



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 November 2025

by David Smith BA(Hons) DMS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P2365/D/25/3374447

2 Lordsgate Drive, Burscough, L40 7RS

- 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 Dr Christopher Goddard against the decision of West Lancashire Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 2025/0525/FUL.
 - The development proposed is an alternative to approved application 2023/0258/FUL to increase the ridge height.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for an alternative to approved application 2023/0258/FUL to increase the ridge height at 2 Lordsgate Drive, Burscough, L40 7RS in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2025/0525/FUL, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos 1150_05B, 1150_06A and site location plan.
 - 3) The external materials of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Main Issue

2. Planning permission was given for a new dormer to the rear of the dwellinghouse in 2023. Compared to that scheme, the existing ridge height would be raised and the size of the dormer increased accordingly. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The two-storey detached and semi-detached houses on the southern side of the short cul-de-sac have a generally consistent ridge line although that at No 5 is stepped. Their designs are similar but not identical.
4. By continuing the front roof plane slightly upwards across the entire width of the property, a coherent and harmonious appearance would be achieved. The proposal would not be seen directly adjacent to neighbouring buildings and so the raised roof would not look out of place. It would be set back from the road and the dormer would be discretely positioned. As such, the proposal as a whole would be a minor and insignificant element in the overall street scene. The design would be sensitive to its local context and have regard to visual amenity as required by

Policy GN3 of the West Lancashire Local Plan. The proposed development would also be well related to the existing building and would not harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Conclusion

5. Conditions are necessary to confirm the approved plans in the interests of certainty and to secure matching materials for a complementary external finish. The proposal would accord with the development plan and, for the reasons given, the appeal should succeed.

David Smith

INSPECTOR