



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 May 2025

by **P Barton BA (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z4310/D/25/3361990

7 Stowe Close, Liverpool L25 7YE

- 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 C Holmes against the decision of Liverpool City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24H/1757.
 - The development proposed was described as “single storey side extension with alterations to main roof – hip to gable and addition of dormer to rear”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the hip to gable roof alterations and the rear dormer.
2. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted insofar as it relates to the single storey side extension and the addition of full height opening doors with a Juliet balcony at first floor level, at 7 Stowe Close, Liverpool L25 7YE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24H/1757, dated 5 July 2024, and the plans submitted with it, so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The single storey side extension and full height opening doors with a Juliet balcony at first floor level hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos. A100 Site and Location Plans, A103 Rev A Proposed Floor Plans and A104 Rev A Proposed Elevations.
 - 3) The external materials of the single storey side extension and full height opening doors with a Juliet balcony at first floor level hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Preliminary Matters

3. The description of development on the application form does not include the addition of full height opening doors with a Juliet balcony at first floor level, which are shown on the plans before me and the appellant has commented upon. Therefore, I consider the development to be as described in the decision.
4. The Council have raised substantive concerns with regard to the proposed rear dormer and the full height opening doors with a Juliet balcony at first floor level, and not the single storey side extension or the hip to gable roof alterations. From the evidence before me, I see no reason to disagree with the Council's position

with respect to the single storey side extension and the hip to gable roof alterations.

5. I am satisfied that the single storey extension and full height opening doors with a Juliet balcony at first floor level are clearly severable from the hip to gable roof alterations and rear dormer, as it is physically and functionally independent. Therefore, under section 79(1)(b) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, I have the power to issue a split decision. However, the hip to gable roof alterations, are not severable from the dormer and as such I have chosen to not split my decision in regard to this element.
6. Additional plans had been submitted that were outside the scope of the Householder Appeal Services, where there is no opportunity to submit new evidence after the local planning authority have made their determination. I have therefore proceeded to determine the appeal on the basis of the same plans and evidence that the local planning authority determined the application upon.

Main Issues

7. The main issues are:
 - the effect of the proposed rear dormer on the character and appearance of the surrounding area; and
 - the effect of the proposed rear dormer and full height opening doors with a Juliet Balcony at first floor level on the living conditions of the occupants of No. 14 Farthing Close, with particular regard to proximity and privacy.

Reasons

Character and appearance

8. The appeal site is located within a modern housing development that consists of detached 2-storey houses set within cul-de-sacs, with either gable end or hip end roof designs. The appeal property faces Stowe Close, and the plot is wide and shallow compared to the surrounding plots. The rear elevation of the house is close to the rear boundary, which it shares with No. 14 Farthing Close, and has private gardens to the sides, resulting in a triple aspect property.
9. The proposed hip to gable roof alterations would reflect the roof design of houses in the locality. Whilst the rear dormer would be set in from the proposed gable ends and clad in hanging tiles, it would not be set down from the ridge line of the roof and would occupy a significant amount of the resulting rear slope.
10. The proposed hip to gable roof alterations would, along with the set ins from either gable end, screen the proposed rear dormer to an acceptable degree when viewed from Stowe Close. However, the rear dormer would be visible from the turning area at the far end of Farthing Close and the houses located to this end of the cul-de-sac.
11. As such, the resulting dormer would dominate and give a bulky, top-heavy feel to the rear slope, when viewed from Farthing Close. This would be further compounded by the proximity of the proposed dormer to the common boundary and No. 14, as well as the appeal site's slightly elevated ground level.

12. I have considered the argument that there are other dormers in the locality of the appeal property. Whilst a number of dormers are visible from Farthing Close, their full widths are set back from nearby boundaries. Consequently, their visual impact is considerably lessened. The presence of these does not overcome the harm that I have otherwise found on this matter.
13. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed rear dormer would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. As such, it would be contrary to Policies H8 and UD1 of the Liverpool Local Plan (LLP). Together these policies seek a high quality of design where, amongst other things, the size and scale of development are in keeping with the original dwelling and the surrounding area.

Living Conditions

14. The increase in bulk and height to the appeal property as a result of the proposed rear dormer would be highly visible from the private outdoor amenity space to No. 14, particularly the area to the side of the house. Moreover, the full width of the proposed dormer would be positioned close to, and run broadly parallel with, the common boundary. Consequently, these factors would result in an unacceptable overbearing effect on the private outdoor amenity space of the occupiers of No. 14.
15. The proposal would accommodate two bedrooms with separate dressing spaces and a shared en-suite within the roof space. The dormer would contain windows serving the bedrooms as well as the en-suite. This would, in essence, position windows to habitable rooms at a second-floor level within a very close distance to the common boundary with No. 14.
16. It is claimed that the impact on privacy would not be much worse than from the existing rooflight window at the appeal property that overlooks the gable of No. 14. However, the proposed bedroom windows within the dormer would be closer to the rear elevation of the appeal property than the existing rooflight. Moreover, views from these windows directly down into the private outdoor amenity space to the side of No. 14 would be possible, resulting in a noticeable loss of privacy. Though, views from the bedroom windows in the proposed dormer into existing habitable rooms, through the windows and doors to the side elevation, at No. 14 are likely to be at such a sharply oblique angle that it would result in no adverse harm.
17. I note the suggestion that the proposed dormer would not cast a shadow onto No. 14 and that this was not a substantive concern raised by the Council. From my own observations and in the absence of any contrary evidence before me, I have come to the same conclusion.
18. The proposed full height opening doors with a Juliet balcony at first floor level would replace an existing window to the side elevation of the appeal property. The Juliet balcony would prevent access beyond the confines of the internal floor space. Due to the existing arrangement as well as the distance and angle from the proposed doors to the existing rear amenity space at No. 14, there would not be an unacceptable level of overlooking and loss of privacy.
19. In conclusion, whilst I have found that the proposed full height opening doors with a Juliet balcony at first floor level would cause no adverse impact on the living conditions of the occupants of No 14, the proposed rear dormer would, with

particular regard to proximity and privacy. This conflicts with Policy H8 of the LLP, which requires extensions and alterations to be designed so there shall be no significant reduction in living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties.

Conditions

20. With regards to the single storey side extension and the addition of full height opening doors with a Juliet balcony at first floor level, and in addition to the standard time condition, I have imposed a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans, as this provides certainty. A condition is also necessary for materials to match those used on the existing house to protect the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

21. The appeal proposal includes different elements. Having regard to the development plan as a whole and all other matters raised, I dismiss the appeal in respect of the hip to gable roof alterations and the rear dormer. However, I allow the appeal in respect of the single storey side extension and the addition of full height opening doors with a Juliet balcony at first floor level.

P Barton

INSPECTOR