

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 October 2016

by A A Phillips BA(Hons) DipTP MTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 24 October 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/T2350/W/16/3152880

Fourwinds, 54 Fairfield Drive, Clitheroe, Lancashire BB7 2PE

- 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 Stephen Pym of Millbrook Associates Ltd against the decision of Ribbles Valley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 3/2016/0368, dated 13 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 24 May 2016.
 - The development proposed is one dwelling within the curtilage of an existing dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for one dwelling within the curtilage of an existing dwelling at Fourwinds, 54 Fairfield Drive, Clitheroe, Lancashire BB7 2PE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 3/2016/0368, dated 13 April 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 4972-01C and 4972-02.
 - 3) No development shall commence until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
 - 4) No development shall commence until details of the alignment, height and appearance of all boundary treatments have been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority prior to their installation. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
 - 5) The garage hereby permitted shall be kept available at all times for the parking of motor vehicles by the occupants of the dwelling and their visitors and for no other purpose.

Main Issues

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises part of the garden area of 54 Fairfield Drive, which is a two storey substantial detached dwelling located in a residential part of Clitheroe.
4. The area is characterised by a wide variety of residential properties of different designs and styles which appear to have been built in the 1960s and 1970s. These include semi-detached and detached two storey pitched roof and gable fronted houses, bungalows and dormer bungalows. A range of materials are used in the immediate surroundings including artificial stone, brick, render and pebble dash. There is also variety in the size of plots and the spacing between properties.
5. To the immediate rear of the site is a new residential development known as 'Ribble Meadows' where there is a wide variety of modern houses and bungalows of different styles and materials.
6. The appeal property differs to others in the vicinity in that it is set within a particularly large plot and has an angled relationship with the road. Also, its proportions, materials and overall design differ from others in its surroundings.
7. It is proposed to erect a two storey pitched roof detached house in part of the garden to the side of No 54. Additional accommodation would be provided in the roof space. A new separate vehicular access, driveway and single detached pitched roof garage are also proposed.
8. The eaves and the ridge of the proposed dwelling would be slightly higher than adjacent properties. However as a consequence of the separation distances between the site and Nos 52 and 54 and the set back from the road I do not consider that the height difference would be apparent or discordant.
9. The proposed dwelling would be predominantly faced in render with stone detailing, including heads, sills, mullions and quoins. Other properties in the vicinity of the site generally have less ornate detailing and are of a more basic design. Given the wide range of properties in the area and the variety of materials used I do not consider that the proposed detailing would be at odds with the surroundings. The introduction of the proposed design features articulates and enlivens the overall design of the property. The horizontal emphasis of the openings on the front elevation and its symmetrical design are sympathetic to its surroundings.
10. The local planning authority is concerned that the proposal would emphasise the existing angled relationship of No 54 to the adjacent street. The proposed dwellings would have the same perpendicular relationship with the street to most properties in the area. Consequently, the proposal would have a good relationship with the street scene and its surroundings, in general. Although the proposal may emphasise the angle I do not consider that the relationship would result in a particularly discordant effect on the area.
11. Overall, although more articulated than other local properties, the design and layout of the proposal is appropriate within this residential setting. I therefore conclude that the proposal would have no harmful effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, it accords with the design requirements of Policy DMD1: General Consideration of the Ribble Valley Borough Council Core Strategy 2008-2028 A Local Plan for Ribble Valley

Adoption Version (Adopted 16 December 2014) (CS) and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other matters

12. In reaching my decision I have taken account of local objections to the proposal. In determining this appeal I have given regard to the development plan comprising the CS and also the Framework.
13. Given the separation distances between the proposal and adjacent residential properties I do not consider that the development would be overbearing, dominant or result in loss of light. Furthermore, taking account of the orientation of main habitable room windows I do not consider that the development would lead to an unacceptable degree of overlooking and loss of privacy. Consequently, on this matter I do not consider that the proposal would be harmful to the living conditions of the occupants of neighbouring residential properties.
14. I do not consider that the development of one property would result in harm to highways conditions. Sufficient driveway and garage space is provided to meet the parking needs of the property. A condition could mitigate the potential future loss of the garage space.
15. I have also considered concerns regarding the effect on local land stability drainage. The application proposes foul water to the mains sewer and surface water is to be dealt with by means of a connection to the existing drainage system. The site is not within an area at risk from flooding and as such, I consider that satisfactory drainage can be achieved on site. I have no evidence of there being land stability issues in the area that would need to be addressed through the planning process.
16. In support of the appeal my attention has been drawn to another development in the area at 8 Lancaster Drive, Clitheroe for which the local planning authority granted planning permission under reference 3/2014/0536 on 14 August 2014. Although that case illustrates how a new house with an almost identical design to the current proposal can complement its surroundings I note that it was approved before the current Core Strategy was adopted. Furthermore, the characteristics of each site are different. As such, it has had limited weight in my assessment of the current appeal.

Conditions

17. I have specified the approved plans for certainty. In accordance with the Council's suggestion I also attach a condition requiring the submission of the details of external materials and boundary treatment in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.
18. I have also specified that the garage shall be kept available for parking vehicles in the interests of ensuring that adequate parking is provided and in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

19. For the above reasons and taking account of other matters raised I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Alastair Phillips

INSPECTOR