|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Signed:** | **Officer:** |  | | | | **Date:** |  | **Manager:** | |  | **Date:** |  |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Application Ref:** | | | | 3/2020/0248 | | | | |  | | | |
| **Date Inspected:** | | | |  | | | | |
| **Officer:** | | | | JM | | | | |
| **DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:** | | | | | | | | | **APPROVAL** | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Development Description:** | | | | | Lean to side extension following removal of existing conservatory | | | | | | | |
| **Site Address/Location:** | | | | | Fairclough Barn Loud Bridge Road Chipping PR3 2NX | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | | **Parish/Town Council** | | | | | | | |
| No response received in respect of the application. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | | **Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies** | | | | | | | |
| **LCC Highways:** | | | | |  | | | | | | | |
| No representations have been received in respect of the proposed development. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | | **Additional Representations.** | | | | | | | |
| No representation | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **RELEVANT POLICIES AND SITE PLANNING HISTORY:** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ribble Valley Core Strategy:**  Key Statement EN2 - Landscape  Policy DMG1 – General Considerations  Policy DMH5 – Residential and curtilage extensions  National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Relevant Planning History:**  **3/2020/0037:**  Two storey side extension Refused /appeal received.  **3/2019/0299:**  Retrospective application for erection of garage and stable building with ancillary living accommodation above. (approved)  **3/2001/0067:**  Garage with storage space above, 3 no. stables and tack room. (approved) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Site Description and Surrounding Area:**  The application relates to a former barn conversion as approved under application 3/1989/0226. The property is located on the southern side of Loud Bridge Road being within a small cluster of existing residential dwellings.  The site is located within the defined Forest of Bowland AONB in a predominantly rural area, being relatively isolated from nearby built-form save that for the grouping of buildings of which it forms part of. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Proposed Development for which consent is sought:**  Following refusal of the two storey extension the proposal seeks consent for the erection of a single storey side extension to the existing building to accommodate and new bedroom window on the first floor.  The extension will be located on the south-facing gable of the existing dwelling projecting southward by 3.6m and a width of 5.2m with a lean to roof...  It is proposed that the east facing elevation will accommodate one windows on the east and west elevation. A new bedroom window is located on the west elevation. The south facing elevation has tri-fold doors and four rooflights. The submitted details propose that the extension will be faced in materials to match the existing building, also benefitting from quoin detailing to match the existing building. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Impact Upon Residential Amenity:**  Taking account of the southerly orientation of the extension and its relationship with nearby residential dwellings it is not considered that the proposed extension will result in any measurable or quantifiable harm to nearby existing residential amenity. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Visual Amenity/External Appearance:**  The case officer has considered that on balance and whilst recognising the inappropriateness of the extension that the limited visual impact would not be unduly harmful. However, the Head of Service considered the scheme as harmful and inappropriate.  It is considered that having regard to the existing conservatory which is now immune from enforcement action and the traditional design of the new extension being of an appropriate design with traditional materials it does not detract from the character of the original building | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Landscape/Ecology:**  No implications. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Observations/Consideration of Matters Raised/Conclusion:**  None. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **RECOMMENDATION**: | | | That planning permission be granted | | | | | | | | | |