
The
Cedars,
34 Peel
Park
Avenue,
Clitheroe
BB7 1ET

First floor
extension over
existing garage -
revised design

Planning Statement

March 2016

Judith Douglas

TOWN PLANNING LTD

HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING APPLICATION TO RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL

BY MR JONATHAN DEAN BRAITHWAITE

A FIRST FLOOR EXTENSION OVER THE EXISTING GARAGE (REVISED DESIGN) AT THE CEDARS, 34 PEEL PARK AVENUE, CLITHEROE BB7 1ET.

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This Planning Statement is in support of a householder application submitted by Mr J Braithwaite for planning permission for a revised design for an extension over the existing garage at The Cedars, 34 Peel Park Avenue, Clitheroe. A previous application for a first floor extension was refused planning permission on the 8th January 2016 reference 3/2015/0883 on the grounds that the extension would *“by virtue of its scale, design and massing would dominate the existing dwelling resulting in an unsympathetic and overlarge addition to the detriment of the character and appearance of the dwelling. The close proximity of the proposed extension would result in a loss of privacy of no.36 Peel Park Avenue. This would be detrimental to the residential amenity of the occupants neighbouring dwelling. This would be contrary to Policies DMG1 and DMH5 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.”*
- 1.2 We have engaged in pre-application discussions regarding the shortcomings of the previous scheme, identifying the elements which required alteration and have arrived at an amended scheme which now satisfactorily addresses the concerns which previously lead to the refusal of planning permission.

The revised drawings comprise:

- Drawing 1 Existing first floor plan, elevations and location plan 1:1250.
- Drawing 2 Proposed first floor plan, elevation and cross section through rear dormer window.
- Drawing 3 Site plan 1:200
- Bat survey

2. APPLICATION SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

- 2.1 The Cedars is one of a group of four individually designed houses built in the 1960's set on a plot which is surrounded by residential roads. Of these properties 2 Claremont Drive is set parallel to the road. 23 Claremont Avenue are set at a 45 degree angle to the road. 25 Claremont Drive is not quite at a 45 degree angle and faces slightly towards 34 Peel Park Avenue. 34 Peel Park Avenue is definitely not at a 45 degree angle and is approximately at a 22 degree angle to Claremont Drive. It faces the rear garden of 2 Claremont Drive more than it faces the rear garden of 25 Claremont Avenue.
- 2.2 The northern gable of The Cedars faces the side/front garden of 25 Claremont Avenue and Peel Park Avenue. The side boundary between The Cedars and 25 Claremont Avenue delineated by a substantial mature evergreen hedge. The front and gable elevations of The Cedars are visible in the street scene.
- 2.3 The Cedars is constructed out of a light coloured orange brick with stone decorative columns and corbels at the original corners of the house. It has a steeply pitched roof covered in dark grey concrete tiles and dormer windows in the front and rear roof slopes. The upper portions of the gables are covered in vertically hung dark grey tiles. On the northern gable is a recently constructed single storey garage.

3. PLANNING HISTORY

- 3.1 3/2009/0337 Garage extension approved 24 June 2009.
- 3.2 3/2015/0883 Over garage extension to form extra bedroom and study refused 08 January 2016.

4. THE DEVELOPMENT PLAN

- 4.1 The relevant part of the Development Plan for the purposes of this application is the Core Strategy. The following policies are applicable:

Policy DMG1- General Considerations

Policy DMH5-Residential and curtilage extensions.

- 4.2 The National Planning Policy Framework is also relevant in particular section 7 requiring good design.

5. PRE-APPLICATION ADVICE

- 5.1 We sought pre-application advice from the Council before submitting this revised application through an exchange of emails. This established that the revisions to the design in relation to the impact on the street scene is satisfactorily addressed by setting down the ridge height by 30 cm. In order to address the over-looking of the neighbours' garden it was suggested that the rear dormer be omitted from the scheme in favour of a roof light. This is discussed further below.

6. EVALUATION

- 6.1 The two main issues to be considered in relation to the proposed development are the impact on the street scene, and the impact on the residential amenities of the neighbouring property 25 Claremont Avenue.

Impact on the street scene.

- 6.2 The Planning Officer's Delegated report to the previous application 3/2015/0883 confirms that dormer are common feature in the locality and the principle of locating dormer on the front roof slope is acceptable¹. It is clear from the delegated report and discussions with the Planning Officer that the inappropriate "*scale, design and massing*" was a result of the extension being designed as a continuation of the existing roof slope on the front elevation, offering no break nor distinction between the host dwelling and the extension. The extension therefore failed to appear subservient to the original dwelling.
- 6.3 This has been addressed by setting the ridge line of the extension down by 30cm and setting the plane of the front slope back so that there is a clear visual break between the original dwelling and the extension. In addition the eaves line above the garage door is lower than the eaves level of the house. This has successfully addressed the visual appearance of the extension when viewed within the street scene. This has been confirmed informally by the

¹ Appendix Delegated Item file report 3/2015/0883

Planning Officer as being acceptable². An additional improvement to the previous scheme is also proposed in relation to the appearance of the rear dormers. The existing rear dormers are clad in light coloured timber with a white fascia. It is proposed to re-clad the existing and proposed rear dormers in tiles to match the roof tiles and to paint the fascias black rather than white. This will help to blend the dormers into the roof and has successfully been employed for the dormers at 25 Claremont Avenue. See photograph 1 of the existing dormer and photographs 2 and 3 which shows the neighbours' dormers.



1 Existing rear dormer.

- 6.4 We also note that a similar two storey extension has recently been approved and built at 22 Mayfield Avenue nearby reference 3/2015/0763. This extension is also on a corner plot. The ridge of the extension was also set down from the main ridge by 30cm.

² Email dated 17th February 2016 from Assistant Planning Officer Rebecca Halliwell.

- 6.5 We consider that the revised proposal now compliments the original dwelling in terms of its scale, massing, style, features and building materials and makes a positive contribution to local character.

Impact on residential amenity

- 6.6 The Planning Officer in the Delegate File Report explains her concern regarding the loss of privacy to the neighbouring property stating *“the extension would be located in close proximity to the neighbouring dwelling no.36 Peel Park Avenue (this is actually 25 Claremont Ave.,) approximately 15m distance. The proposed rear dormer would overlook the garden of no. 36 Peel Park Avenue this would result in overlooking of this neighbour’s private amenity and would result in a loss of privacy”*. We consider that this assessment is incorrect and that no loss of privacy would occur.
- 6.7 Drawing 3 site plan, shows that the proposed extension at its nearest point is approximately 2m from the boundary. This boundary is denoted by a substantial evergreen hedge and conifer tree which provides substantial screening of the neighbours’ garden. See photographs 2 and 3. The orientation of The Cedars is such that the proposed windows in the rear dormer face the neighbours’ garden at a slight angle and does not directly face the neighbours’ garden at close quarters. However as this has been raised as an issue we have sought to address this by proposing that the sill level of the window on the proposed rear dormer which will light and office/study is raised to a level which prevents any overlooking of the neighbours garden. The cill level is positioned at 1.8m above floor level providing the occupants of the room with a view of the sky only. In addition the applicant has offered to obscure glaze this window however I do not consider this to be necessary.
- 6.8 The Planning Officer has suggested that the dormer be omitted and substituted for a roof light. I assume the rationale for this is that it would not be possible to view the neighbours’ garden from a roof light. As I have explained, the high level window in the dormer achieves the same effect and so the substitution to roof light is not necessary.



2 Substantial evergreen hedge and conifer on joint boundary



3 Substantial evergreen hedge on joint boundary

Other matters

- 6.9 Comment on the previous application recorded on the Delegated File Report confirm that the application raises no issues in relation to highway safety or the adequacy of parking. The daylight scoping survey found no evidence of bats or nesting birds at the property.

7. CONCLUSION

- 7.1 The proposal is for a revised design for first floor extension over the existing garage. We have demonstrated that the design of the extension is now acceptable and meets the requirement of policies DMG1 and DMH5 in relation to the impact on the street scene and the effect on the privacy of the neighbouring property. The application represents good design as required by section 7 of the NPPF.

APPENDIX

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

Ribble Valley Borough Council

DATE INSPECTED: 25/11/2015

DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT - REFUSAL

Ref: RH

Application No:	3/2015/0883
Site:	34 Peel Park Avenue, Clitheroe, BB7 1EU
Development Proposed:	Over garage extension to form extra bedroom and study
Target:	08 January 2016

CONSULTATIONS: Town/Parish Council

Town Council: No objections

CONSULTATIONS: Highway/Water Authority/Other Bodies

LCC Highways: The Highways Development Control section does not have any objections regarding the proposed extension over the garage and are of the opinion that the proposed development should have a negligible impact on highways safety and highway capacity in the immediate vicinity of the site.

Based on the Joint Lancashire Structure Plan the Highway Development Control Section is of the opinion that the applicant has provided adequate off road parking provision for this type and size of development.

CONSULTATIONS: Additional Representations

No representations have been received

RELEVANT POLICIES:**Ribble Valley Core Strategy**

Policy DMG1 – General Considerations

Policy DMH5 – Residential and Curtilage Extensions

National Planning Policy Framework

Section 7 – Requiring Good Design

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

Consent is sought for the erection of a first floor extension over the existing garage to form an extra bedroom and study at 34 Peel Park Avenue, Clitheroe. The application dwelling is a detached property which lies as a corner plot at the junction of Claremont Drive within the settlement of Clitheroe. The property is faced with beige house bricks, grey roof tiles and white UPVC windows.

The proposed extension would project over the existing attached garage which was approved under application number 3/2009/0377 on the north east side of the property and would extend to a height to match the host dwelling. The extension would have a front dormer to match the style and size of those on the existing property and would be constructed from materials to match those used in the main dwelling.

The area is predominantly residential, consisting of detached and semi-detached dwellings. In this case, it is noted that the immediate area is characterised by some uniformity of design along Peel Park Avenue and Claremont Drive. In determining the application it is important to consider the design of the extension, its effect on amenities of neighbours, highway safety and on European protected species.

The first floor extension would be built on the walls of the existing garage and would measure approximately 6.3m x 5m. It is proposed to have a pitched roof with a ridge height of around 7.5m that would form a continuation of the existing roof. The development would be constructed from materials to match those used in the main dwelling.

Front dormers are a common feature in the locality, and as such, the principle of locating

dormers on the front roof slope is acceptable. The walls of the extensions will not project forward of the principle elevation or of the rear elevation nor is it set back or down from the principle elevation thus resulting in a continuation of the existing roof form. 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. Furthermore, new development should make a positive contribution to the local character and distinctiveness of the building. The proposed extension would not appear as a subservient addition as the extensions would appear dominant. This would be detrimental to the property itself, the attached bungalow and the amenities of locality, due to the extension being visible from the street scene.

With regards to the potential impact on the residential amenity of the occupiers of nearby dwellings, the proposed first floor side extension would be located in close proximity to neighbouring dwelling no.36 Peel Park Avenue approximately 15m in distance. The proposed rear dormer would overlook the garden of no.36 Peel Park Avenue this would result in overlooking of this neighbour's private amenity and would result in a loss of privacy.

With regards to highway safety, the proposed development would lead to the creation of an additional bedroom at the application property. As a result, there is a requirement for additional off-street car parking spaces. The existing garage and area of hardstanding is sufficient to provide this and would be retained at the application property. As such, it is considered that the proposed development would not have a detrimental impact on highway safety.

A daylight scoping survey for European Protected species has been submitted which found no evidence of bats or nesting wild birds at the property and concludes that the proposed works are unlikely to cause disturbance to bats or wild birds, result in loss of bat or wild bird roost or cause injury or death to bats or wild birds.

In conclusion the proposal by virtue of its scale, design and massing, would dominate the existing dwelling, resulting in an unsympathetic and overlarge addition to the detriment of the character and appearance of the dwelling. The close proximity of the proposed extension would result in a loss of privacy of no.36 Peel Park Avenue. This would be detrimental to the residential amenity of the occupants neighbouring dwelling. This would be contrary to Policies DMG1 and DMH5 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy. Accordingly, it is recommended that the application be refused.

REASON FOR REFUSAL:

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

Prepared by:

Judith Douglas Bsc Hons Dip TP MRTPI

Judith Douglas Town Planning Ltd

90 Pimlico Road

Clitheroe, BB7 2AH

Tel. 01200 425051

Mobile 07729 302644

Ref. JDTPPL 0013

March 2016