
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 January 2026

by **C Evans MTCP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26th February 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/Z4310/D/25/3376261

19 The Beeches, Liverpool L18 3LT

- 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 Nick Ford against the decision of Liverpool City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25H/0818.
 - The development proposed is extension of existing garage and porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and wider area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located in a predominantly residential area. The surrounding dwellings are of a similar style and appearance, with some alterations visible. There are different garage doors in the area. Whilst they vary in style and width, they are of a similar standard height for residential areas.
4. The proposal is for a single storey garage extension to the side of the dwelling, which would replace the existing garage. The forward projection of the proposal would be increased beyond the current footprint, and the proposed roof elevation would be changed to form a gable end. As a result, the proposal would dominate the front elevation and would not relate well to the host dwelling. It would also jar with the wider street scene.
5. The proposed garage door may be considered as domestic in style and use; however, it is of a size that is not typical for the area. It would be taller than what is currently featured on the host property and those on neighbouring dwellings. The proposal would be out of proportion and would not complement the host dwelling. Consequently, the proposal would be an incongruous addition, which would be at odds with the street scene.
6. The appellant contends that the local area would be improved through the removal of a visually dominant vehicle from the driveway. The vehicle is not a permanent feature of the area and therefore, this has limited benefits. Whilst I sympathise with the appellant regarding their security concerns, I am not convinced that a garage of this scale is the only means to address these concerns.

7. The appellant has included details of two other schemes for large garage doors which have been approved by the Council. I was able to view both while on my site visit. 9 Childwall Lane features a flat roof garage in an area where these are common. Although it is not stepped back from the front elevation of the host dwelling, it is stepped back from the adjacent garage. In the vicinity of 49 Childwall Park Avenue, there are a range of house types and styles. The garage balances with other alterations made to the pair of semi-detached dwellings. Consequently, these examples are not directly comparable to the appeal site, as the garages relate well to their host dwellings and appear less prominent in the street scene. In any case, I must determine this appeal on the basis of its own merits, and these schemes have not altered my findings regarding the harm identified above.
8. To conclude, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host property and wider area. It conflicts with Policy H8 House Extensions of the Liverpool Local Plan 2013-2033 (adopted January 2022). This requires proposals for extensions and alterations to dwellings to have a high quality design that complements the dwelling and surrounding area.

Other Matters

9. I acknowledge the appellant's comments over the Council's handling of the application; however, these are matters between the respective parties. My decision has focussed on the planning merits of the appeal proposal.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

C Evans

INSPECTOR