

Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 7 December 2020 by Hilary Senior BA (Hons) MCD MRTPI

Decision by Zoe Raygen Dip URP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/H4315/D/20/3259403

30 Osborne Road, Eccleston, ST. HELENS, WA10 5JS

- 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 Paul Mooney against the decision of St Helens Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P/2020/0316/HHFP, dated 21 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 25 June 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as a two storey extension at side, single storey extension/porch at front/side and single storey extension at rear/side.
-

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 30 Osborne Road and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. 30 Osborne Road is a semi-detached property set in a corner plot at the junction of Osborne Road and Walmesley Road and is in a residential area.
5. The area is characterised by a mix of housing types which are set back from the highway, predominantly behind low walls with clear uniform building lines, giving an open and spacious character to the area.
6. The Household Development Supplementary Planning Document (2011) (SPD) includes guidance for corner plots, which states that extension should be no more than 3 metres wide or occupy no more than half the width of the original house and that the extension should respect existing clear building lines.
7. The proposed extension would be marginally wider than half the width of the original dwelling, however the Council considered that this was acceptable due to the minimal additional impact on the dwelling. From all I have seen and read I have no reason to disagree with this conclusion.

8. Nevertheless, whilst the proposed extension would not harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling due to its size and design, the extension would project significantly beyond the clear building line along Walmesley Road. As a consequence, it would erode the open spacious character of the area. The two storey nature of the proposal, together with its bulk and mass, would be a dominant, obtrusive feature on what is currently a characteristic open corner contrary to guidance in the SPD. As it would be closer to the highway and beyond the building line it would be readily visible from views along Walmesley Road.
9. My attention was drawn to a small number of examples of two storey extension in the vicinity of the appeal site, which I saw on the site visit. However, the specific details of these cases are not before this appeal. I am not therefore aware of the details of these properties, or the planning policy context in which planning permission was granted. In any event, they are not of sufficient number to alter the predominant clear building lines in the area and I have determined this appeal on the site specific circumstances of this case.
10. For the above reasons, I conclude that the development would harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It would therefore be contrary to saved Policy GEN 8 of the St Helens Unitary Development Plan (1997), and guidance contained in the SPD which together, amongst other things seek to ensure that development respect the character of its local setting.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. 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

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

Zoe Raygen

INSPECTOR