

Peter Hitchen Architects

Peter Hitchen Architects Ltd
Marathon House
The Sidings Business Park
Whalley
Lancashire
BB7 9SE
22 December 2025

APPELLANT STATEMENT (GROUNDS FOR APPEAL) 42 PAINTER WOOD, BILLINGTON, LANCASHIRE

PLANNING APPLICATION REF 3/2025/0818

1.0) INTRODUCTION

This statement is in support of the householder planning appeal following the refusal of the original application on 1 December 2025 on behalf of Mr & Mrs Howarth for the corten steel cladding to the rendered wall of the balcony to the existing house. This statement should be read with the relevant documentation.

1.1) - LOCATION

The site is located within an established residential area on the edge of Billington. The house sits in a large domestic curtilage similar to the neighbouring properties and raised above the road level with long views.

1.2) - EXISTING SITE

The house is detached and has a large front lawn area with a drive leading to forecourt parking at the rear. The property has 4 bedrooms and open plan living within a generous plan area. The house has a contemporary appearance following the completion of the works which were the subject of a previous planning approval in April 2020 (ref 3/2020/0163). This was for extensions and alterations to the elevations.

2.0) – PLANNING

Planning application ref 3/2025/0818 – refused 1 December 2025

The recent planning application was refused by the case officer for the following reason

The proposal is considered to be in direct conflict with Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and Paragraph 140 of the National Planning Policy Framework insofar that approval would result in a diminished quality of development, comparative to that of the approved, resulting in a form of development that would be of detriment to the visual amenities of the immediate area

3.0) – STATEMENT

The appellant would like to contest this reason as the proposal clearly demonstrates a modest material alteration to the front elevation of the house.

The application was submitted as a non material amendment initially in the summer of 2025 (application ref 3/2025/0525) and refused on the 1st of September. It was submitted on the basis of the minor change that was proposed to clad the existing stained render finish with the corten steel.

We suggest the planning inspector refers to this application also in order to appreciate how the appellant has pursued this alteration through the planning procedures. We are aware there is no right of appeal to a non material amendment decision.

We disagree with the original refusal for the non material amendment, however we accept that there is no right of appeal, therefore a Variation of Condition application was submitted in order to seek approval for what we consider to be a minor change to the front elevation of the property.

The house has an existing contemporary aesthetic by virtue of the recent planning approval and the mix of materiality) timber cladding, render and aluminium window frames along with the glass balustrading to the small balcony area.

The neighbouring properties along this stretch of road demonstrate an eclectic mix of materiality as the photographs at the end of this statement demonstrate. It is worth highlighting the fact that a corten steel principle entrance door is incorporated into the modern appearance of the house at No 34.

The case officer's delegated report includes the following statement which the appellant contests :-

Whilst the contemporary style of the application property and nearby built form is acknowledged, the principal elevation of the application dwelling comprises a mixture of white render, vertical timber cladding, horizontal charred timber cladding and stone. In this respect, the use of corten steel cladding would result in the introduction of an additional material/ colour to the principal elevation of the dwellinghouse which would appear neither sympathetic to nor reflective of the existing external facing materials featured to the front of the property. The proposal, if implemented, would thus result in the material palette of the property appearing overtly fussy, resulting in a diminishing quality of development, comparative to that of the approved. The impact of this would only be exacerbated by the prominent siting of the application property along Painter Wood, with the dwelling also occupying an elevated position when viewed from the highway. The proposed variation would therefore be directly visible from the adjacent public realm, resulting in a clear visual impact and being of detriment to the visual amenities of the immediate area

We argue a simple case which highlights the fact that the introduction of a small area of corten steel to the palette of materiality is a complementary addition and enhances the appearance given that the existing render will require maintenance to rectify any unsightly staining.

It is hoped that the planning inspector, following an assessment of the design and the future site visit which should include an inspection of the other properties close to the appellant's site. The inspector will see that the appeal should be allowed on the basis that the appeal is allowed as it is a minor change, does not diminish the quality, provides no visual harm and is entirely appropriate in the context of the immediate area to the dwelling or the immediate area. The photographs included in this statement below support our case.



No 44 – Red tiled cladding, brickwork



No 40 – Render, stained timber boarding, brickwork



No 38 – Render, brickwork



No 36 – Render, stained timber boarding, brickwork



No 34 – Render, Zinc cladding, aluminium windows, corten steel door



No 42 – Render, timber boarding, aluminium windows, glass balustrading