



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 December 2024

by J D Clark BA (Hons) DpTRP MCD DMS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 December 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/H4315/D/24/3348953

76 Longton Lane, Rainhill L35 8NY

- 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 Gary Christian against the decision of St Helens Metropolitan Borough Council.
- The application Ref is P/2024/0286/HHFP.
- The development proposed is two storey & single storey pitched roof extensions to side.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extensions on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a semi-detached two-storey house on the corner of Longton Lane and Vincent Road. The house has previously been extended with single storey side and rear extensions together with a front porch. The house is in a particularly prominent location due to its corner location at the mini-roundabout junction and the position of the neighbouring terraced row of properties to the south and the curve of the road.
4. The Council indicates that it finds the two storey side extension acceptable and given the design of the house and its existing extensions, I agree. However, the additional single storey element would enlarge the width of the house disproportionately. This would be particularly evident when viewed in the context of its attached neighbour, which although having been extended, this is by a single storey extension only. Furthermore, the overall bulk and massing of the proposed extensions cumulatively would reduce the openness of this property in a very prominent location.
5. Whilst there is a boundary wall to the side of the house which would partly obscure the single storey element, especially when viewed close up, the prominence of the house and its open side space means that this element would stand out as an excessive sideways projection when viewed in its wider context.
6. The combined effect of the two storey and single storey extensions would extend the width of the house by more than 3 metres and by more than half the width of the original house which would conflict with the guidelines set out

in the Council's SPD for householder developments¹. Although there are no clear building lines in this case, the location of the house means it is particularly prominent and therefore the width of the proposed extensions in relation to the original house would reduce the openness of this corner plot.

7. Consequently, the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area and conflict with Local Plan Policy LPD04² which, amongst other things, seeks to ensure that extensions to an existing dwelling respects and/or enhances the appearance and character of the existing dwelling and the surrounding area.

Other Matters

8. Although no concerns have been raised with regard to traffic, or any effects including light or view to neighbours, these lack of harms do not overcome the harm I have identified. The appellant refers to other examples of similar proposals in the area but no details have been provided.

Conclusion

9. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. Consequently, the appeal should be dismissed.

J D Clark

INSPECTOR

¹ St Helens Council Local Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document Householder Development, Adopted June 2011 (SPD).

²St Helens Borough Council Local Plan up to 2037 – A balanced plan for a better future, July 2022.