



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 October 2023

by G Bayliss BA (Hons) MA MA MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31st October 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/T2350/W/23/3321409

94 Ribchester Road, Clayton-Le-Dale, Lancashire BB1 9HQ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant consent, agreement or approval to details required by a condition of a planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Nick Skelton against the decision of Ribble Valley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 3/2023/0059, dated 16 January 2023, sought approval of details pursuant to condition No 1 of planning permission Ref 3/2022/0457, granted on 12 July 2022.
 - The application was refused by notice dated 17 April 2023.
 - The development proposed is outline application with all matters reserved for the demolition of an existing outbuilding and erection of a detached dwelling house in the grounds of 94 Ribchester Road. Previously approved under Ref 3/2018/1116.
 - The details for which approval is sought are: Reserved matters of access, appearance, landscaping, layout, scale relating to planning permission Ref 3/2022/0457.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by the appellant against the Council. This is the subject of a separate Decision.

Preliminary Matters

3. The Council has advised in its appeal statement that since the submission of this appeal a further reserved matters application has been made, relating to this site, and this has recently been refused. However, as this occurred after the submission of this appeal and it differs in detail/some respects, it is not directly relevant to the appeal before me and has not formed part of my decision.
4. The appeal before me seeks approval of Reserved Matters following the grant of outline planning permission Ref: 3/2022/0457.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

6. The appeal site is located within a predominantly residential area which is characterised by a mix of traditional cottages and more recent dwellings which vary in size and design. Most dwellings front Ribchester Road and the older

buildings tend to be sited closer to the road with more recent buildings set back behind small front gardens, mainly bounded by stone walls or hedges. The alignment of the road allows relatively long vistas to be afforded in both directions near to the appeal site. These present a pleasant and characterful street scape, and the mix of historic and more recent buildings blend relatively harmoniously together, with none unduly standing out, and with the traditional cottages tending to be most prominent due to their forward siting and terraced form.

7. The appeal site is associated with 94 Ribchester Road (No.94), an historic cottage and attached stone outbuilding which form the end of a relatively long row of cottages. They are characterised by their traditional form and detailing, are mainly a mix of stone and render to walling and are prominent in the streetscape. On the western side of the appeal site the dwellings are more modern and suburban in appearance, set back from the road with a mix of heights and forms and mainly faced in brick and render. The appeal site therefore marks a transition point between the historic buildings to the east and more modern buildings to the west. Opposite the appeal site, the dwellings are more typically modern, suburban buildings with a relatively consistent form and design features. They are set back from the road with views partly filtered by planting within front gardens.
8. The outline planning approval, which allows the demolition of the stone outbuilding, has confirmed that the site has the potential to accommodate one additional detached dwelling which would be located in the gap between No.94 and No.102 Ribchester Road (No.102), a more modern, two storey brick, detached dwelling with slate roof.
9. The proposed dwelling is described as a two storey dwelling, although with its low eaves, the first floor accommodation would be within the roof space. It would be sited further back in the plot than No.94 but forward of No.102. The building, faced in white K-Rend, would have relatively wide side gables and a pitched roof with low eaves and a ridge height similar to No.102. The appearance of the roof would be emphasised by the relatively pronounced eaves and verge details and by a central dormer feature. Window openings to the ground floor at the front would be horizontal in form and of varying dimensions.
10. Although the immediate area is characterised by dwellings that vary in their size and design, I have highlighted above that the buildings blend relatively harmoniously together. In this regard, the appeal proposal fails to assimilate within this context, especially given its position between traditional cottages on one side and more modern, detached buildings on the other. In my view, the appeal proposal with its relatively low eaves but very dominant roof form and prominent central dormer would appear markedly different to the buildings on either side. The massing and proportion of the building with its visually top-heavy roof, would be quite unlike these buildings or those within the wider streetscape. It would be conspicuous and incongruous in its forward position and would not assimilate within its context; especially when viewed from the west with the backdrop of relatively low-lying traditional cottages. Furthermore, the proportion and arrangement of the openings to the ground floor of the front elevation would jar with the typically more symmetrical and legible arrangement of openings to many nearby buildings. The apparent

absence of sills, lintels or other embellishments would also present a rather bland architectural styling.

11. Although white render is found on many buildings in the area, it would be preferable to blend this with brick or stone to soften the appearance of the building, especially following the demolition of the prominent stone building on the site. This would ensure that the amount of render would not overly dominate the streetscape in this immediate area.
12. The appellant has identified nearby buildings exhibiting variety to their form and detailing but none of these appear similar to the appeal proposal before me, and they do not incorporate features which are overly dominant or particularly noticeable in the street scape. Also, their overall form and massing largely reflect the prevailing ratio of walling to roof height in the immediate vicinity. Furthermore, none of these images capture the front elevation of the buildings immediately adjoining the appeal site.
13. The appeal proposal would therefore have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area and would be contrary to Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy (2014) which seeks to ensure that development is of a high standard of design and relates well to its surroundings. It would also fail to meet the high-quality design expectations of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

14. The appellant has expressed concerns regarding a lack of communication with the Council during the application process. Whilst this must have caused the appellant some distress, and is addressed further in the accompanying costs decision, this does not materially affect my consideration of the planning merits of the appeal proposal.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above, the proposal would conflict with the development plan, when read as a whole. Material considerations, including the Framework, do not indicate that a decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Having considered all other matters raised I therefore conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

G Bayliss

INSPECTOR