
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 August 2021

by Helen B Hockenhull BA (Hons) B. PI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 31 August 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/P2365/D/21/3276516

Glenridding, 24 Ruff Lane, Ormskirk, Lancashire L39 4QZ

- 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 Ms Hannah Khattab against the decision of West Lancashire Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2021/0093/FUL, dated 20 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 26 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is a detached garage development.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a detached garage development at Glenridding, 24 Ruff Lane, Ormskirk, Lancashire L39 4QZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2021/0093/FUL, dated 20 January 2021, 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: Existing Site Plan - Drawing No. A105, Proposed Plans - Drawing No. A106, Proposed Elevations - Drawing No. A107, Proposed Section/3D Views - Drawing No. A108 and Proposed Landscaping - Drawing No 109.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Ruff Lane Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

3. The appeal property forms a detached house set in a large plot with an extensive mature landscaped garden area. The dwelling is located in the Ruff Lane CA.
4. Ruff Lane forms a mainly residential area characterised by large early twentieth century detached villas of varying design, set in substantial landscaped plots set back from the road. The presence of trees along the highway and in the

front gardens of the residential properties gives the area a verdant and attractive appearance. I consider that the significance of the CA, as it relates to this appeal, derives from its low-density spacious development and its landscape quality.

5. The proposed garage would be sited forward of the building line of the host property, though would be offset to the side. I acknowledge that garages associated with dwellings of this age would have been sited to the side, however there is insufficient space at the appeal property to do this. I observed on my site visit the position of other garages on Ruff Lane. Whilst many were located to the side, there were examples of garages forward of the front elevation at No.50 and No.30.
6. The siting of the proposed garage close to the house would maintain a significant setback of built development from the road. Furthermore, the existing trees and vegetation in the garden as well as the proposed additional planting would screen the proposal from public viewpoints. Whilst in the winter months, this screening may be less effective, I consider it would still substantially screen the proposal.
7. The proposed double garage would be of approximate dimensions 6.1 metres by 5.6 metres by 4.4 metres high. It would form a modest ancillary building which despite being forward of the front elevation, would, in terms of size and design, not visually compete with the existing dwelling or significantly reduce the size of the plot or the extent of the garden area.
8. The Council has argued that if this appeal is allowed, it would set a precedent for other similar proposals sited forward of existing dwellings. However, as I have already noted above, there are such examples already existing on Ruff Lane. In any event, each scheme should be considered on its merits, following an assessment of any harm.
9. Given the above, I conclude that the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the Ruff Lane CA and would therefore comply with section 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policies GN3 and EN4 of the West Lancashire Local Plan. These policies seek to preserve and enhance cultural and heritage assets and achieve a high design quality having regard to the West Lancashire Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document.

Conditions

10. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council. In addition to the standard time limit, I have imposed a condition specifying the approved plans, as this provides certainty. A condition requiring materials to match that of the existing dwelling is also necessary in the interests of the character and appearance of the CA and the host property.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I allow this appeal.

Helen Hockenfull

INSPECTOR