



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 June 2026

by J Smith MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3rd June 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/Z4310/W/25/3375501

73 - 75 Garmoyle Road, Liverpool L15 3JH

- 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 Tenveer Ahmed against the decision of Liverpool City Council.
- The application Ref is 25F/0521.
- The development proposed is described as: "part retrospective application seeking retention of second floor extension at rear and adaptation of unauthorised alterations undertaken to roof, including removal of flat roof element, and construction of new pitched roof incorporating 2 dormers".

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on:
 - the character and appearance of the host properties and the street scene; and,
 - the living conditions of the occupiers of 77 Garmoyle Road, with regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. 73 and 75 Garmoyle Road comprise two terraced properties located on a corner plot at the junction with Ferndale Road. The surrounding area is characterised by traditional terraced housing. These terraces typically feature pitched roofs, with prominent gabled elements on the end properties of each row. To the rear, the dwellings include outrigger extensions incorporating a mix of hipped and pitched roof forms.
4. The evidence before me indicates that the appeal properties originally featured hipped-roof outriggers. The proposed development seeks to introduce an extended gable-roof form. During my site visit, I observed that similar roof forms, particularly to the rear outriggers of corner-plot properties, are not uncommon in the surrounding area. As such, the proposal would maintain this aspect of the local character. While I acknowledge that the scheme would result in a comparatively bulky rear projection, shared between both properties rather than expressed as two individual outriggers, I am mindful that its visibility is significantly limited to passing glimpses. This is due to the dense arrangement of surrounding buildings on Ferndale Road. Therefore, this element of the development would be perceptible only from a small number of restricted vantage points.

5. My attention now turns to the dormer roof element facing Ferndale Road. The proposed addition would adopt a traditional gabled form, consistent with many comparable dormers within the surrounding streets, and would therefore not appear incongruous. Its proportions would sit comfortably within the roofscape, owing to its modest scale and its set-back position from the eaves. While the dormer would not align precisely with the two principal windows on the floor levels below, the separation created by the secondary ground-floor window, together with the dormer's standalone presence within the roof plane, leads me to conclude that the arrangement would not result in a visually cluttered appearance.
6. Turning to the larger of the two proposed dormers, this element would be of a substantial size and, with no fenestration to break up its massing, would present as a noticeably bulky addition to the roofscape. However, during my site visit it was evident that views of this dormer would be extremely limited, largely restricted to brief glimpses along the rear alley. The dense arrangement of surrounding residential properties, together with the presence of existing rear outriggers, would further obscure the structure, particularly from vantage points along Langdale Road. From Ferndale Road, the dormer would be even less perceptible due to its position behind the gabled roof of the proposed extension and its lower height relative to that ridge line.
7. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the proposed development would not result in harm to the character or appearance of the host property or the wider street scene. The scheme therefore accords with Policies H7, H8, UD1 and UD7 of the Liverpool Local Plan 2022 (LP), which seek, among other objectives, to ensure that development responds appropriately to the scale, form and character of existing buildings and preserves the overall character of the surrounding area.

Living conditions

8. No. 77 Garmoye Road contains ground and first-floor windows within its rear elevation, positioned close to the boundary with the appeal site, as is typical within terraced settings. The introduction of a dormer extension above the joint outrigger would add considerable height and mass across a meaningful length of the boundary. When viewed from the ground-floor rear window and yard of No. 77 in particular, and, to a lesser extent, from the first-floor rear window, this increased bulk would create a pronounced sense of enclosure that would feel oppressive to neighbouring occupants. As a result, the proposal would materially diminish the outlook available to the residents of 77 Garmoye Road.
9. In conclusion, the proposed development would cause harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of 77 Garmoye Road, arising from its adverse impact on their rearward outlook and rear yard area. The scheme therefore conflicts with Policies H7, H8 and UD7 of the Liverpool Local Plan 2022, which together seek to ensure that development proposals safeguard the living conditions of existing residents.
10. The Council has referred to Policy UD1 of the LP in its reason for refusal on this main issue. However, in considering the appeal, I note that Policy UD1 is concerned primarily with matters of character and distinctiveness. It does not directly relate to the protection of living conditions. Accordingly, I do not find any conflict with this specific policy in relation to this main issue.

Other Matters

11. The appellant refers to a previous permission, granted some time ago, which is said to have included a dormer facing towards 77 Garmoyle Road. While there appears to be no dispute between the parties regarding whether that permission was lawfully implemented, the evidence before me does not include the corresponding decision notice or a complete set of approved plans. Although a side-by-side comparison of the alleged earlier scheme and the current proposal have been provided, I cannot be undeniably certain, as the decision maker, that the snapshot of the plan included within the appeal evidence is the final approved version from that permission. Consequently, this matter attracts only limited weight in my assessment of the appeal.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above and bringing all material considerations into account, I find that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Smith

INSPECTOR