

Ribble Valley Borough Council

DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT - REFUSAL

Ref: CB

Application No:	3/2011/0509
Development Proposed:	Proposed new access and two storey rear extension with side porch extension at Craigmere, Eastham Street, Clitheroe, BB7 2HY

CONSULTATIONS: Parish/Town Council

Clitheroe Town Council has no objections to this proposal.

CONSULTATIONS: Highway/Water Authority/Other Bodies

Highways – verbally has no objections and the change in access will move the access away from the bend in the road, which is preferable.

Eastham Street is not a classified road therefore planning permission is not required for the creation of the new access.

CONSULTATIONS: Additional Representations

No representations have been received.

RELEVANT POLICIES:

Policy G1 – Development Control

Policy H10 - Residential Extensions

Policy SPG – “Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings”

POLICY REASONS FOR REFUSAL:

Policies G1 and H10 of the DWLP and the Council's SPG on Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings – impact on street scene.

COMMENTS/ENVIRONMENTAL/AONB/HUMAN RIGHTS ISSUES/RECOMMENDATION:

Permission is sought for a two storey rear extension on a detached property situated on Eastham Street, Clitheroe on the corner where the road bends left leading to Knuck Knowles Drive and Ribblesdale Avenue. Permission is also sought for a single storey lean to canopy structure on the side elevation of the property to provide a covered area.

The proposed two storey extension would have approximate dimensions of 5.3m x 6.0m x 9.5m in height, and effectively has three floors, with a room in the roofspace. The three storey extension would run flush with the existing side gable of the property. The proposed canopy extension would project from the side of the property by approximately 1.8m. It would measure 12.6m in length and would be approximately 2.6m to eaves and 3.5m at its highest. The side and rear elevations of the property will be affected by the proposed extensions.

In determining the acceptability of the proposals, it is important to consider the visual impact, impact on neighbours, highway safety and protected species and whether the proposal accords with the 'saved' policies within the Districtwide Local Plan.

This property is located on a corner plot, consequently three of the four elevations are highly visible within the estate. The property is a unique design, with a front, east facing, gable projection. The property also has a prominent steep roof with a high ridge point on the main roof.

Policy G1 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan (LP) seeks a high standard of design. The Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings' has much the same objective. It advises that extensions should not dominate the original house. Moreover, it advocates that there should be a good visual relationship between the original dwelling and any subsequent additions (either existing or proposed) and also that extensions should respect the proportion, form and detailing of the original dwelling and to avoid extensions which are bulky and effect the overall mass of the dwelling to an extent where the dwelling is highly prominent.

Due to the scale, design and massing, the extension would appear highly prominent within the street scene when viewing the property from the side and rear.

As the property has a front gable projection, it is important to consider how the extensions/projections will work together. According to the plans submitted, the roof of the two storey extension would be set down from the main roof ridge by approximately 0.5m and would project from the rear roof slope by approximately 8.3m. In comparison, the front, east facing gable projection, sits 0.8m below the main roof ridge and projects from the front roof slope by approximately 6.7m.

When viewed from the side, this elevation is particularly prominent within the street, when approaching Eastham Street from Tunstead Avenue there is currently a sense of openness between Craigmere and the adjacent property Holmleigh. The extent of roof projection at 8.3m seriously undermines the feeling of openness in the area. Moreover, the extension would appear overly large, bulky and unbalanced due to its bulk and massing. This is further emphasised by the extent of projection and the number of window openings. The rear extension would also appear higher than the existing front projection that again accentuates that this extension would appear out of proportion with the original dwelling.

When travelling from Knuck Knowles Drive towards Eastham Street, the rear of the dwelling is also highly visible from the highway. The two/ three storey element would mask the currently unadorned rear roof slope. The steeply pitched roof is a feature in itself, with the front roof slope containing a small dormer window with the rear slope being blank. Similarly the impact of the extension when viewed from the side the extension would appear highly prominent, dominating a large proportion of the rear roof slope which would adversely affecting the amenities of the street scene. To protect visual amenity, I thus recommend that the proposal be resisted.

In terms of residential amenity, the rear extension would be within 18m of the first floor gable windows of the property referred to as 'Holmleigh'. This does not accord with the minimum 21 metre requirement stated in the SPG. In relation to the windows in the side elevation, the distance between this property and Nearfield on the opposite side of the road which faces Tunstead Avenue exceeds the 21m guide given in the SPG as do the first floor windows in the side elevation nearest to Oak House, the adjacent property facing Eastham Street, I therefore consider this aspect of the scheme to be acceptable.

In relation to highway safety, the existing double garage will remain and the curtilage can accommodate another three cars. This meets the required provision. As stated at the beginning of this report, the altered access does not require planning permission as Eastham Street is not a classified road. A tarmac surface is proposed for the new driveway. To prevent direct water runoff on to the main road, a condition could be used which requires surface water run off to be directed to a permeable or porous surface within the curtilage.

To ensure the proposed development would not harm important wildlife, a bat survey has been submitted, dated 8 July 2011, which concludes that the potential of injuring bats or disturbing their habitat would be very low.

I am aware that I gave positive pre-application advice on the possibility of a two storey rear extension, however, I envisaged a subservient extension, set well down from the existing ridge, and set back from the gable elevation. Considering there is approximately 24 metres between the rear of Criagmore and the first floor windows on the gable of Holmleigh, I also envisaged a limited 3m projection to meet the 21m rule set out in the SPG. An extension of this nature is far more likely to accord with policy and reduce its impact on the street scene.

Taking all of the above in to consideration, and in the interests of visual and residential amenity, I thus recommend the application accordingly.

RECOMMENDATION: That permission be refused.