|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Signed:** | **Officer:** | **LE** | | | | **Date:** | **16.04.21** | **Manager:** | |  | | **Date:** |  |
| **Site Notice displayed** | **Y** | **Photos uploaded** | | | | **Y** |  | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Application Ref:** | | | 3/2021/0210 | | | | | |  | | | | |
| **Date Inspected:** | | | 14/04/21 | | | | | |
| **Officer:** | | | **LE** | | | | | |
| **DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:** | | | | | | | | | **Decision** | | **APPROVE** | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Development Description:** | | | | | Retention of unauthorised two storey side extension, work included demolition of garage which was replaced with a garden outbuilding. Third bedroom also created in the loft space. | | | | | | | | |
| **Site Address/Location:** | | | | | 1 Demesne Cottage Settle Road Newsholme Clitheroe BB7 4JF | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | | **Parish/Town Council** | | | | | | | | |
| No objections | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | | **Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies** | | | | | | | | |
| **LCC Highways:** | | | | | **N/A** | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | | **Additional Representations.** | | | | | | | | |
| Representations have been received from one address.  The planning issues raised are:  Visual impact not in keeping with the surrounding area  Nuisance from excessive light  Loss of privacy  Overshadowing  Other comments relating to non planning issues are:  Length of time for post to be delivered.  Boundary disputes | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **RELEVANT POLICIES AND SITE PLANNING HISTORY:** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ribble Valley Core Strategy:**  Policy DS1: Development Strategy  Policy DS2: Sustainable Development  Policy DMG1: General Considerations  Policy DMG2: Strategic Considerations  Policy DMH5: Residential and Curtilage Extensions | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Relevant Planning History:**  None | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Site Description and Surrounding Area:**  The property is a semidetached dwelling located in a small group of properties facing the A682 in a liner form. The dwelling is finished in cream colour render with a tiled roof. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Proposed Development for which consent is sought:**  The application seeks consent for retention of an unauthorised two storey side extension and front dormers, as wells as a new outbuilding to the rear. The dormers and side extension are substantially complete. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Principle of Development:**  The application is for domestic extensions and outbuildings ancillary to the dwelling and as such is considered acceptable in principle subject to an assessment of the material planning considerations. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Residential Amenity:**  The two-storey side extension is subservient to the main house and measures 2.5 metres in width. It does bring built form nearer to the neighbouring dwelling however there is still a gap to the boundary and the side of the extension will be approx. 13 metres to the side of the adjacent neighbour. This is considered more than an adequate facing distance. The extension does contain a side facing upper floor window. Hover the property previously had upper floor side windows there is screening from trees on the boundary and the window arrangement is as such on the adjacent property that there will be no direct overlooking.  The front and rear dormers will face two the front and rear in the same manner as existing windows on these elevations. Dormers are a common feature and it is not considered that they will result in a loss of privacy. Furthermore the rear dormer is permitted development and does not require planning permission as discussed below.  The garden room is located closer to the common boundary with the neighbouring adjacent dwelling. It is to be located behind an existing wall and belt of trees. The rear elevation abutting the boundary measures 2.2 metres in height with a monopitch roof sloping upwards away from this. The rear is only slightly higher than an average garden fence and contains no windows, therefore it is not considered that it will have an overbearing impact on any neighbouring properties. It will face on to the property’s own garden and is a sufficient distance away from the adjoining neighbour, single storey and screening by boundary treatments, so will have no impact on them.  With regards to the comments in respect of the application being in part retrospective. This is not an offence under planning legislation. The application is considered against the relevant planning policies in the same way as if it had not yet been built. With regards to the comments regarding publicity, neighbour notification letters were sent on the day the application was registered by the council. The disputes over the position of the boundary are a private issue to be resolved by the interested landowners and would not preclude the granting of planning consent not override any private rights. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Visual Amenity:**  There are several elements to the application.  The two-storey side extension is substantially complete. It is constructed using natural materials and both the front and rear elevations and roof are set in from and below the line of the original dwelling. It will bring built form closer to the side boundary but there is a gap maintained. As such it is considered that the proposal is subservient to the parent property and is not an over dominant feature in the street scene or wider landscape. Nor does it unduly unbalance the symmetry of the pair of semi-detached dwellings. The use of stone is in contrast with the rendered walls of the main house but it is not considered that this is harmful; it ensures that the addition is clearly read as a later extension and helps to break up the built form adding visual interest.  The front dormers are within a previously unbroken roofline. Those to the front are narrow with pitched roofs located centrally above the eaves and below the pitch with a vertical emphasis. These are considered to be sympathetic and do not dominate the roof of the original house.  The rear box style dormer has a volume of approximately 23m3 Given that the dwelling is not within an AONB or conservation area and is constructed using materials that are similar to the original dwelling. This would constitute permitted development and does not require planning permission. As such this element in isolation is outside the control of the local planning authority. It is not considered that new windows in a domestic property would result in excessive light pollution.  The proposed garden room will replace an existing garage / store which appears to have been added to over the years and needs repair. The new outbuilding will be a modern timber structure with a mono pitch roof. It will be located closer to the side boundary with the lowest part facing this. At a height of 2.2 metres at the lowest point is will only be partially visible above the line of the boundary treatment with the roof sloping upwards away from this. As such it is not considered that it will be a dominant feature in the landscape and whilst may be visible from the neighbouring properties it is not considered that this impact would be unacceptable as it is a garden building in a private garden. It should also be noted that more extensive structures could potentially be built without the requirement for planning permission.  The proposal will change the appearance of the property but it is considered to be in keeping and will not have a detrimental visual impact on the dwelling or surrounding area. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Highways:**  The property will retain adequate off-street parking and there are no envisaged highway safety implications. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Observations/Consideration of Matters Raised/Conclusion:**  The concerns raised by neighbours are noted and the planning issues discussed above. However, the proposal is considered to be an acceptable form of development in terms of the relevant development plan policies and therefore it is recommended accordingly. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **RECOMMENDATION**: | | | | That planning consent is granted. | | | | | | | | | |