|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Signed:** | **Officer:** | BT | | | | **Date:** | 8/3/2021 | **Manager:** | |  | | **Date:** |  |
| **Site Notice displayed** | N/A | **Photos uploaded** | | | | Y |  | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Application Ref:** | | | 3/2020/1102 | | | | | |  | | | | |
| **Date Inspected:** | | | 1/2/2021 | | | | | |
| **Officer:** | | | BT | | | | | |
| **DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:** | | | | | | | | | **Decision** | | Approval | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Development Description:** | | | | | Proposed extensions to front and rear with internal alterations | | | | | | | | |
| **Site Address/Location:** | | | | | 55 Mellor Brow, Mellor. BB2 7EX. | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | | **Parish/Town Council** | | | | | | | | |
| Mellor Parish Council have no objections | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | | **Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies** | | | | | | | | |
| None. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | | **Additional Representations.** | | | | | | | | |
| No representations have been received in respect of the application. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **RELEVANT POLICIES AND SITE PLANNING HISTORY:** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ribble Valley Core Strategy:**  Key Statement DS1 - Development Strategy  Key Statement DS2 - Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development  Key Statement EN1 – Green Belt  Policy DMG1 – General Considerations  Policy DMG2 – Strategic Considerations  Policy DMH5 – Residential and Curtilage Extensions  **National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Relevant Planning History:**  No recent planning history relevant to the determination of the planning application. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Site Description and Surrounding Area:**  The proposal relates to a detached property in Mellor. The property is constructed from natural coursed stone with white render, red concrete tiles and white UPVC doors and windows. The property is situated amongst several other detached properties on Mellor Brow just inside a large area of Green Belt land. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Proposed Development for which consent is sought:**  Consent is sought for the construction of front and rear extensions to the primary dwelling. The proposed works also include the demolition of the existing garage at the front of the property and the replacement of the existing rear conservatory with a snug. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Principle of development:**  The proposal is a domestic extension to a dwelling and is acceptable in principle subject to an assessment of the material planning considerations.  The proposal site is situated just inside a designated greenbelt zone. The government places considerable emphasis on the protection of greenbelt land with the primary aim of keeping green belt areas open wherever possible.  Green belt areas are assigned optimum levels of protection from all types of development. The NPPF explicitly states that development proposals in green belt areas will not be given planning permission unless they fall within the definition of specific exceptions which are detailed in para 145 of the NPPF. These stipulations are also reflected in policy EN1 of the Ribble Borough Valley Core Strategy.  With specific regard to building alterations and extensions, paragraph 145, part C of the NPPF states that:  *‘A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt.* ***Exceptions to this are the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building.’***  Plans from the proposal indicate that the proposed rear extension will largely comprise the same footprint of the property’s existing conservatory. Moreover, the removal of the property’s existing garage will create a net increase of ground floor space within the property’s front curtilage. As such, it is not considered that the development will in any way constrain the existing openness of the surrounding green belt area. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Residential Amenity:**  The front elevation of the proposal includes a bedroom and kitchen window on the first floor which will face towards properties on the opposite side of Mellor Brow however these will be sited in an identical position to the existing bedroom and kitchen windows and as such will have no significant upon existing levels of privacy.  The Eastern side elevation of the proposal includes kitchen windows at the first floor level which will face towards the front garden and driveway of No.57 Mellor Brow however these will be positioned in a similar position to the existing kitchen windows and as such will not provide any new opportunities for overlooking.  The existing windows on the rear elevation of the proposal are to be replaced with full length windows, a set of French doors and windows within the proposed snug which will face into the rear garden of the property. The new windows and doors will be situated on the property’s first floor in an almost identical position to the existing windows and as such will have no significant impact upon the privacy of the neighbouring residents.  The proposal also includes a small balcony on the South-western corner of its rear elevation. The balcony will not provide any significant opportunities for overlooking in as much that the adjacent neighbouring rear garden of No.57 Mellor Brow is set back approximately 12 metres from the proposal site out of view from the balcony.  The proposal’s single storey rear extension will be situated approximately 7 metres from the adjacent neighbouring properties in an almost identical position to the property’s existing conservatory. The main structure of No.57 Mellor Brow and the existing conservatory at No.53 Mellor Brow both have considerably further outward projections than the proposed extension and as such will not suffer any significant loss of natural light or outlook as a result of the proposed works.  The proposed front extension will form part of the property’s front entrance and hall and will be sited in a similar position to the property’s existing front steps and porch. The front extension will be screened from No.53 Mellor Brow behind an existing bedroom and will be set considerably further forward than the front elevation of No.57 Mellor Brow therefore its impact upon natural light and outlook for the neighbouring residents will be minimal. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Visual Amenity:**  The proposal’s rear extension will have an eaves and roof height of 2.5 metres and 3 metres respectively and a relatively modest outwards projection of 3.1 metres making it wholly subservient to the dimensions of the main property. The rear extension will not be visible in the public realm by virtue of its siting and as such will have a minimal impact upon visual amenity.  The proposed works to the front of the property will have some visual impact in as much that they involve the demolition of the property’s existing garage and the replacement of the property’s existing steps and porch with a column style front extension and steps to the side.  However, the front extension will have a smaller outward projection than the existing steps while the repositioned steps will remain largely out of view to the side of the property therefore it is not considered that the proposed works to the front of the property will have any significant impact upon visual amenity. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Landscape/Ecology:**  A bat survey conducted at the proposal site on 19/1/21 found no evidence of any bat related activity however the property’s rear garden was found to offer high potential for nesting birds during the nesting season. As such, the applicant has been advised to avoid carrying out any of the proposed works between the months of February and September. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Highways:**  The proposal will not result in the loss of any existing off-street parking spaces on site therefore it is not considered that the proposed works will have any adverse effect upon highway safety. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Observations/Consideration of Matters Raised/Conclusion:**  The proposal does not raise any concerns in relation to residential amenity in as much that it is not considered that the proposed works will lead to any significant loss of privacy, natural light or outlook.  The rear extension of the proposal will largely mirror the footprint of the existing conservatory while the alterations to the front of the property will result in a simplified and uncluttered layout therefore it is not considered that the proposed works will have any significant visual impact.  It is for the above reasons and having regard to all material considerations and matters raised that the application is recommended for approval. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **RECOMMENDATION**: | | | | That planning permission be granted. | | | | | | | | | |