
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 April 2025 by J Reed MPlan

Decision by M Clowes BA (Hons) MCD PGCERT (Arch con) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z4310/D/25/3360788

34 Lyndor Road, Liverpool L25 8QW

- 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 Roberta Laterza against the decision of Liverpool City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24H/2512.
 - The development proposed is described as 'loft conversion with rear and side dormer, window replacement and flat roof replacement.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development upon:
 - the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area; and
 - the living conditions of the occupants of 32 Lyndor Road, with specific regard to outlook.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached bungalow, in a residential area of similarly designed dwellings. It has a simple architectural appearance with a hipped roof formation, mirroring that of the adjoining semi and its wider neighbours. Although it differs with the provision of modest front and rear box dormers, it contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.
5. The hipped roof formation helps to reduce the scale and mass of the dwelling above ground level. In contrast, the proposed side dormer window would extend close to the eaves line resulting in a boxy addition that would add significantly to the scale of the roof, despite a set back from the front elevation and inclusion of a hipped roof. It is not clear from the drawings, but it appears that the side of the roof to the dormer would overlap the existing ridge tiles.

6. In addition, the proposed rear dormer window would also encroach onto the side-facing hipped roof. Given the gap created by the rear garden to the adjacent dwelling, both dormer windows would be visible from within the street scene, albeit the rear one would be to a more limited extent. Due to their position, size and form, the proposed dormers would overwhelm and dominate the host property, rather than appear subordinate to it. In this regard they would further unbalance the appearance of the attached semi. Even if the views from within the street scene would be relatively localised, an incongruous form of development that would disrupt the harmonious character would nonetheless arise. This would not be mitigated by the position of the dwelling close to the junction with Charterhouse Road.
7. I acknowledge that there are some examples of dormer windows within the wider area. However, the majority are located to the rear and I did not observe any examples within the direct vicinity of the appeal site. It is unclear from the evidence presented whether they have planning permission. Irrespective, the presence of other unsympathetic forms of development would not justify further harm to the street scene. The presence of larger domestic extensions elsewhere does not justify permitting smaller dormers that fail to relate well and appear subordinate to, the host dwelling.
8. For the reasons set out, the proposal would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area. As such it fails to comply with the relevant provisions of Policies H8, UD1 and UD7 of the Liverpool Local Plan (LLP) 2022, which requires development to be of high-quality design that compliments the style of the existing dwelling and surrounding area.

Living conditions

9. The Council has articulated its concerns regarding the impact of the dormer on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 32, in respect of outlook from the rear garden space only. I will make the same assessment.
10. The proposed rear dormer extension would be directly adjacent to the shared boundary with No.32 and would occupy the majority of the rear roof slope. It would extend close to the original eaves line such that it would be akin to a first-floor addition. The dormer would inevitably result in a change, and due to its boxy appearance, it would appear as a dominant addition in character and appearance terms, as I have found above.
11. However, the offset position of the dormer beyond the shared boundary and being set behind the single storey rear extension to No 32, would help to mitigate and reduce its impact on the outlook afforded to the rear garden space. Despite its height, the proposed dormer would not project along the shared boundary and thus would not create an undue sense of enclosure. The rear garden to No 32 would remain unconstrained by built development on all three existing sides.
12. I find that the proposed development would not have an excessively overbearing impact and instead, a good level of outlook would be retained for the occupiers of No 32 when utilising their garden. The proposal would not have an unacceptable impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 32, with particular regard to outlook. It would therefore accord with the aims of Policy H8 of the LLP which requires development to consider the effect upon the surrounding environment and amenities of occupiers of nearby properties.

Other Matters

13. Support for a proposal does not equate to a lack of harm and I note that no comments were received from interested parties during the determination process. The appellant's desire to create more useable space to meet their future family needs is acknowledged. However, this would largely be a private benefit that would not outweigh the harm identified.
14. Concerns have been raised regarding the Council's conduct during the application stage. Nevertheless, this issue does not relate to the planning merits of the appeal, which must be the focus of my recommendation.
15. Reference is made to a press article in which it is suggested that the Government is showing support for upwards extensions. The proposed development includes dormer extensions to an existing roof, rather than the creation of an additional storey by raising the height of the dwelling. Planning permission is required for the proposed development and I have found it unacceptable for the reasons given. This does not affect my findings.

Conclusion and Recommendation

16. The proposal would not be harmful to the living conditions of the occupants of No 32. This however, weighs neutrally in the planning balance. I have found that the proposal would have an adverse effect on the host dwelling and the character and appearance of the area. The proposal therefore fails to accord with the development plan, when taken as a whole, and there are no material considerations of sufficient magnitude to indicate that the appeal should be determined other than in accordance with it.
17. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Reed

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

18. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

M Clowes

INSPECTOR