

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 23 September 2022 11:13
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2022/0837 FS-Case-453685628

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2022/0837

Address of Development: Inglemead, Waddington Road

Comments: I submit comments on behalf of [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] do not have any objection in principle to the intended works to the property however do wish to express some concern about the materials being chosen for the extension, particularly at first floor level.

The brief details that this will be of 'standing seam sheet metal in bronze'. This is of course a modern and contemporary finish. Due to the age of the building it would be preferable in [REDACTED] view to utilise more traditional building materials that are more in keeping with the surrounding vernacular. Clearly there is a desire when extending buildings to not always seek to 'exactly match' the existing building to show the progression of development. However, at this site the use of the intended materials would not be in keeping with the surrounding buildings which are of a very similar age and are constructed from very similar materials.

Therefore a review/alteration of materials would be preferable as part of the consideration of this application by officers/members.

[REDACTED]

From: Planning
Subject: FW: Planning Application Comments - 3/2022/0837 FS-Case-452673933

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 20 September 2022 00:10
To: Planning <planning@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2022/0837 FS-Case-452673933

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2022/0837

Address of Development: Inglemead
Waddington Road
Clitheroe
BB7 2HN

Comments: 19 September 2022

Re: Planning application number: 3/2022/ 0837

Dear [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] have the following comments about planning application number 3/2022/0837 – Proposed two storey rear and side extension and replacement of the front elevation porch at Inglemead, Waddington Road, Clitheroe BB7 2HN. Inglemead is the semi-detached house [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] comments are mainly related to these material considerations

- Scale, appearance and design
- impact on the local residents
- impact on the character of an area

but [REDACTED] have added additional comments, considerations and suggestions.

Design and access statement.

1.2 The site

'The site is a relatively disused part of the rear garden'. This is incorrect and seems to have been copied and pasted from a previous planning application not of relevance to this one. One wonders about the care taken with this planning application. The site is the main house at the front of the plot and is described as a proposal for a rear two storey extension and replacement of front elevation porch. The front porch seems to be shaded out on the drawings but the explanation of this is only shown on the application form but not a full description of the materials to be used eg for the walls. No mention of it is made in the design and access statement. Demolition of the garage is described in the design and access statement but this is not shown on the proposed site plans nor in the application form.

2.1 Design Approach

It is stated that 'the proposal's design approach takes inspiration from the local vernacular of the original rear two storey structures protruding from the row of semi-detached properties along Waddington Road'. These original two storey structures are in stone or rendered rough stone or rendered brick which has been painted in a colour in keeping with the stone. None of these structures are made of sheet metal and therefore it cannot be said that inspiration has been taken from these structures.

It is irrelevant to describe new build properties at the bottom of Hawthorne Place as these are not located in the middle of the historic part of Waddington Road.

Materiality.

'The siting and locality of the proposal lends itself to a restricted material palette similar to the highlighted precedent (precedent image 1)'. The highlighted precedent is a modern house/ flat clad in standing sheet metal. It states that this 'complements the tones and textures of the local context'. All of the buildings in this part of Waddington Road and including the Waddington Road end of Hawthorne Place are of historic interest. None of them possesses a metal extension. We welcome that locally sourced buff stone is proposed around the ground floor, side and rear elevations. Facing brick, unless rendered appropriately, or sheet metal are not in keeping and we would expect that the upper floor is also of traditional materials. We welcome the 'small slate roof over the snug area to tie in the proposal with the existing house'.

Inglemead and its semi-detached neighbouring property Riversdale are mentioned in local historical records (e.g., Historical Clitheroe- Between the Bridges- Waddington Road Area- Robert Jones 2000) as substantial Victorian properties of local interest and therefore surely any building work undertaken in their vicinity should be sympathetic to the style in which they were built, as if it was meant to be there.

We are concerned that the architect is a conservation architect and that he does not seem to have taken conservation into account and has drawn these particular plans to the contrary. This house is known and described in the design statement as a period property. What hope is there for other local period properties?

It appears that the front porch will be demolished and rebuilt on the drawings, but this is not described, other than some materials in the application form. It is unclear what part of the porch some of these materials are used for or what the solid base of the porch is constructed from. We would welcome a description of the materials proposed to be used for the front porch renovations. Especially with the front elevation of this age of property, this must be in keeping with a period property.

Scale.

The majority of the proposal is stated 'to appear barely noticeable to pedestrians passing by due to the relatively tall stone boundary wall, which would conceal the structure'. This is incorrect. The boundary wall is noted as 3.7 metres high at its maximum, 3.1m for the majority and 2.5m for the rear wall, whereas the proposed side and rear elevation of which the upper part is standing sheet metal extends up to 7.3 metres high. This means that it is the coursed stone which will not be visible whereas the metal structure which is not in keeping with the surrounding properties will be fully visible to passers-by and residents of Hawthorne Place. On the photo at the side of the section 1.2 and the photos of the southeast elevation in 1.3 you can see quite clearly the huge discrepancy in height between the height of the outbuildings which are noted as 3.7m compared to the much higher main house. The garden wall will certainly not conceal any part of the metal structure as it extends up to rear gutter height. The house itself is elevated from the roads anyway so even more visible. This is also a corner property so the sheet metal will be immediately visible to pedestrians and residents walking along Waddington Road. The modern materials will also be visible from the front of the property as, even though they are set back, they stick out to the side and the side wall is either not present nor high enough to block the view. It does seem unusual that, rather than celebrating the restoration and extension of a period property, the architect is trying to say that the structure will be hidden from view (it won't), suggesting that they themselves realise that it will be unattractive/inappropriate.

Bat survey

It is noted that the survey shows no evidence of bat roost in the property and foraging potential is suggested to be low to moderate. The survey was carried out in the daytime. If this had been carried out at dusk, then much bat foraging activity in the garden and surrounding gardens would have been witnessed. Although the building work may not affect bat roost, we feel that foraging potential should be noted as moderate to high. Clearly they are roosting nearby somewhere.

Site Plan

On the Existing and the Proposed Site Plan, although not of relevance to the current planning application, it must be noted that we believe that the red boundary line at the front of the property is drawn incorrectly.

Interior Plan

We are pleased for the owners of Inglemead that they are able to extend their property and the interior renovations look to be very interesting and versatile for the family.

We would like to ask that as work is being done on the rooms [REDACTED] that a note is made that the [REDACTED] and that this is also the case with [REDACTED] have recently [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] For privacy, the owners of Inglemead are encouraged [REDACTED] It would also be particularly helpful [REDACTED] in addition, as major renovations will be taking place, to [REDACTED] noise during building work.

In summary

The proposed building in its current design proposal:

- Would not be in keeping with the scale and design of surrounding dwellings in this historic part of Clitheroe.
- Would impact on the character of the area.
- Is factually incorrect and should be resubmitted with errors corrected
- Has significant detail omitted particularly in relation to the design of the front elevation porch which prevents comment on this proposal and this should be rectified.

[REDACTED] with their interior renovation, but [REDACTED] do hope that they and their architect will take on board [REDACTED] comments for the benefit of the area and its residents, particularly regarding the exterior materials.

[REDACTED] would be grateful if our comments and our suggestions for improvement could be noted when this application is considered.

Yours sincerely

NB Also submitted electronically.