

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 July 2020 by C McDonagh BA (Hons), MA

by Susan Ashworth BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/T2350/D/20/3249406
90 Mitton Road, Whalley BB7 9JN

- 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 Andrew Hartley against the decision of Ribble Valley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 3/2020/0039, dated 10 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 26 February 2020.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing detached brick built garage with slate pitched roof. Erection of In-Fill structure between the gable end of the property and boundary wall of the neighbouring property, which currently supports the existing garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and street scene.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling with an existing detached garage to the side. The property is located on a bend in Mitton Road, which as a result affords extra space to the side when compared to adjacent dwellings.
5. The proposal involves the removal of the existing garage and erection of a wider, replacement structure which would fill the gap between the side of the house and the boundary with the neighbouring property.
6. The proposed garage would be wider than the host property and, despite a slight set-back from the front elevation of the house, would add a substantial and disproportionate amount of mass to the side of the dwelling. While I note the existing roof tiles are proposed to be re-used in the construction of the new

garage to aid in its integration, the scale and appearance of the new structure would not be in keeping with the residential setting.

7. Furthermore, due to the bend in the road at this location and the angle at which No.88 is offset, the side of the appeal property is prominent in the street scene. As such, the structure would form an incongruous addition to the area. The lack of designation as a Conservation Area or Listed Building would not remove the harm to the character and appearance of both the host building and local area which I have identified. Moreover, while the appellant asserts that the existing garage is out of keeping with the area, it respects the character and scale of the house and it does not follow that incongruous design should be encouraged in its place.
8. To conclude on this main issue, the proposal would fail to comply with the requirements of Policies DMG1 and DMH5 of the Ribble Valley Borough Council Core Strategy. These seek to ensure development is sympathetic to existing and proposed land uses in terms of size, intensity and nature as well as its scale, massing and style among others.

Other Matters

9. I note the arguments from the appellant that the development would not cause harm to the living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring properties or to highway safety, while it would also provide two off road parking spaces. However, from all I have seen and read the Council have not taken issue with these aspects of the proposal.

Recommendation

10. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

C McDonagh

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

S Ashworth

INSPECTOR