

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 June 2023

by John Whalley

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26th June 2023

Appeal ref: APP/P2365/D/23/3321343

Old Orchard House, 70 Granville Park West, Aughton, West Lancashire L39 5HS

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal of planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Ms Laura Evans against the decision of West Lancashire Borough Council.
 - The application, ref. 2022/1183/FUL dated 2 November 2022, was refused by a notice dated 10 February 2023.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of existing garage, proposed single storey garage extension and two storey rear extension. Alterations and widening existing access.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed and planning permission refused.

Main issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed extensions to the dwelling at No. 70 Granville Park West on the house and on the character and appearance of this part of the Granville Park Conservation Area.

Considerations

3. The large appeal dwelling No. 70 Granville Park West lies within the Granville Park Conservation Area fronting Granville Park West. Granville Park is on its south-eastern side. The rear garden of the house reaches to Winifred Lane. Granville Park West is typified by fine large detached houses, several of which have been enlarged or substantially remodelled.
4. The Council said the appeal proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The extensions would not be subservient to the host building. They said the proposals failed the objectives of Chapter 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy EN4 of the West Lancashire Local Plan. Nor did the project comply with the Council's Design Guide and guidance in the Granville Park Conservation Area Appraisal.
5. Policy EN4 of the West Lancashire Local Plan 2012-2027 - Preserving and Enhancing West Lancashire's Cultural and Heritage Assets, says there will be a presumption in favour of the conservation of designated heritage assets. Development will not be permitted that will adversely affect a listed building, a

- scheduled monument, a conservation area, historic park or garden, or important archaeological remains. Development affecting the historic environment should seek to preserve or enhance the heritage asset and any features of specific historic, archaeological, architectural or artistic interest.
6. Local Plan policy GN3 states: "that in the case of extensions, conversions or alterations to existing buildings, the proposal should relate to the existing building, in terms of design and materials and should not detract from the character of the street scene".
 7. The Heritage Statement submitted with the application says No. 70, known as Old Orchard House, is a good example of a Neo-Georgian house. It is said to be of a particular quality and design, making a contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The proposed 2 storey rear extension would replace an existing flat roofed rear extension with a structure 5.80m wide extending some 6.5m from the main rear elevation of the house. The amended application drawings show a 70mm reduction in the depth of this extension. But it would remain in excess of the Council's SPD Design Guide which says extensions in length or width should not exceed 2/3rds of the corresponding dimension of the host property. The side and rear extensions would exceed this requirement.
 8. Whilst design details and proposed finishes have been carefully selected to ensure retention of the main external features of the existing house, the use of flat roofing to the entirety of this large extension project seems to me inappropriate, discordant and ill-fitting to the original house and garage. The incorporation of pitched roofs in the design of extensions can be difficult. But an example shown in the Appellant's statement at page 16 to illustrate the aesthetic and finish sought nevertheless shows a single storey extension with a pitched roof.
 9. The house at No. 70 is screened from the fronting road by high hedging. But I do not regard that a permanent feature. The proposed long flat roofed 3 garage and glazed link would extend the house by some 13.7m close to the boundary with No. 66 next door with a somewhat jarring feature of 3 single car garage doors, giving a look more akin to a short row of lock up garages than a domestic amenity. This lengthy side extension would also adversely affect the soundly balanced proportions of the main house.
 10. I conclude that whilst the appeal extensions project shows some fine design elements, it does not fulfil the need to safeguard the character and appearance of this part of the Granville Park Conservation Area, a duty imposed by s.66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons outlined above, and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

John Whalley

INSPECTOR