

Note: This report needs to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.

Ribble Valley Borough Council

DATE INSPECTED: 30/07/2015

DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT - REFUSAL

Ref: AB

Application No:	3/2015/0549/P
Site:	7 Hospital Cottages, Ribchester Road, Ribchester, PR3 3YA
Development Proposed:	First floor extension over existing ground floor extension.
Target:	4 th September 2015

CONSULTATIONS: Town/Parish Council

Parish Council: No objections

CONSULTATIONS: Highway/Water Authority/Other Bodies

LCC Highways:

CONSULTATIONS: Additional Representations

No representations have been received

RELEVANT POLICIES:

Ribble Valley Core Strategy

Policy EN2 - Landscape

Policy DMG1 – General Considerations

Policy DMH5 – Residential and Curtilage Extensions

Policy DME3 – Site and Species Protection and Conservation

National Planning Policy Framework

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

Consent is sought for the erection of a first floor rear extension over the existing ground floor extension at 7 Hospital Cottages, Ribchester Road, Ribchester. The application dwelling is a two storey semi-detached property located in an area of open countryside between the settlements on Longridge and Ribchester. It is separated from no.6 Hospital Cottage by associated driveways and has gardens to the front and rear. There is an existing flat-roofed single storey extension across the rear elevation of the main dwelling with a further single storey conservatory adjacent the common boundary with no.8 Hospital Cottage. The key considerations in the determination of this application are its impact on the visual appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area, its effect on the amenities of neighbouring occupiers and its impact on protected species.

The application proposes the erection of a first floor extension above the existing single storey rear extension. The existing rear extension projects around 4m beyond the rear wall of the main dwelling and extends the full width of the host property. The first floor extension would be built off the walls of the single storey element measuring 4m x 8.3m. It would have a dual-pitched roof with an eaves and ridge height to match the main dwelling.

The proposed development would be situated to the rear of the application property and as such would not be prominent in the streetscene. However, it would be a prominent feature in the context of the rear gardens of the immediate properties in the area. Ribble Valley Core Strategy Policy DMG1 provides specific guidance in relation to design and states that extensions should be designed to complement the original dwelling in terms of its scale, massing, style, features and building materials. The proposed two storey rear extension would impact on the character of the host dwelling due to the increase in mass to the rear. The proposed extension would not be set down from the main dwelling at the eaves or ridge nor would it be set in from the gable elevations and it would fail to appear subservient to the application property. As a result, it would completely overwhelm and wholly dominate the application property on both side and rear elevations. The proposed development would be an incongruous and bulky addition and would be seriously detrimental to the appearance and character of the host dwelling and the surrounding area by virtue of its design, scale and size. Furthermore, the proposed window openings on the rear elevation would not respect the existing window arrangement or the style

and proportions of existing openings resulting in further visual harm. In addition, it is considered the approval of the scheme would create a harmful precedent for the acceptance of other similar unjustified proposals at neighbouring dwellings. The proposals are considered contrary to policies DMB1 and DHM5 of the Core Strategy.

With regards to the potential impact on adjacent neighbours, the neighbouring dwelling to the east is no.6 Hospital Cottage. There are no windows proposed on the elevation facing this neighbour and the proposed development is unlikely to have an unacceptable impact on the amenities of this occupant through loss of light, outlook or privacy. However, the proposed development would abut the common boundary with the adjoining property, no.8 Hospital Cottage. The proposals would result in a blank two storey wall projecting 4m beyond the rear elevation of the application property and no.8 Hospital Cottage. This would result in a significant loss of light and outlook from the rear ground floor windows of no.8 Hospital Cottage and would give rise to an unacceptable sense of enclosure, overbearing impact and overshadowing of these neighbouring occupiers. The proposals would seriously harm the amenity levels that householders might reasonably expect to enjoy and would not accord with Core Strategy Policy DMB1.

A protected species survey has been submitted which found no evidence of bats using the property and concludes that the proposed works are unlikely to cause disturbance to bats, result in the loss of a bat roost or cause injury or death to bats. Furthermore, it is considered that the proposed development will not be to the detriment of highway safety.

In conclusion, the proposals, by virtue of its scale, design and mass, would result in a dominant, unsympathetic and incongruous scheme of development that would be harmful to the character and visual amenities of the existing building and the wider built environment. Furthermore, it would cause in severe harm to the residential amenities of the occupiers of no.8 Hospital Cottage through loss of light and outlook resulting in an overbearing impact and sense of enclosure. Accordingly, it is recommended that the application be refused.

SUMMARY REASONS FOR REFUSAL:

Contrary to Policies DMG1 and DMH5 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.
