|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Signed:** | **Officer:** | BT | | | | **Date:** | 3/5/2022 | **Manager:** | |  | | **Date:** |  |
| **Site Notice displayed** | N/A | **Photos uploaded** | | | | Y |  | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Application Ref:** | | | 3/2022/0262 | | | | | |  | | | | |
| **Date Inspected:** | | | 1/4/2022 | | | | | |
| **Officer:** | | | BT | | | | | |
| **DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:** | | | | | | | | | **Decision** | | Approval | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Development Description:** | | | | | Proposed demolition of existing conservatory and erection of single storey 21m² rear/side extension. | | | | | | | | |
| **Site Address/Location:** | | | | | 42 St Peters Close, Clayton-Le-Dale. BB1 9HH | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | | **Parish/Town Council** | | | | | | | | |
| Clayton-le-Dale Parish Council consulted on 25/3/22 – no response. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | | **Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies** | | | | | | | | |
| United Utilities consulted on 25/3/22 – no response. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | | **Additional Representations.** | | | | | | | | |
| None. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **RELEVANT POLICIES AND SITE PLANNING HISTORY:** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ribble Valley Core Strategy:**  Key Statement DS1 – Development Strategy  Key Statement DS2 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development  Policy DMG1 – General Considerations  Policy DMG2 – Strategic Considerations  Policy DMH5 – Residential and Curtilage Extensions  **NPPF** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Relevant Planning History:**  None. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Site Description and Surrounding Area:**  The application relates to a semi-detached two storey property in Clayton-le-Dale. The property consists of pebble dashed render, slate roof tiles and UPVC doors and windows. The surrounding area is residential and comprises numerous semi-detached two storey properties. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Proposed Development for which consent is sought:**  Consent is sought for the construction of a rear single storey extension. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **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. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Residential Amenity:**  The rear and side windows of the proposed extension would solely provide views into the property’s rear curtilage and as such would not compromise the privacy of any neighbouring residents. The South-western side elevation of the extension would set inward from the common boundary shared with No. 43 St. Peters Close with its roof pitch sloping away from the neighbouring property. Furthermore, the extension would be compliant with the 45 degree test with regards to the adjacent rear windows on the adjoined neighbouring property. As such, it is not considered that the proposal would be harmful to the amenity of any neighbouring residents. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Visual Amenity:**  The extension would comprise a modest outwards projection with its footprint largely sited on the footprint of the property’s existing conservatory and eaves and roof pitch set well below the eaves and roof pitch of the main property. Accordingly, the extension would read as a subservient addition to the host property. The extension would be sited to the rear of the property away from the public realm where it would only be visible from a small number of surrounding properties therefore the visual impact of the proposal would be minimal. With the above in mind, it is not considered that the proposed development would be of detriment to the visual amenities of the area. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ecology:**  No ecological constraints were identified in relation to the proposal. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Highways:**  Lancashire County Council Highways have not been consulted on the proposal however given that the proposed works would not affect the property’s existing parking arrangement it is not considered that the proposal would have any undue impact upon highway safety. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Observations/Consideration of Matters Raised/Conclusion:**  It is not considered that the proposal would have any undue impact upon residential amenity for any neighbouring residents, nor is it considered that the proposal would be harmful to the visual amenities of the immediate or surrounding area.  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. | | | | | | | | | |