



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 December 2022

by J D Clark BA (Hons) DpTRP MCD DMS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27th March 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/P2365/D/22/3304068

Arcadian, 72 Granville Park, Aughton, Lancashire L39 5DX

- 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 Thomas Ryder against the decision of West Lancashire Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2022/0275/FUL, dated 9 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 1 July 2022.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing garage, internal remodelling and proposed extension to the side and rear of 72 Granville Park. Existing vehicular access to the site – currently via Winifred Lane – proposed to be relocated to enter via Granville Park.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the host dwelling and whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Granville Park Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a detached house and the land around it located on the corner of Granville Park and Winifred Lane in the Granville Park Conservation Area. The serpentine layout of Granville Park with its residential properties is one of the key characteristics of the Conservation Area along with its semi-rural setting as a residential park with views across fields south of Winifred Lane. The significance of the Conservation Area is its park-like setting of large houses set back from the roads with street trees as well as mature landscaping to individual properties.
4. No 72 Granville Park is amongst the older properties within the pre-1900 phase of development of the Conservation Area and its grandeur and landmark location together with its generous plot, low boundary walls and its set back from the two roads which adjoin it, contribute to its significance in the Conservation Area.
5. The single storey extension would be flat roofed and mostly glazed but whilst notably lower in height than the house itself and with brickwork to match the house and a sedum roof, it would appear as a discordant box-like add on which would be unsympathetic to the style and design of the host dwelling. Furthermore, although the extension would be located away from the site's

boundaries it would be very visible due to the location of the dwelling and its prominence in the Conservation Area. I note that there are contemporary replacement dwellings and extensions to properties within the Conservation Area and whilst a contemporary addition could be acceptable, in this case I find that it would not be appropriate in this context.

6. The front elevation faces the corner of Granville Park and Winifred Lane and so its rear elevation (south-east) is clearly visible from Winifred Lane. It comprises a detailed elevation with multiple windows which would be removed by the proposed two-storey extension. Furthermore, the south-east boundary of the appeal site denotes the boundary of the Conservation Area and so No 72 represents an important building in terms of views into the Conservation Area from Winifred Lane, particularly to those approaching from the south-east towards the junction with Granville Park. Although the proximity of the neighbouring house, 44 Winifred Lane partly obscures the view, the rear elevation of No 72 is still clearly visible and the loss of the detailed fenestration would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling.
7. The proposal includes the creation of a new vehicular access to Granville Road which would widen an existing pedestrian gate and result in some loss of walling. However, the existing flat roof garage and its access to Winifred Lane would be removed and the wall continued along this boundary which would have a positive impact on the host dwelling and the street scene. I also note that the proposed extension would create a gap between the boundary of the house and its boundary with 44 Winifred Lane. However, these benefits are small and do not overcome the harm I have identified.
8. In reaching my conclusion I have had regard to Section 72(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 which requires that special attention be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area.
9. I consider that the proposal would amount to harm to the significance of the heritage asset. In finding harm, this is something to which I have given considerable importance and weight to. This harm is less than substantial in terms of the National Planning Policy Framework¹, and although the proposed extensions are part of an overall refurbishment of this property, there are no public benefits that outweigh this harm.
10. I conclude that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and fails to preserve the character and appearance of the Granville Park Conservation Area and would cause less than substantial harm to its significance as a designated heritage asset. It would conflict with Local Plan² Policies ENV4 and GN3 in that it would not preserve West Lancashire's heritage asset or have regard to the historic character of the host dwelling and the distinctiveness of its surroundings. This would also be inconsistent with the aims of the Framework with regard to heritage and design and with the design principles set out in the SPD³.

¹ Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government National Planning Policy Framework, 2021 (the Framework).

² West Lancashire Local Plan 2012-2027 Development Plan Document, October 2013.

³ West Lancashire District Council Supplementary Planning Document Design Guide, January 2008.

Conclusion

11. For the reason given above, and having had regard to the development plan and all other consideration, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J D Clark

INSPECTOR