|  |
| --- |
| **Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.** |
| **Signed:** | **Officer:** | BT | **Date:** | 6/4/2022 | **Manager:** |  | **Date:** |  |
| **Site Notice displayed** | N/A | **Photos uploaded** | Y |  |
|  |
| **Application Ref:** | 3/2022/0104 |  |
| **Date Inspected:** | 10/6/2021 |
| **Officer:** | BT |
| **DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:**  | **Decision** | Refusal |
|  |
| **Development Description:** | Proposed extension to rear and alterations to roof height to include dormers. Balcony to side elevation. Resubmission of 3/2021/0496. |
| **Site Address/Location:** | 21 Knowsley Road, Wilpshire. BB1 9PX |
|  |
| **CONSULTATIONS:**  | **Parish/Town Council** |
| Wilpshire Parish Council consulted on 7/3/22 – no response. |
|  |
| **CONSULTATIONS:**  | **Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies** |
| None. |
| **CONSULTATIONS:**  | **Additional Representations.** |
| One objection has been received in respect to the application. This objection is summarised as:* Impact of the proposal upon visual amenity
 |
|  |
| **RELEVANT POLICIES AND SITE PLANNING HISTORY:** |
| **Ribble Valley Core Strategy:**Key Statement DS1 – Development StrategyKey Statement DS2 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable DevelopmentKey Statement EN1 – Green BeltPolicy DMG1 – General ConsiderationsPolicy DMG2 – Strategic ConsiderationsPolicy DMG3 – Transport and MobilityPolicy DMH5 – Residential and Curtilage Extensions**NPPF** |
| **Relevant Planning History:****3/2021/0496:**Proposed rear extension and alteration to roof to include dormers (Refused) |
|  |
| **ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:** |
| **Site Description and Surrounding Area:**The application relates to a detached property in Wilpshire. The property is constructed from red brick, slate roof tiles and white UPVC doors and windows. The surrounding area is residential with a large area of Green Belt directly to the West.  |
| **Proposed Development for which consent is sought:**Consent is sought for the construction of a rear extension, rear dormer windows and a proposed roof raise to the property’s existing roof. The application is a resubmission of previously refused planning application 3/2021/0496 which was refused planning consent on the grounds of adverse impacts upon visual amenity. Numerous elements from the previously refused application have been omitted from the current proposal which include the previously proposed side dormer windows and large gable feature comprising extensive glazing and cladding proposed for the property’s South-western elevation.The current design incorporates several new design elements which include the addition of a large gable feature comprising extensive glazing and cladding to the property’s front elevation, two large rear first floor dormer windows and a projecting balcony to the property’s South-western side elevation. The proposed roof lift would result in a 1.2 metre increase in height to the roof pitch of the existing property compared with the previous application whereby a 1.6 metre increase in height was proposed. |
| **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 partially situated in the designated Green Belt. National planning legislation 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 states that development proposals in Green Belt areas should be regarded as unacceptable unless they fall within the definition of specific exceptions which are detailed in para 145 of the NPPF. 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.’* Moreover, Key Statement EN1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy states that *‘the overall extent of the Green Belt will be maintained to safeguard the surrounding countryside from inappropriate encroachment.’* There are no specific definitions within the NPPF framework or RVBC Core strategy in relation to what constitutes ‘disproportionate’ and ‘inappropriate encroachment’ however the generally accepted approach is for an assessment on the increased footprint and volume that the development would create. Analysis shows that the proposed alterations to the property’s roof would amount to a noticeable increase in cubic volume however it is worth noting that the footprint of the existing property would remain unaltered through the proposed works. Accordingly, it is not considered that the proposed increase in cubic volume would be harmful to the surrounding Green Belt area or conflict with the aims of Key Statement EN1 or paragraph 145 of the NPPF. |
| **Residential Amenity:**The proposal would incorporate several new windows including ground and first floor windows to the property’s North-eastern side elevation, ground and first floor windows and a projecting balcony to the property’s South-western elevation and two rear first floor dormer windows. The proposed rear first floor dormer windows would face towards No. 21a Knowsley Road which contains windows on its South-eastern elevation however given that this property is located approximately 20 metres away it is not considered that the proposed dormer windows would compromise the privacy of the neighbouring property opposite.The proposed first floor window on the property’s North-eastern side elevation would face towards the first floor windows of residential properties on Pettyfoot Bridge however given that these properties are located approximately 20 metres away it is not anticipated that the proposed window would compromise the privacy of the opposite neighbouring residents. Furthermore, the window would be partially screened behind existing vegetation within the property’s garden which in turn would reduce new opportunities for overlooking.The proposed first floor window and balcony on the property’s South-western side elevation would primarily provide views into the open fields which form part of the adjoining Green Belt. The gable end of No. 17 Knowsley Road would be viewable from the proposed first floor windows and balcony however this elevation is already viewable from the property’s side curtilage and ground floor windows therefore the proposed first floor window and balcony would not offer any new opportunities for overlooking. The proposed roof lift to the existing property would more than likely lead to some additional overshadowing within the property’s rear curtilage however desktop analysis shows that the additional overshadowing would not project into the curtilage of No. 21a Knowsley Road or any other surrounding properties therefore it is not anticipated that the proposed works would have any adverse impact upon natural light or outlook for any neighbouring residents. |
| **Visual Amenity:**The proposal involves a number of significant additions and alterations to the existing property in a similar vein to the previously refused application which include the addition of two large dormer windows to the rear elevation of the property and a half-hip roof conversion which would increase the height of the property’s existing roof pitch by 1.2 metres (3.9 feet). The proposed works also include the addition of a large gable feature comprising extensive glazing and cladding to the property’s front elevation.As was noted in the previously refused application, the application property is clearly viewable from Knowsley Road and most of the other properties which surround it therefore it was stressed that the addition of bulk and massing in the form of large dormers and any significant increase in cubic volume to the roof would carry a significant visual impact. It was also noted that extensive glazing, cladding and large dormer windows would be anomalous additions to the existing street scene by virtue of there being no similar features on the properties which comprise the surrounding area.Several of the design features from the previously refused application have been removed from the current proposal however in this instance these have been replaced with similar features in the form of two large rear dormer windows and a large front gable feature consisting of extensive glazing and cladding. It is noted that the increase in height to the property’s roof has been reduced in the current proposal however this alteration amounts to only a small reduction in height on the original proposal and as such is not considered to sufficiently address the concerns raised in the previously refused application. Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy states that all development must ‘*be sympathetic to existing and proposed land uses in terms of its size, intensity and nature as well as scale, massing and style’* and *‘not adversely affect the amenities of the surrounding area’* however given the scale, massing, design and public visibility of the proposal it is considered that the proposed works would be an over dominant and anomalous addition to the existing property and surrounding pattern of development that would ultimately be harmful to the visual amenities of the area and contrary to the aims of the above policy. |
| **Ecology:** A bat survey conducted at the proposal site on 18/5/21 found no evidence of any bat related activity however the main property, nesting boxes and garden vegetation were all identified as offering high potential for accommodating nesting birds. Accordingly, additional planning conditions would need to be implemented in the event of any future planning consents being granted to ensure the protection of nesting birds in the event of any works being carried out within the breeding bird season (March-August inclusive). |
| **Highways:** Lancashire County Council Highways have not been consulted on the proposal however the loss of two off-street parking spaces through the proposed internal alterations to the property’s integral garages would not affect the property’s existing parking arrangement in as much that the property’s rear curtilage would still provide sufficient off-street parking for several vehicles. As such, it is not considered that the proposed works would lead to any adverse impact upon highway safety.  |
| **Observations/Consideration of Matters Raised/Conclusion:**The proposal does not raise any concerns with regards to residential amenity in as much that the proposed works would not lead to any loss of privacy, natural light or outlook for any neighbouring residents.The current proposal features some design changes in comparison to the previously refused application however in this instance it is not considered that these changes are sufficient enough to address the previous reasons for refusal in as much that the proposed works would still be harmful to the existing street scene and visual amenities of the area.It is for the above reasons and having regard to all material considerations and matters raised that planning consent be refused. |
| **RECOMMENDATION**: | That planning permission be refused for the following reason: |
| **01** | The proposal is considered to be in conflict with policies DMG1 and DMH5 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy in as much that the proposed works would be a disproportionate, over dominant, and unsympathetic addition to the original property and existing pattern of housing by virtue of their scale, massing and design, all of which would be harmful to the visual amenities of the area. |