



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 May 2018

by W Johnson BA (Hons) DipTP DipUDR MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 June 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/T2350/D/18/3194563

Ivy Cottage, Chapel Lane, West Bradford, Clitheroe, Lancashire BB7 4SN

- 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 Mrs Olga Duckworth against the decision of Ribble Valley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 3/2017/0593, dated 21 June 2017, was refused by notice dated 9 October 2017.
 - The development is erection of a fence to the front of the property with a pedestrian access.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed

Procedural Matter

2. I have used the description of the proposal from the Council's decision notice. It adequately and simply describes the proposed development instead of the much longer and detailed description given on the application form, and appeal form.
3. At the time of my site visit, I saw that the fencing was complete. I also had the benefit of seeing the scheme in place. I have dealt with the appeal on that basis.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal dwelling is located on Chapel Lane, off the west side of the road. The property is a modest house of stone construction with a tile roof. An outside garden/yard is located to the south of the property, which is in turn enclosed by the appeal scheme.
6. The scheme is a timber fence with a gate, which provides access from Chapel Lane. At this point on Chapel Lane where the access is located there is no pavement. The fence consists of 3 solid vertically boarded timber panels. One panel is located on the south elevation of the garden/yard, and the remaining 2 panels are on the east elevation, and are all approximately 1.8m in height. The

gate is situated between the 2 panels on the east elevation, and has a domed top, with contrasting lattice detailing, which again results in a solid appearance.

7. The area surrounding the host dwelling mainly consists of a variety of residential properties. However, the majority of the properties on Chapel Lane have stone boundary walls, which vary in height and style. These stone walls form a strong and positive local characteristic in the street scene. The appeal dwelling occupies a prominent position on Chapel Lane, and by contrast the existing fencing, due to its size, location, appearance and materials used in construction, results in a discordant addition to the host dwelling, as it does not assimilate with or complement the original property. The resulting significant adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling is readily visible in the street scene, forming an incongruous feature within it, to the detriment of the wider surrounding area.
8. For all of these reasons, I therefore conclude that the timber boundary fencing unacceptably harms the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and the surrounding area. This is contrary to Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Borough Council Core Strategy 2008-2028, A Local Plan for Ribble Valley Adopted Version 16 December 2014, which seeks amongst other things, seeks a high quality building design. Furthermore, the proposal would not comply with paragraph 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which amongst other things seeks to secure high quality design, and paragraph 60, which seeks to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness.

Other Matters

9. I note the comments from West Bradford Parish Council and Lancashire County Council Highways (LCCH). Whilst the Parish Council has raised concerns regarding highway safety, LCCH has not raised any objections. I have considered these concerns, but have judged them to be unfounded.
10. I have also had regard to various other matters raised by the appellant, including their need to provide a safe and secure outside area for their 2 young children to play, but on the evidence before me, I find this factor does not outweigh the wider harm to local character and appearance as identified.
11. Concern has also been expressed about the way that the Council handled the application, but this does not affect the planning merits of the case before me.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

Wayne Johnson

INSPECTOR