed hipped roof, rendered façade and the pattern of fenestration would also be consistent with the existing dwelling and wider street scene. I therefore find the proposed development to be acceptable in both scale and design.
12. For the above reasons, I find the appeal scheme would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore accord with Policies UD1, UD7 and H8 of the LLP which, amongst other things, require development proposals to take account of local character and distinctiveness; to be

appropriate in scale, proportion, form, materials and character; and to complement the style of the dwelling and the surrounding area.

Parking provision

13. Policy UD2 and Part 4 of Policy TP8 of the LLP require car parking to be integral to the overall design of development proposals. However, Part 1 of LLP Policy TP8 goes on to say that parking provision should be appropriate to the scale and nature of the development. This appeal relates to an extension to a single dwelling, where on-site provision would be unachievable without a significant reduction in the already-limited amenity space of the property.
14. During my visit I noted that most residential plots included on-plot parking, reducing the demand for on-street parking. Local roads are not subject to parking restrictions and as such there seems to be adequate on street parking availability to enable motorists to park without raising highway safety issues.
15. Whilst I accept that the additional bedrooms proposed as part of the scheme would likely lead to an increase in demand for on-street parking, the addition of one or two parked cars in the vicinity of the site would have a negligible visual impact on the street scene.
16. Given the small increase in demand for parking which would likely arise from the proposed development and the availability of parking spaces in the vicinity of the site, off-street parking in this instance would not be necessary. Indeed, in the absence of any specific parking standards for such developments or any compelling evidence to suggest otherwise, the lack of off-street parking would be unlikely to cause inconvenience for road users nor would it have an adverse effect on highway safety or visual amenity. It would therefore accord with Policy TP8, and the broader aims of Policy UD2 of the LLP, which collectively seek to ensure that design solutions are appropriate to their context.

Other Matters

17. I acknowledge the appellant's comments concerning the Council's reason for refusal relating to amenity space and the submitted examples of local plots with small gardens. However, I do not know the precise details of the examples provided and how each case equates to the appeal before me. In any event, I have determined this appeal on its own individual planning merits.
18. The appellant has also set out concerns with regard to the handling of the planning application, in terms of the amount of time it took for a decision to be issued and a lack of engagement by the Council. Whilst I note these frustrations, this does not appear to have interfered with the Council's assessment of the scheme nor does it outweigh the harm I have identified in relation to occupiers' living conditions.

Conclusion and Recommendation

19. I have found that the proposal would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area and would not give rise to highway safety issues or inconvenience for road users. However, the appeal scheme would have a harmful effect on the living conditions of the future occupiers of the host dwelling with regard to both the provision of amenity space and outlook. For this reason and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Jamieson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

20. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

B Plenty

INSPECTOR