

Peter Hitchen Architects

Marathon House
The Sidings Business Park
Whalley
Lancashire
BB7 9SE
27 June 2018

APPELLANT STATEMENT

10 Knowsley Road , Wilpshire , Blackburn , BB1 9PX

**Proposed conversion and extensions to the former care home to create five dwellings
(planning application reference 3/2018/0263)**

Further to the decision notice dated 25 May 2018 we contest the two reasons for the refusal on the basis of the following supporting statements :-

Reason 1

The proposed development, by virtue of its layout, scale, design and mass would result in an unsympathetic and incongruous scheme of development that would be harmful to the visual appearance and significance of the existing building, a non-designated heritage asset, and the character of the wider built environment. This would be contrary to Key Statement EN5 and Policies DMG1 and DME4 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and NPPF paragraphs 58 and 135.

The building was converted into a care home over 30 years ago. Prior to this the building was used as DSS flats. There are no original internal fixtures or features of heritage value. The porch was added at a later date and is not part of the original building.

The design has been produced to respect the overall mass , proportions of the existing building whilst acknowledging the previous extension on the north side. The material treatment to the facades is entirely appropriate and the layout of the proposal reflects the functionality of a domestic proposal.

This is supported by the fact that a previous, now expired, application to extend the property further to the rear and to add a conservatory to the South side was approved in December 1998 (reference 3/1997/0757).

Reason 2

The proposed development, by virtue of its layout and design, would fail to provide safe visibility for vehicles emerging from the site, the loading and unloading of vehicles would place pedestrians within the live carriageway and visibility for vehicles exiting Clifton Grove would be compromised. As such, the proposed development would be detrimental to highway safety contrary to Policies DMG1 and DMG3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.

The proposal as submitted for the formal planning application following initial advice received from the planning department during the pre-application process was subject to a further pre-application enquiry to LCC Highways. The details of this consultation was included within the design and access statement in order to confirm that the proposal addresses their concerns. This was principally relating to the ownership of the footway which runs parallel to the building frontage. This pedestrian route does not continue to the north or south of the property.

We were very disappointed to receive the details of the LCC consultation during the formal planning process which contradicts and incorporated information not included within the written advice we received to our pre-app enquiry.

It is worth noting that the case officer, within an email dated 22 May 2018 (included here) remarked *'we have yet to receive a consultation response from LCC Highways but note that no objections were raised at pre-application stage except for discussion regarding the status of the footway along the site frontage'*.

We re-iterate that the layout submitted for planning approval was produced in accordance with the advice given by the LCC Highways officer when he attended the property at the pre-application enquiry with both the Architect and the appellant present. He was specifically questioned about the plan to have parking to the front of the property, measured the available frontage and advised ourselves that he had no issues with the proposed parking scheme.

It is also worth stating that the current car park supports 6 cars. Access and egress for the new development would not change the manner in which vehicles access and leave. Previously, staff and visitors to the home either reversed out onto the road, or manoeuvred in the carriageway in order to reverse onto the site.

Vehicles exiting Clifton Grove to the northern side of the plot are required to pull forward beyond what would be the rear of any parked cars at the front of the proposed development. This is due to the fact that visibility to the right when exiting Clifton Grove is occluded by both a hedge and the fact that Pettyfoot Bridge extends further into the main carriageway than the curtilage of what would be the parking to the front of the new development. In addition the car park presently situated to the left of Clifton Grove is designed to accommodate 6 vehicles. When the car park is fully occupied persons exiting Clifton Grove appear not to have had any difficulty seeing to the left beyond the parked cars and this has been the situation for over 30 years.

To substantiate our grievance, we include both the response from LCC during the planning consultation and the response we received (and concluded) during the pre-application enquiry.

Additional relevant note

The application was determined within the allocated period but we were only informed of the case officers concerns very late in the process. Two of the concerns are now confirmed as the reasons for the refusal but two other concerns relating to the sale of the care home business and the tree impact matters were also raised. We were only given 48 hours to respond due to the absence of the case officer in the final week of the process due to annual holiday leave.

The sale/marketing issue and the tree matters were ultimately resolved due to our immediate response highlighting the information provided at pre-application stage and the mitigation measures proposed for the landscaping due to the loss of the trees.