

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 July 2023

by John Whalley

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 August 2023

Appeal ref: APP/V4305/D/23/3321768

23 Woodbridge Avenue, Knowsley, Halewood L26 7XH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal of planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Mark Legros against the decision of Knowsley Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application, ref. 22/00643/FUL, dated 14 October 2022, was refused by a notice dated 15 February 2023.
 - The development proposed is: Erection of two storey rear extension and erection of first floor extension above garage together with a front and rear dormer extension including loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

2. The main issue in this appeal concerns the likely effect of the proposed house extensions at No. 23 Woodbridge Avenue on the amenity of neighbouring dwellings to the south-west in Blackberry Grove.

Considerations

3. Mr Legros wishes to reconstruct and extend his home. A second floor en-suite bedroom and laundry room would be built above the double garage and hall. The conservatory would be replaced by a 2 story extension to rear of the house. An en-suite bedroom dormer would be built into the rear roof.
4. The proposed extensions, especially that added to the garage, would be built close to the boundaries of rear gardens of houses at the end of the Blackberry Grove cul-de-sac just to the south-west. I consider the Council right to be concerned that the occupiers of Nos. 7 and 9 Blackberry Grove in particular would be likely to suffer a significant loss of amenity in their rear gardens and at the rear of their homes.
5. The garage extension would see a 2 storey building almost on the rear boundary of Nos. 7 and 9 Blackberry Grove. It would create an undesirable hemmed-in feeling, especially so at the end of the No. 9 garden. The height increase of the garage reconstruction so close to the common boundary with Nos. 7 and 9 Blackberry Grove would cause unacceptable overshadowing and a poorer outlook for those properties, adding to an unduly overbearing effect.

Such a reduction of amenity the adjoining occupants currently experience would not be acceptable.

6. Other features of Mr Legros' project are of less concern. The rear 2 story extension would bring the rear of the house more into line with the rear of No. 25 next door in Woodbridge Avenue. However, together with the large rear dormer proposal, the increased height and bulk of the house at No. 23 would be closer to the rear gardens of the houses in Blackberry Grove than No. 25, adding further detriment to their amenity.
7. I can understand Mr Legros' determination to improve and considerably extend his home. But it should not cause significant harm to neighbouring homes.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons outlined above, I conclude that the appeal should not be allowed.

John Whalley

INSPECTOR