



# Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 2 March 2021

**by Graham Wraight BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 11 March 2021**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/T2350/D/20/3265678**

**88 Fairfield Drive, Clitheroe, BB7 2PS**

- 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 John Trevor Moore against the decision of Ribble Valley Borough Council.
  - The application Ref 3/2020/0595, dated 26 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 20 October 2020.
  - The development proposed is a One and half storey side extension, Extension to rear dormer, Installation of front dormer.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

## Reasons

3. The surrounding area is characterised by a mix of dwelling types, including two storey dwellings, dormer bungalows and bungalows. The appeal site occupies a prominent position both on a bend in Fairfield Drive and on the corner of Fairfield Drive and Fairfield Close, meaning that the proposed development would be clearly visible in shorter and longer views taken from both roads. The arrangement of existing dwellings gives the surrounding area a spacious feel, and the current positioning of the appeal dwelling contributes to this, by reflecting the general alignment of dwellings on Fairfield Close.
4. The proposal would extend the footprint of the dwelling near to the boundary with Fairfield Close and it would result in large dormer windows of substantial size and bulk being placed across the front and rear roof planes of the dwelling, both of which would be clearly visible in the street scene due to the prominent positioning of the front and rear of the appeal dwelling. There are only limited examples of dormers present on front roof planes and as such they do not define the prevailing character of the area.
5. By reason of its extended footprint close to the side boundary of the site, the size and bulk of the enlarged dormer to the rear roof plane and that of the new dormer to the front roof plane, the proposal would dominate views taken from both Fairfield Drive and Fairfield Close, forming an unsympathetic, incongruous and discordant feature within the street scene. This would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and to the surrounding area.

6. My attention has been drawn to other examples of front dormer windows in the area, however only that at 92 Fairfield Drive sits within the context that the appeal site is viewed. In addition, these other examples are not comparable in their overall width and bulk, and in the impact that they have on their respective street scenes. They do not therefore justify the harm that would be caused by the appeal proposal. Reference is made to approvals that have been granted for front dormer windows in the local area in the past 24 months, but no details of these have been provided.
7. The development on the corner of Fairfield Drive and Lancaster Drive relates to a two-storey dwelling which is viewed primarily within the context of other two storey dwellings. Furthermore, it is not within the immediate vicinity of the appeal site. It is therefore not similar in impact to the proposal that is before me and is not located close to it, and accordingly it does not offer weight in support of the appeal development.
8. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposal would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and to the surrounding area. Consequently, it would fail to accord with Policies DMG1 and DMH5 of the Core Strategy 2014 where they seek to protect character and appearance.

### **Other Matters**

9. It is clear that the appellant is unhappy with how the planning application was considered by the Council and with the decision-making process. However, this matter is not relevant to the determination of the appeal, which must be made on planning grounds.

### **Conclusion**

10. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Graham Wraight*

INSPECTOR