
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 February 2020 by Hilary Senior BA (Hons) MCD MRTPI

by Susan Ashworth BA (Hons) BPL MRTPI

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

Decision date: 16 March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/H4315/D/19/3241392
77 Windsor Road, Billinge, Wigan, WN5 7LD

- 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 Ian Wright against the decision of St. Helens Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P/2019/0595/HHFP, dated 4 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 8 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is formation of domestic accommodation above the existing garage, including raising the roof and the formation of dormers to the front and rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a corner plot at the junction of Windsor Road and Royden Road and includes a previously extended detached dwelling and single-storey detached double garage. It lies within an established residential area characterised predominantly by two-storey detached and semi-detached dwellings of a variety of styles and design.
5. The proposal would increase both the height of the eaves and overall height of garage to create an upper storey of living accommodation with the addition of both front and rear dormers. The accommodation would be used in connection with, and ancillary to, the host dwelling. It is not proposed to extend the garage forward and there would be no change in the amount of car parking available.
6. The garage is a simply designed building of regular proportions. It is legible as an outbuilding to the dwelling, and is reflective of the size and appearance of other domestic outbuildings in the locality. The raising of the eaves, which

would result in additional masonry above the garage door, and the raising of the ridge height would give the building a disproportionate appearance that would not reflect that of an outbuilding or a two-storey dwelling, and as such would appear as an anomaly. The addition of the dormer window, another unusual feature on a domestic outbuilding in this locality, would emphasise its incongruity in the street scene.

7. I acknowledge that there is no consistency in the style of buildings in the street scene. However, the buildings are all well-proportioned and designed. From the site visit I note that there are limited examples of front dormers in the immediate vicinity of the proposal. The photographs submitted in support of the application show dormer extensions, but I do not have details of their location in comparison to the appeal site. Moreover, they do not share the same characteristics as the proposal as they relate to two-storey dwellings and, in any event, I have assessed this proposal on the key characteristics of the immediate vicinity of the site.
8. I acknowledge that the proposal would not affect the living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring properties, particularly with regard to light and privacy. However, this is a neutral matter rather than one which weighs in favour of the scheme.
9. Accordingly, for the above reasons, the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the local area and would therefore be contrary to saved Policy GEN 8 of the St Helens Unitary Development Plan (2007) which seeks to ensure that development respects the scale, design and character and appearance of the original dwelling, and the character of its neighbours and local setting.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

Hilary Senior

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Susan Ashworth

INSPECTOR