



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 October 2023

by F Rafiq BSc (Hons) MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 November 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/T2350/W/23/3320947

Hillview House, 25 Paris, Ramsgreave, Lancashire BB1 9BJ

- 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 David Verlander against the decision of Ribble Valley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 3/2022/1084, dated 18 November 2022, was refused by notice dated 10 February 2023.
 - The development proposed is a proposed detached dormer bungalow.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises of an area of land to the rear of 21a and 21b Paris and is accessed along a shared driveway off Paris. The area contains a mix of dwellings, but those properties towards the northern part of Paris are mainly bungalows, some of which feature modest dormers. This scale of development and the views over surrounding areas of open land, gives the area a spacious, semi-rural character.
4. The proposed dwelling would be a bungalow property with further accommodation provided within the roofspace. This would result in the proposal having a taller overall height than other bungalow properties around it. However, given the variations that exist in the heights of these neighbouring buildings, and their siting at differing levels due to the varying topography, I do not consider the overall height of the proposed dwelling would make it appear incongruous in these surroundings.
5. The appeal property would be sited higher than other dwellings that are closer to Paris. There are however other dwellings on Waverley Road, a short distance from the appeal site that are at a higher level still. As such, the topography of the area would not result in the proposed dwelling being unduly prominent.
6. The proposal would feature a large dormer that would have a L-shaped form and extend across most of the roof on two planes. Its size and design would differ from the other smaller dormers seen on nearby properties. By virtue of its scale and form, it would result in a dwelling that fails to assimilate with the surrounding built form.

7. As a result, I conclude that the proposed development would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area. As such, it would be contrary to Policy DMG1 of the Core Strategy 2008-2028 A Local Plan for Ribble Valley, which seeks, amongst other matters, development that is sympathetic in terms of its scale, massing, style, features and building materials. It would also be contrary to Paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which seeks development that is sympathetic to local character.

Other Matters

8. My attention has been drawn to a number of large two storey and two half storey developments in the area. I have not been provided with the full details of these developments, but it is evident that they differ from the appeal development in their size, design and in their relationship with surrounding residential properties. In particular, from my site observations, they do not feature a single, large dormer such as that proposed as part of the appeal development. They therefore have limited relevance to the appeal scheme before me which I can confirm that I have dealt with on its own merits.
9. The appellant has made reference to discussions with the Council on the acceptability of a dwelling with a first-floor element and dormer. The Council has however stated that it was clear from a condition on the outline planning approval¹ that the development should not exceed single storey in height. Reference has also been made to changes that were suggested by the appellant to the Council. This appeal follows the Council's formal determination, based on the plans their decision was made on. I have considered this appeal accordingly, which for the reasons set out would be harmful.
10. The impact of the development on the living conditions of surrounding residential occupiers does not form part of the Council's decision, but the acceptability of the development in this regard is a neutral consideration and not one which weighs in favour of the proposal.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, having considered the development plan as a whole, the approach in the Framework, and all other relevant material considerations, the appeal is dismissed.

F Rafiq

INSPECTOR

¹ LPA Reference No: 3/2022/0618