

RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL



Ribble Valley
Borough Council

www.ribblevalley.gov.uk

COMMENTS ON APPELLANT'S STATEMENT

TOWN & COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

Planning Inspectorate Reference:	6011996
LPA Application Reference:	3/2025/0823

Appeal by Zaid Tariq
Against the refusal by
Ribble Valley Borough Council to grant planning permission for:

Proposed conversion of vacant care home (Use Class C2) 622 sq.m. into two semi-detached residential 5 bed dwellinghouses; Use of two storey annex as incidental accommodation; erection of two storey rear extension to one dwelling and erection of single storey side and rear extension to one dwelling together with dormers to front and rear elevation, first floor balconies to rear elevation, portico to front elevation, changes in fenestration and introduction of additional doors and windows to both properties and associated parking and landscaping.

Longworth House, Higher Ramsgreave Road, Ramsgreave BB1 9DJ

**WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS SUBMITTED ON BEHALF OF
THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY**

Comments on Appellants Statement of Case to be read in conjunction with the submitted delegated officers report.

- 1.1 The appellant has stated at 3 that the two storey extension would square of the ground floor and continue the ridge line it would not appear “bulky” and would “add minor additional volume”, however, the LPA does not consider this to be case as the property is already substantial and has been added to considerably since it was last in use as a dwelling.
- 1.2 There is a public footpath (3-33-FP7) which runs through the site from the vehicular entrance gate (southern boundary) to the north eastern point of the site and which then continues into the field at the rear of the application site and, from which, when viewed the building would have clear visual impact.
- 1.3 The appellant refers in 3.9 to the nearest property on the north east side as Sibaya (80m to the east) this is incorrect as The Mullions lies immediately adjacent the site. Both properties would have private views into the site, albeit The Mullions is set forward and separated by the existing stables/outbuilding set on the eastern boundary of the site.
- 1.4 The appellant at 3.12 claims that the front and rear dormers would be “simple and elegant” with the flat roof design minimise their mass and unobtrusive. The LPA is of the view that a total of six dormers on both the front and rear elevations add to the overall bulk and scale of the proposal, which has public views from the existing public footpath which runs through the site (point 1.2 above).
- 1.5 The appellant suggests at 3.19 that the presence of an existing balcony together with a fire escape on the rear elevation of the care home allows for a new balcony to be erected above a single storey projection which would not extend out further than the fire escape. However, this balcony would provide views into the first floor windows on the western gable projection of the adjoining eastern dwellinghouse which serves a bedroom thus raising concerns over privacy and overlooking. There would also be loss of privacy and overlooking from the eastern dwellinghouse from these same gable bedrooms windows into the bedroom of the western property to which the balcony serves with its large bi-folding window openings.

- 1.6 The appellant referred at 3.24 to the existing porch and its replacement with two front porticos and that the portico's would mark the new front entrances to the two dwellinghouses. These features, together with the proposed extensions and dormers add further to bulk of the building whereas the existing porch retains a more domestic scale of development.
- 1.7 With regards to the residential curtilage point 3.36/3.37 it is evident that a care home use differs considerably to that of a residential property and given that the proposal is for two residential properties it even more reason to ensure that the curtilage is clearly defined and controlled. The Google image shown at 3.37 includes a large area of hardstanding to the western boundary part of which was a former menage which gained planning permission (3/2005/0365) to be used as a car park. The land to the west of the car park labelled garden on site plan Drg No 290/01 was not included within the red edge of the 2005 application (although it was edged in blue, together with the field to the rear to indicate land with their ownership) the red edge for this application has also been extended further northwards to run level with the adjacent properties at No.'s 11 and 13 Higher Ramsgreave Road. Which raises concerns with encroachment into the open countryside in terms of residential curtilage.
- 1.8 In terms of the tilted balance, the Council admits that it does not have a five year housing land supply. The application form states the units are to be self-build and/or custom build housing however as no Unilateral Undertaking had been submitted to secure this as such this carries no weight. Consequently, the development could not be supported even through applying Paragraph 11 (d) (ii) of the Framework as set out in the attached officer's report.
- 1.9 It should also be noted that the appellant refers to the application process and timescales involved as a reason not to amend, however, no pre-application engagement was sought on this scheme prior to submission.
- 1.10 The submitted appeal statement does not address the issues raised and therefore on this basis, the Inspector is respectfully requested to dismiss this appeal.