



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 October 2024

by Martin H Seddon BSc MPhil DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 October 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/H4315/D/24/3345094

32 Gorsey Lane, Clockface WA9 4XB

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Stephen Lyons against the decision of St Helens Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is P/2024/0122/HHFP.
 - The development proposed is loft conversion with dormers to front and rear with new roof to existing rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposals on the character and appearance of the building and the street scene.

Reasons

3. 32 Gorsey Lane is a semi-detached bungalow located in a residential area. It is part of a row of other bungalows, which face two storey semi-detached dwellings on the opposite side of Gorsey Lane.
4. The appellant advises that several properties in the vicinity have front dormers and that they are a characteristic feature of the neighbourhood. Whilst that may be the case within a much wider area, the bungalows along this part of Gorsey Lane lack front dormer extensions and have mainly retained their original architectural form and style. This creates a regularity in their character and appearance. Despite their design, scale and proportions, the proposed two pitched roofed front dormers would appear discordant, prominent and out of keeping in the street scene. Moreover, they would unbalance the symmetry in roof form of the pair of semi-detached bungalows.
5. In view of the context set by the existing bungalows in Gorsey Lane, the proposed front dormers would fail to respect or enhance the character and appearance of the dwelling, contrary to St Helens Borough Local Plan policy LPD04. The proposed dormers would conflict with Local Plan policy LDP01 because they would not maintain local distinctiveness in built design. There would also be conflict with the Council's Householder Development Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) which indicates that front dormers

will not usually be permitted unless they are a prevailing feature of the house style and character of the area.

6. The proposed rear dormer does not appear to meet all the dimensional criteria, as indicated in the Householder Development SPD, although the Council has raised no objection to this part of the proposal having regard to its impact on residential amenity.
7. I acknowledge the appellant's desire to enhance the liveability and aesthetic value of the property by providing additional space and light, and the appellant's reference to letters of support. The appellant also submits that the proposal will comply with local plan policies to adapt existing housing. However, the development would only result in a very limited increase in the housing stock.
8. These considerations are insufficient to outweigh my finding that the proposed front dormers would have a significant harmful effect on the character and appearance of the building and the street scene. The proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

Martin H Seddon

INSPECTOR