The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 July 2020

by Robert Hitchcock BSc DipCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/T2350/W/20/3251534
28 Calfcote Lane, Longridge PR3 3SR

- 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 & Mrs G & L Walmsley against the decision of Ribble Valley Borough Council.
- The application Ref 3/2020/0036, dated 22 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 3 March 2020.
- The development proposed is a detached bungalow and land to rear of 28 Calfcote Lane accessed from Brindle Close Longridge.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the locality.

Reasons

3. The site is located in a planned residential estate within the Longridge settlement area. The immediate area is characterised by primarily detached and semi-detached bungalow dwellings set behind front gardens. The dwellings often display common design details along road frontages and generally have regular spacing with private gardens to the rear.

4. 28 Calfcote Lane is a bungalow property fronting Calfcote Lane with gardens to the front and rear. The rear garden is on a split level on account of land levels dropping to the south. The rear boundary of No28 aligns with those of the adjacent properties on Calfcote Lane and, along with the rear boundary of 26 Calfcote Lane, backs on to the turning head of Brindle Close, a residential cul-de-sac.

5. The true bungalows on Brindle Close are regularly spaced along consistent building lines and set behind gardens either side of the carriageway. The majority of the existing dwellings on the Close benefit from side driveways with subordinate outbuildings to the rear.

6. The proposal would subdivide the existing garden area of No28 to form a separate plot adjacent to the turning head of Brindle Close and accessed directly from it. Consequently, the building would be mainly viewed in the context of Brindle Close.

7. However, the size of the plot would be much smaller than those typical of the surrounding townscape. Although the position of the building would substantially retain an open vista looking towards the head of the cul-de-sac, the building would be in close proximity to the plot boundaries which would necessarily be retained at height to protect the living conditions of neighbouring residents.

8. When taken with the orientation and short distance of the proposed principal elevation to the elevated side garden boundary of 26 Calfcote Lane and the close proximity to built development on three sides of the dwelling, the proposal would appear cramped and hemmed-in within the site. This arrangement would contrast sharply with the consistent pattern of deeper plots of the nearby residential properties and introduce a higher density of development that would run contrary to the layout and grain of local development. In turn, this would fail to achieve a sense of spaciousness about the building which is a positive characteristic of development in the locality.

9. For the above reasons I conclude that the proposal would fail to reflect the characteristic layout and grain of local development. It would conflict with Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Borough Council Core Strategy 2008-2028 A Local Plan for Ribble Valley (2014) which, amongst other matters, requires new development to consider the density, layout and relationships between buildings and their surroundings.

Other Matters

10. I acknowledge that the proposal would contribute to the supply of local housing and an identified need for ground floor accommodation types. I also recognise that it would deliver a fully accessible unit in a manner to protect highway safety in the locality. However, these matters do not outweigh the harm identified.

11. In support of the development the appellant's statement advises that a comparable size of building could be erected under permitted development rights attached to No28. However, there is nothing before me to suggest that if this were possible, the appellant would genuinely pursue this option if the appeal failed. As such, it is a matter of negligible weight in my determination of this appeal.

12. I have also noted the concerns from local residents to the proposal. However, in the light of my findings on the main issue of the appeal, my decision does not turn on these matters.

Conclusion

13. For the above reasons, the appeal should be dismissed.

R Hitchcock

INSPECTOR