
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 April 2024

by Elaine Benson BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 April 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/M4320/D/23/3333711

21a Ryeground Lane, Formby, Sefton L37 7EG

- 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 M Goulbourne against the decision of Sefton Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref DC/2023/01175, dated 5 July 2023, was refused by notice dated 4 September 2023.
 - The development proposed is 'amendment to Approved Application (DC/2022/01593) from pitched roof dormers to flat roof dormers on the front elevation'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. This is the effect of the appeal proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The two appeal dormers have already been constructed on the front elevation of the appeal property. The principle of front dormer extensions and their position on the roof were approved in a recent planning permission ref DC/2022/01593. The flat roof design of the dormers is consistent with the contemporary architectural treatment of the host property and to my mind is an acceptable approach in an area of diverse house designs where dormers are a characteristic design feature.
4. However, the dormers are overly large in proportion to the size and scale of the front roof plane and the ground floor windows. Due to their size and the extent of their projection from the roof, the dormers appear dominant, out of proportion with the scale of the property as a whole and are incongruous. Furthermore, whilst the proposal complies with certain guidance in the Council's SPD House Extensions (SPD), the proposal conflicts with its paragraph 6.4 in this regard.
5. The appeal property is in a prominent location at the bend of the road and at a point where the designs of the adjacent properties transition. Notwithstanding its set back from the road frontage, the building is conspicuous due to the strident and discordant appearance of the dormers. The development harms the character and appearance of its surroundings.

6. I conclude that the dormer development results in a top-heavy roof which unbalances the overall appearance of the building. The proposal does not respond positively to the character and appearance of the surrounding area and consequently fails to comply with Policies EQ2 and HC4 of the Local Plan and Policy ESD2 of the Formby and Little Altcar Neighbourhood Plan which, in summary, seek to achieve high quality design that makes a positive contribution to the surrounding area. As already indicated, the scheme conflicts with similar design guidance in the SPD relating to roof alterations. The proposal is also counter to the design guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework which states that development that is not well designed should be refused.
7. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

Elaine Benson

INSPECTOR