

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 20 August 2024 22:44
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2024/0613 FS-Case-640185330

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2024/0613

Address of Development: Inglemead Waddington Road Clitheroe

Comments: Having looked at the proposed plans one of the concerns would be parking. The plans are only allowing parking for one vehicle. If the property would be occupied by a two or more vehicle family there would be an issue on a street which is already overstretched by vehicles and parking. Where would visitors park? Another concern would be noise and dirt pollution, especially having to endure this with the new housing development at the end of Hawthorne place. There is also the alleyway that connects Hawthorne place and Eastham street this is where the entrance to the proposed site would be, the alley is full of wildlife and vegetation which complements the area. We hope that a sensible decision can be made regarding this application.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 29 August 2024 14:34
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2024/0613 FS-Case-642326365

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2024/0613

Address of Development: Inglemead
Waddington Road
Clitheroe
BB7 2HN

Comments: We have the following comments about planning application number 3/2024/0613- proposed demolition of existing single garage and construction of new single storey two bedroom dwelling (Self build) at the end of the rear garden of Inglemead, Waddington Road, Clitheroe BB7 2HN.

Inglemead [REDACTED]

Style of building

Although we appreciate that the applicant may be wishing to use mixed materials for the building as a feature, this is not in keeping with surrounding dwellings which are in a traditional style. We would suggest all the building is of coursed stone [REDACTED].

Whilst we appreciate the ecological benefits of the flat sedum roof and the fact that this is low and expected to be hidden behind the higher wall, again this is not in keeping with surrounding property styles. The sedum roof is a minor gesture compared to the loss of flora and fauna caused by building's erection. It also needs a lot of maintaining to ensure that after a short period of time it does not die exposing unattractive under material or become out of control with tall weeds. Two roof lights/solar panels which are over a metre high are also unsightly.

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 stone Victorian properties of local interest and therefore 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.

The standing seamsheet metal is not at all in keeping with surrounding properties or Inglemead and would stand out as such. One appreciates that the manufacture of zinc may be more environmentally friendly than other metals, but reclaimed stone would be more so, as would a reclaimed slate roof and would also be more natural materials, as is fitting for the age and style of the surrounding

properties. Other properties' outbuildings and garden buildings are made of a variety of materials including wood, brick and stone. This is a dwelling not a garden building. It is notable that no other property or outbuilding locally is made of zinc.

It is notable that the applicant had a planning application refused in 2022 because of the materials used. 3/2022/0837. See statement of refusal below.

“DEVELOPMENT PROPOSED: Proposed two storey rear and side extension and replacement of the front elevation porch. AT: Inglemead Waddington Road Clitheroe BB7 2HN Ribble Valley Borough Council hereby give notice in pursuance of the provisions of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 that permission has been refused for the carrying out of the above development for the following reason(s): 1 The proposal, by virtue of the design and external appearance of the proposed two storey side and rear extension, in concert with the high-level of visual prominence afforded to the proposal from the public realm would result in the introduction of an unsympathetic, overbearing, incongruous, anomalous, and discordant form of development that would be of significant harm to the character and visual amenities of the area and immediate streetscene. As such the proposal is considered to be in direct conflict with Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.”

If RVBC feels strongly against the use of these materials in this area, as it appears, then clearly, this current proposal, although not as visible to the main street, is visible to many neighbours in the area and, surely, should not be agreed upon. Why the obsession with standing sheet metal in this area of character?

The close boarded long wooden fence dividing the garden from Inglemead is not particularly attractive from any aspect and we would suggest that the walled Victorian garden theme is maintained. If this barrier is to be erected, it should be constructed of coursed or random stone with appropriate planting on either side. A close boarded high fence of 14.7m length and 1.8m high

properties. If any hedging is planted, we would ask that it not be coniferous as this, although cheap and fast growing is unsightly and difficult to control in the long term.

Light

The building would cast shadow [redacted] Inglemead. [redacted] building is 3m high at its lowest point [redacted].

Loss of amenity

The design brief suggests that the house would be built on a 'relatively level disused area of garden'. [redacted] , this was a productive fruit and vegetable garden which was a [redacted] . This is also the case with the apple tree, [redacted] continues to be very productive. We would therefore suggest that building on this garden would in fact be a loss of amenity to local residents.

[redacted] In the section on PDR and visual amenity it is described what would be permitted for an outbuilding and that the building design should be of similar size to other outbuildings in the area. This is a house, not an outbuilding and is far larger than any other outbuildings in the area. It is stated that the proposal 'will not result in any significant nor measurable detrimental impact upon the character or visual amenities of the area and that it has a strong connection and respect for its setting'. [redacted]

[REDACTED]. The 'robust architectural language' used for the new dwelling, describes it, in fact as 'a simple zinc 'box'.

We feel that buying properties with large gardens and building houses within their boundary sets a precedent in the town which ultimately destroys the town's character and history and should be discouraged.

Ecological survey

It is noted that the survey shows no evidence of bat roost in the existing garage and that bat foraging potential is suggested to be low to moderate. This 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. At this time of year there are always at least 4-5 bats flying in the garden around dusk. It should be determined where these bats are in fact roosting and if building work is likely to affect their habitat and flight paths. We would suggest that although the current garage may not be suitable for roosting, bat activity is classified as 'High- site is close to and connected to known roosts'. We welcome the suggestion that bat boxes should be installed and have [REDACTED] but if building here would deter bats then this is counterproductive.

Water supply and drainage

We consider that there is a strong possibility that the water pressure [REDACTED] may be adversely affected by this proposed development in view of the shared water main of the two present buildings. [REDACTED].

Access and comments on Highways report

There is parking in the current garage/ site if demolished. Residents on Hawthorne Place will still see a reduction of on street parking spaces available to them in an already congested parking situation where outside working hours, cars are parked on both sides of the narrow street often partially blocking the exit onto Hawthorne Place making the right turn fraught with danger due to poor vision of traffic coming from either direction and schoolchildren walking to school. If there are two cars linked to the property, as is often the case, this would further exacerbate the parking problem. We already often have near misses and [REDACTED], [REDACTED]. The houses opposite the garden wall bordering Hawthorne Place do not have any off-street parking. This is a cul de sac and therefore children do play outside here. Increasing traffic especially a car trying to turn into a drive or reverse out would increase risk to pedestrians. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]. We feel that anyone trying to access this space regularly will become fed up and inevitably will resort to street parking thereby increasing congestion.

Any construction would be fraught with difficulty due to the service lane behind the property being needed by residents along Waddington Road, Eastham Street and Hawthorne Place for garage access. Construction vehicles would not be able to stop there. They could also not stop on Hawthorne Place without blocking the highway or removing parking places for Hawthorne Place residents.

In summary

The proposed building in its current design proposal:

- Would not be in keeping with the style of surrounding dwellings in this historic part of Clitheroe.
- Would reduce light and privacy [REDACTED].
- Sets a precedent for altering the character of the area by giving up historic properties' gardens to the building of new housing.
- Has potentially ecological effects and loss of amenity to local residents.
- Will affect access for Hawthorne Place residents and the access to the parking space will be much more difficult than indicated on the plans.
- Will produce long term difficulty with regard to access to the service lane.

[REDACTED], made of materials sympathetic to the surrounding area. A separate much larger footprint of a house with daily access and built of unsympathetic materials [REDACTED]. Historically it doesn't seem that long term residence here is likely either, just a build and sell plan.

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

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]