



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 August 2006

by Eur Ing **Allan Denham** BSc(Eng) CEng CEnv MICE MCIWEM

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for
Communities and Local Government

The Planning Inspectorate
4/11 Eagle Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN
☎ 0117 372 6372
e-mail: enquiries@planning-inspectorate.gsi.gov.uk

Date: 28 September 2006

Appeal Ref: APP/T2350/A/06/2015801
144 Woone Lane, Clitheroe BB7 1BN

- 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 G Gordon against the decision of Ribble Valley Borough Council.
- The application Ref 3/2006/0135, dated 18 February 2006, was refused by notice dated 13 April 2006.
- The development proposed is the use of dwelling as offices.

Decision

1. I allow the appeal, and grant planning permission for the use of a dwelling as offices at 144 Woone Lane, Clitheroe BB7 1BN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 3/2006/0135, dated 18 February 2006, and the plans submitted therewith, subject to the condition that the development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission.

Main issues

2. I consider the main issue is the effect of the on-street parking arising from the proposal on highway safety along Woone Lane, George Street, Kay Street and Fort Street.

Reasons

3. The proposed development is the change of use of a large terraced house to use as an office. The property is at the end of a row in Kay Street but fronts onto Woone Lane. The area surrounding the proposal is a quiet suburb of Clitheroe.
4. Policy G1 of the adopted Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan describes the criteria to be applied to all development. Paragraph (c) of the Policy, which requires that adequate arrangements for parking should be made, is the pertinent section in this case.
5. Woone Lane is a very quiet street adjacent to a reservoir on the south east side with short streets running off to the north west. The overhanging trees and close proximity of the boundary wall along Woone Lane serves to limit traffic speeds. During my visit, I noted that the vehicles using the street proceeded slowly.
6. The Council calculates that the development would generate a requirement for five parking spaces yet evidence from the appellant suggests that the proposal would require only four. It is reasonable to assume that the existing use requires space for two cars. I noted, during

my visit, that there was ample on-street parking available around the area of the proposed development. Therefore, I consider that there would be available on-street parking space in the vicinity during normal office hours which could be utilised in connection with the proposed use.

7. Office workers would normally wish to park as close as possible to their place of work, which may mean that they parked closer to the junctions than the recommended 10 metres. However, there are no parking restrictions in the area. In any event, due to the limited amount of turning traffic and the slow speeds, danger would not be caused in Woone Lane or the surrounding streets. Additional parking in Kay Street may also serve to keep vehicle speeds low. I consider that parking along the street would not be disruptive as on-street parking is commonplace in the area.
8. In conclusion, I consider that the development would not compromise Policy G1 (c) of the Local Plan nor would on-street parking, arising from the development, harm highway safety along Woone Lane.
9. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

Allan Denham

Inspector