# **Appeal Decision**

Site visit made on 7 April 2017

## by Kay Sheffield BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

**Decision date: 26.04.2017** 

# Appeal Ref: APP/Z4310/W/17/3167357 Land to the side of 106 Priory Road, Liverpool, L4 2SH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr Phillip Jackson against the decision of Liverpool City Council.
- The application Ref 16F/2454, dated 20/09/2016, was refused by notice dated 06/12/2016.
- The development proposed is an end terrace dwelling.

#### **Decision**

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### **Preliminary Matter**

2. The Council's delegated report on the application and the Appellant's statement of case in respect of the appeal cite two reasons for refusal. However, the decision notice issued by the Council cites one reason and the Council's statement of case offers no justification of the second. The appeal has been determined on the basis of the decision notice.

#### **Main Issue**

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

#### Reasons

- 4. The appeal site is located on the corner of Priory Road and Denebank Road. It is a residential area of predominantly two and three storey Victorian terraced properties together with a parade of shops. The site lies to the side of the existing property, 106 Priory Road, and currently forms part of the private amenity space associated with the dwelling. In contrast to other dwellings in the area the existing property is a relatively modern two storey semi-detached house sharing similar characteristics to the pair of dwellings to the south.
- 5. The proposed two storey dwelling would be attached to No. 106 and would create a terrace of three. The front of the property would be set back from the footway in line with the front elevation of the existing dwellings. It would also match the existing rear building line and the eaves and ridge heights of the adjoining pair. The boundary of the site with Denebank Road is angled. The side elevation of the dwelling would follow the boundary before diverting from

it towards the rear. The private rear garden to No. 106 would be split between the properties to provide an amenity space for the proposed dwelling.

- 6. Although the two pairs of semi-detached dwellings are different in character from the terraced properties which predominate in the area, they nevertheless display symmetry in their design. The width of the front elevation of the proposed dwelling would be significantly less than the adjoining pair. As a result the pattern of the door and window openings together with the door canopy and bay window detail of the existing semi-detached dwellings would not be replicated and the regularity and rhythm of the existing dwellings would be harmed, to the detriment of the appearance of the terrace which would be created.
- 7. Furthermore the two pairs of semi-detached properties sit between two road junctions and the space to either side of them currently balances their location between the side roads. The erection of the proposed dwelling up to the boundary with Denebank Road would create a cramped form of development which would appear incongruous in the street scene, to the detriment of the visual amenity of this part of Priory Road.
- 8. It is therefore concluded that the development would appear incongruous in the street scene to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area and contrary to Policies HD18, H5 and SPG10 of the City of Liverpool Unitary Development Plan which require proposals to respect the character of the surrounding area.
- 9. It is acknowledged that the proposal would provide an additional dwelling. Nevertheless, it is considered that the benefit this would provide would not outweigh the harm identified in respect of visual amenity.
- 10. For the reasons given above, and having had regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

Kay Sheffield

**INSPECTOR**