

# Peter Hitchen Architects

**Peter Hitchen Architects Ltd**

Marathon House  
The Sidings Business Park  
Whalley  
Lancashire  
BB7 9SE  
24 May 2024

**DESIGN STATEMENT TO SUPPORT HOUSEHOLDER APPLICATION  
FOR  
PROPOSED TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION AND ALTERATIONS  
AT  
38 ROGERSFIELD  
LANGHO  
LANCASHIRE**



## **Introduction**

This statement is written to support the resubmission for planning approval following the refusal dated 28 March 2024. The reason for the refusal was stated as follows :-

*The proposal by virtue of its size, scale, massing, and visual prominence would result in the introduction of an unsympathetic and incongruous form of development which in turn would be harmful to the visual amenities of the application property and surrounding area. The proposal would therefore be in direct conflict with Policy DMG1 and DMH5 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and Paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework.*

## **Amended Proposal**

The site is occupied by an existing two storey detached dwelling of simple proportions and mass and typical of other houses in the area. It was built circa 1970. The house is a corner plot with a large garden footprint which has a mature hedgerow to Rogersfield.

The extensive garden to the east is the site area for the two storey side extension and the logical location to create space on two floors to improve the house and increase the family accommodation without impacting the existing layout and, crucially, to ensure that there is no effect on any neighbouring residential amenity.

It's apparent that the proposed side extension would not result in any material impact upon nearby occupants by way of overshadowing, loss of outlook or daylight. It's apparent that an extension at the rear it would have a negative impact on the property immediately over the northern boundary (No 84 Rogersfield) which would clearly be affected by the overall mass of a two storey rear extension.

In addition to the side extension the drawings show a proposal for a front porch which is of modest proportions and a simple addition to the front elevation.

The design demonstrates an architectural aesthetic to replicate the style of the house. The overall mass has been reduced from the original submission and the roof profile shows a hipped solution.

In order to ensure that the proposed extension is subservient the amended plans show that the overall width of the extension is less than the half the width of the host dwelling. The extension is set down from the ridge of the house and also set back from the principle elevation. This is in line with the planning requirements for domestic extensions. The materiality replicates the existing house in order to ensure an architectural compatibility.

Finally, the case officer previously expressed a concern over the effect of the extension on the building line. The site plan submitted with the application expands the area and shows that there is no discernible building line to this corner plot on Rogersfield, and the extension is an entirely appropriate configuration within the plot and the immediate area.

