

## Ribble Valley Borough Council

**DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT - REFUSAL**

Ref: CB/EL

<b>Application No:</b>	3/2014/0124/P
<b>Development Proposed:</b>	Proposed two storey side extension, rear conservatory and two roof lights at 5 The Crescent, Dunsop Bridge, Clitheroe BB7 3BA

**CONSULTATIONS: Parish/Town Council**

Parish Council - No objections to this proposal.

**CONSULTATIONS: Highway/Water Authority/Other Bodies**

Environment Directorate (County Surveyor) – No objections to the proposal.

**CONSULTATIONS: Additional Representations**

No representations have been received.

**RELEVANT POLICIES:***Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan*

Policy G1 - Development Control.

Policy G5 - Settlement Strategy.

Policy ENV1 - Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

Policy ENV3 - Development in Open Countryside.

Policy ENV7 – Protected Species.

Policy H10 - Residential Extensions.

Policy SPG – “Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings”.

*Ribble Valley Core Strategy Regulation 22 Submission Draft Post Submission Version (including proposed main changes)*

Policy DMG1 – General Considerations.

Policy EN2 – Landscape.

Policy DME2 – Landscape Protection.

Policy DME3 – Site and Species Protection and Conservation.

Policy DMH5 – Residential and Curtilage Extensions.

*National Planning Policy Framework*

Achieving Sustainable Development.

Section 7 Requiring Good Design.

Section 11 – Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment.

**POLICY REASONS FOR REFUSAL:**

G1, ENV1, ENV3, H10, SPG, DMG1, EN2, DMH5 – terracing, detrimental to visual amenity and overlooking of neighbouring property.

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

The application relates to the south eastern end of a pair of semi detached dwellings located within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty on The Crescent, Dunsop Bridge. The property forms one of the seven pairs of semi detached properties which form a crescent of properties around a grassed boundary verge.

Permission is sought to demolish the single storey lean-to extension on the application property and erect a two storey side extension 3.6m wide x 6.1m in length (ie the depth of the house). The extension would match the even ridge height of the existing property. Permission is also sought for a rear conservatory with approximate dimensions of 3.3m x 3.6m x 2.4m to the eaves and 3.4m to its highest point. Permission is also sought for the creation of a single roof light in both the front and rear roof slopes of the property to serve the attic, although no floor plans have been submitted showing this.

The properties, to which the application site forms one of, are set on a hill overlooking the village. A Public Right of Way (Bridleway no.8 in the Parish of Bowland Forest Higher) runs past the front of the properties. Each pair of semi-detached dwellings are equally spaced apart which enables views through of the countryside (AONB), the hills above and the countryside below.

In assessing the visual impact of the proposal, the properties on The Crescent are highly visible within this nationally important landscape, particularly when travelling along the public bridleway in front of the properties, from the bridge crossing the River Dunsop on the C568 Newton Road as it rises uphill from the river past the entrance to The Crescent, and from the Trough Road (C477) to the west of the application site over the fields and from the site of the village hall.

Paragraph 115 of the NPPF states:

*“Great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, The Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty ...”*

With each pair of semi detached dwellings being set apart from each other, views of the hills above to the west and the countryside below to the east, are seen between the dwellings, which add to the rural settings of the properties and enables views through of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

Whilst I note that two of the properties on The Crescent have had two storey side extensions, No 4 adjacent and No 8, it is necessary to assess each application on its individual merits.

The proposed extension would be built flush with the front and rear elevations and would follow the existing eaves and ridge heights of the dwelling. The two storey side extension would be built in from the shared boundary with No 4 The Crescent by only 600mm and the separation distance between No 4 and the application property would be reduced from 5.15m to 0.85m. In addition, the pair of semi-detached dwellings to which the property forms one part is parallel with the adjacent pair of semi detached dwellings on The Crescent and given no.4 has extended up to the shared boundary, I consider that doing similar with this property would result in a cramped form of development leading to a terracing effect in the street scene as the gap between the two pairs of semi-detached would be significantly reduced. In addition views of the countryside both ways would be significantly blocked to the detriment of visual amenity.

The resultant terracing effect would create a significant change to the basic character and layout of the original estate to the detriment of visual amenity, contrary to Policy G1 of the saved Local Plan and the Council's SPG on Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings. Furthermore, it would significantly detract from the visual amenities of the countryside in which the dwellings are set and the rural setting of the properties on The Crescent to the detriment of the wider visual amenities of this part of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, in conflict with Local Plan Policy G1, ENV1 and ENV3, and also paragraph 115 of the NPPF, which requires Local Planning Authorities to give *great weight to conserving landscape and scenic beauty* in Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty. As a result, I recommend the

application be refused on this basis.

The proposed conservatory at the rear of the property in the Crescent would be partially visible from the Trough Road and from the grounds of the village hall situated on the same road, however, I consider existing field hedging will screen the majority of the conservatory with only the upper portions of the conservatory being visible. I therefore consider this aspect of the proposal to be acceptable from a visual amenity perspective.

With regards to the proposed roof lights, only one other property has a roof light, No 4. When viewing the rear of the property from the Trough Road and grounds of the village hall, the reflectiveness of the rear roof light on No 4 appears as a stark contrast to the dull tiled roofs present on the semi detached properties and would be visually awkward. Similarly, solar panels exist on the rear of No 6 The Crescent that have a similar effect on the visual amenities of the AONB. The addition of a single roof light would add to the clutter on the rear roof slopes of the 14 properties to the detriment of visual amenity. The proposed roof light on the front roof slope would be the first one on the front elevation and would set a precedent for others to follow and similarly I also have concerns about the visual impact on the AONB, contrary to Policy ENV1 of the Local Plan.

In terms of the impact on neighbours, no windows exist on the gable of the side extension at No 4 adjacent, therefore no amenity issues will occur as a result of the two storey side extension. However, the rear conservatory would be fully glazed and this would lead to overlooking of adjacent properties garden areas. The SPG on Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings states:

*“Conservatories sited on or close to a common boundary with a neighbour should have a solid side, or be obscure glazed, or be screened by a fence or wall. This is to protect your neighbour’s privacy”.*

No 4 The Crescent has a shed along the shared boundary of the two properties, therefore this will prevent any overlooking of this neighbour occurring. In contrast, an open view of the rear garden area of the adjoining property, No 6, would occur and I consider this would lead to unacceptable overlooking of the neighbour’s rear garden contrary to Policy G1 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan and the Council’s SPG on Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings. In the interests of safeguarding the amenities of the existing and any future occupiers, I thus recommend the application also be refused on this basis.

Turning to highway safety, the number of bedrooms at the property will increase from 3 to 4. The Highway Authority initially objected to the proposal on the lack of off street parking as only one off street parking space exists at the property at present. In an email dated 10 March 2014, the applicant disputed the need to provide a second off street parking space given the property is located on a quiet private road/public bridleway and on the road directly in front of the property, two cars can park without affecting the main through road which still enables cars to pass. The Highway Authority has subsequently withdrawn their subject to no concerns being raised by local residents’ objection (see email dated 17 March 2014 from David Bloomer). No objections to the proposal have been received from nearby residents but in any case, given the setting of the properties I do not consider there would be a highway safety issues caused as a result of allowing the proposal.

The effect of works on Protected Species is another material planning consideration. The works would involve disrupting the existing roof of the property and the removal of the existing single storey side extension, therefore a bat survey has been submitted dated 30 January 2014. This survey found no evidence of bats using the property so the works proposed should not cause injury to this European protected species. The survey however did find evidence of two House Martin nests under the roof soffit, and although it is understood that these birds did not nest at the property in 2013, as House Martins are site

faithful, it is considered necessary to replace the loss of the nests with artificial nests to exactly the same spot where they came from, if permission were to be granted for this proposal, this would be need to be conditioned accordingly.

To conclude, the proposals would lead to a terracing effect that would have a harmful effect on the visual amenities of the AONB. The rear conservatory would also harm the amenities of adjoining neighbours, and I therefore recommend the application be resisted.

**RECOMMENDATION:** That permission be refused.