



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 August 2020

**by Sarah Manchester BSc MSc PhD MEnvSc**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 7<sup>th</sup> September 2020**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/P2365/D/20/3252881**

**The Ranneys, 117 Alma Hill, Up Holland, Skelmersdale WN8 0NR**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Mr Baxter against the decision of West Lancashire Borough Council.
  - The application Ref 2020/0118/FUL, dated 06 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 04 May 2020.
  - The development proposed is raising height of roof to create a first floor and reformat the existing 3 no. bedroom single storey dwelling to a 4 no. bedroom two storey dwelling. Single storey rear extension and recladding of dwelling with standing seam zinc and timber strips.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for raising height of roof to create a first floor and reformat the existing 3 no. bedroom single storey dwelling to a 4 no. bedroom two storey dwelling. Single storey rear extension and recladding of dwelling with standing seam zinc and timber strips at The Ranneys, 117 Alma Hill, Up Holland, Skelmersdale, WN8 0NR, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2020/0118/FUL, dated 06 February 2020, 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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:  
Location Plan – TQRQM19284231219928; Proposed Site Plan – ALM-PWA-VV-00-DR-A-05\_20-0301; Proposed Floor Plans – ALM-PWA-VV-00-DR-A-05\_20-0302; Proposed Elevations Sheet 1 – ALM-PWA-VV-00-DR-A-05\_20-0303; Proposed Elevations Sheet 2 – ALM-PWA-VV-00-DR-A-05\_20-0304.

### Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

### Reasons

3. No 117 is one of 2 detached single storey dwellings accessed from Alma Hill via a private road and set back behind the extensive mature grounds of the neighbouring community bowling green. The appeal property is set in large

grounds that extend to the rear and include an area of woodland covered by a Tree Preservation Order. The part of the settlement that includes the appeal property comprises a range of residential and community buildings of various ages, styles, sizes and siting. Consequently, the area has a mixed character and appearance.

4. No 117 is a modest building constructed in brick and render and with a tile roof. Notwithstanding its increased height, the proposal would be relatively modest in terms of its size and scale. By virtue of its design and external materials, the proposal would have a contemporary appearance and it would significantly alter the character and appearance of the host property. However, No 117 is an unremarkable building with no particular architectural merit such that the alterations to its appearance would not result in significant harm.
5. Although No 117 and the neighbouring property No 115a are constructed in similar materials, they are not matching in terms of their design, style or size. Therefore, the proposal would not disrupt a uniform pair of properties. From the limited public viewpoints on Alma Hill, No 115a would be seen in the foreground of the proposal. The large expanse of zinc cladding would be mitigated by the size of the proposal and it would be broken up by the timber cladding and openings. Therefore, notwithstanding that the proposal would be taller than the neighbouring single storey dwelling, it would not appear overly dominant and it would not overwhelm No 115a.
6. Furthermore, while the proposal would be distinctly different from the surrounding properties, the area is characterised by variously sited and conspicuously dissimilar properties. The proposal would be set back and it would not be prominent in the street scene. Moreover, it would be screened from wide public views by buildings and landscape planting. While it would be noticeably different, it would not disrupt a harmonious group of properties or a coherent street scene. It would not therefore be detrimental to the character and appearance of the townscape.
7. Therefore, the proposal would not be significantly harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would not conflict with the aims of Policy GN3 of West Lancashire Local Plan 2012-2027 Development Plan Document Adopted October 2013 in relation to high quality design and visual amenity. It would not conflict with the aims of the West Lancashire District Council Supplementary Planning Document Design Guide Adopted January 2008. This notes that many settlements are characterised by development from different periods in history and new development need not mimic earlier buildings. In this respect, while the use of matching materials is generally encouraged, contemporary and innovative designs in high quality materials that contribute to the attractiveness of the area are acceptable.

## **Conditions**

8. In the event that the appeal was allowed, the Council has suggested planning conditions. I have assessed these against the tests set out in Paragraph 55 of the Framework.
9. In addition to the standard condition limiting the lifespan of the planning permission, I have also specified the approved plans in the interests of uncertainty. However, on the basis that the proposal would not conflict with the development plan, a condition securing external materials to match those used

in the existing building is not necessary in order to protect the character and appearance of the area.

**Conclusion**

10. For the reasons set out above, the proposal would not conflict with the development plan. Therefore, the appeal should be allowed and planning permission should be granted, subject to conditions.

*Sarah Manchester*

INSPECTOR