



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 July 2016

by **Julie Dale Clark BA (Hons) MCD DMS MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 10 August 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/T2350/D/16/3150282

Blue Trees, Manor Road, Copster Green, Lancashire BB1 9EP

- 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 J Rowley against the decision of Ribble Valley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 3/2016/0114, dated 29 January 2016, was refused by notice dated 15 March 2016.
 - The development proposed is erection of garage and boundary fence.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. I consider that the main issues are the effect of the proposed garage and fence on (1) the character and appearance of the area; and (2) the living conditions of the occupiers of the adjacent dwelling.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The proposed garage would be large and the appellant states that it is required for a caravan / motorhome. It would have large aluminium doors to the front and rear. Whilst it would be set back some distance from the road, it would still be visible especially due to its height. The submitted drawings show dimensions for the building as being 4.2 metres to the eaves and almost 5.9 metres to the ridge. The overall scale of this garage would appear at odds in this location, it would not reflect the semi-rural residential character of Copster Green but would appear incongruous to the area.
 4. The fence would run along the boundary with the adjacent dwelling, Oaksmead and for most of its length it would be just under 3.2 metres high. Although it would be lower in height as it neared the road, given the long length and height it would be visually intrusive and out of keeping with the character of the area.
-

5. Core Strategy¹ Policy DMG1 sets out design considerations, amongst other things. These set out a number of matters to be taken into account when determining planning applications including that development must be of a high standard of design. It also requires development to be sympathetic to existing land uses in terms of size, scale, massing and building materials. A high standard of design is also required by the National Planning Policy Framework². I do not consider that the size, scale and massing are consistent with policy DMG1 or the Framework. I also do not consider that the proposed large aluminium doors would be of a satisfactory appearance to comply with Policy DMG1. I also do not consider the proposal to be consistent with the objectives of Core Strategy Policy DME2 in terms of protecting the landscape and townscape.

Living Conditions

6. Although there is a tall hedge along the boundary with Oaksmead the garage would be very close to the boundary. Notwithstanding the hedge, which could easily be reduced in height or removed, given the height and proximity of the garage it would be visually intrusive when viewed from Oaksmead. Likewise the long stretch of fencing proposed along the boundary would be visually intrusive and result in an overbearing impact. However, due the orientation of Oaksmead in relation to the garage and fence, the proposal would not lead to direct overshadowing but this does not lessen the unacceptable impact of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of Oaksmead.
7. As well as the matters set out above, Policy DMG1 also emphasises the visual appearance and relationship to surroundings and the effect of development on existing amenities. The proposal would relate poorly to the adjacent dwelling and the amenity of the occupiers would be harmed in conflict with this policy.

Other Matters and Conclusion

8. The appellant refers to an extension that has been approved to the front of Oaksmead. However, this does not alter my determination of this appeal. I also note the long planning history associated with the appeal site and can appreciate the concerns raised by local residents. However, I have determined this appeal on the basis of the proposal currently before me.
9. Other matters raised include vehicular activity and noise. I have taken these and all other matters raised into consideration but none alter my conclusion. I conclude that the proposed garage and fence would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area and on the living conditions of the occupiers of the adjacent dwelling. It would conflict with the policies referred to and therefore the appeal fails.

J D Clark

INSPECTOR

¹ Ribble Valley Borough Council Core Strategy 2008-2028. A Local Plan for Ribble Valley Adoption Version, Adopted 16 December 2016.

² Department for Communities and Local Government National Planning Policy Framework, March 2012.