|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Signed:** | | **Officer:** | SK | | | | **Date:** | 17.10.22 | **Manager:** | | **NH** | **Date:** | **17/10/22** |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Application Ref:** | | | | | 2022/0837 | | | | |  | | | |
| **Date Inspected:** | | | | | 20/09/22 | | | | |
| **Officer:** | | | | | SK | | | | |
| **DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:** | | | | | | | | | | **REFUSAL** | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Development Description:** | | | | | | Proposed two storey rear and side extension and replacement of the front elevation porch. | | | | | | | |
| **Site Address/Location:** | | | | | | Inglemead Waddington Road Clitheroe BB7 2HN | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | | | **Parish/Town Council** | | | | | | | |
| No representations received in respect of the application. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | | | **Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies** | | | | | | | |
| **LCC Highways:** | | | | | |  | | | | | | | |
| No objections raised in respect of the proposal. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | | | **Additional Representations.** | | | | | | | |
| Six letters of representation (including one from Clitheroe Civic Society) have been received objecting to the proposal on the following grounds:   * Materials not in keeping with the character of the area * Proposed extension is out of keeping * Scale of the extension * Loss of privacy * Devaluation of property | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **RELEVANT POLICIES AND SITE PLANNING HISTORY:** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ribble Valley Core Strategy:**  Key Statement DS1 – Development Strategy  Key Statement DS2 – Sustainable Development  Policy DMG1 – General Considerations  Policy DMH5 – Residential and Curtilage Extensions  National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Relevant Planning History:**  **2020/1015:**  Demolition of an existing single garage and construction of a proposed single storey two-bedroom detached dwelling at the bottom of the rear garden of 'Inglemead'. This is proposed to be accessed off the side residential road Hawthorne Place. (Refused) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Site Description and Surrounding Area:**  The application relates to an existing semi-detached two-storey dwelling fronting both Waddington Road and Hawthorne Place, Clitheroe. The primary elevation of the dwelling fronts the former with the southern (side) elevation fronting the latter.  The proposal site is located within the defined settlement limits of Clitheroe being located outside of any special designations. The area is predominantly residential in character being largely typified by dwellings in a terraced configuration, the majority of with are primarily if not solely faced in natural stone. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Proposed Development for which consent is sought:**  The submitted details seek consent for the erection of a two-storey rear and partial side extension with single storey element (to rear) and the replacement and reconfiguration of the front porch of the dwelling on the primary (south-west) facing elevation.  The proposed rear/side extension will be predominantly two-storey in height, being of a simple contemporary gabled appearance. It is proposed that the ground floor element of the extension will be faced in natural stone to match that on the existing dwelling with the upper (first) floor being facing in standing seam sheet metal (bronze in colour) which adopts a ‘wrap over’ configuration also being utilised as the primary material for the roof of the two-storey element of the extension.  It is further proposed that the existing mono-pitch porch addition on the primary elevation of the dwelling will be removed and replaced by that of a flat-roofed porch addition with wraparound ‘transom-light glazing’. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Impact Upon Residential Amenity:**  Given the proposal is located in a predominantly residential area surrounded by a number of existing residential dwellings, consideration must be given in respect for the potential of the proposal to have a detrimental impact or undermine existing residential amenities.  In this respect it is noted that the proposed extension incorporates a first-floor bedroom window on the side (south-east) elevation that will have a visual interface with number 2 Hawthorne Place. However, given the placement of the window, it is likely that the primary outlook from this window will be directed towards the south-east towards an existing ‘alley’. In this respect it is not considered that the proposal will result in any significant detriment to residential amenities by virtue of a direct loss of privacy resultant from this outlook.  A further window is proposed at first-floor on the rear (north-east) facing elevation of the extension. However, taking account of the orientation of this window and relative interface distances from nearby essential, receptors, it is not considered that outlook from this element of the proposal will be of significant measurable harm to existing nearby residential amenities. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Visual Amenity/External Appearance:**  The submitted details propose that the extension will be of a simple contemporary appearance with the upper floor being facing in standing seam sheet metal (bronze in colour) which adopts a ‘wrap over’ configuration also being utilised as the primary material for the roof of the two-storey element of the extension. The submitted details further propose that the extension will benefit from a ‘wraparound’ element that projects further to the south-east than the existing south-eastern elevation fronting Hawthorn Place. The character of the area is largely typified by terraced dwellings of a semi-traditional form and proportioning.  In this respect, when taking account of the proposed materiality of the extension, the level of visual prominence that will be afforded to the structure from the public realm and taking account of the further projection sideward of the extension from the side elevation fronting Hawthorne Place. It is considered that the proposed two storey side and rear extension, in concert with the high-level of visual prominence afforded to the proposal from the public realm would result in the introduction of an unsympathetic, overbearing, incongruous, anomalous, and discordant from of development that would be of significant harm to the character and visual amenities of the area and immediate streetscene  As such the proposal is considered to be in direct conflict with Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Landscape/Ecology:**  The application has been accompanied by the submission of a preliminary Bat Roost Assessment, the report concludes that there was no evidence to suggest the building has been utilised for roosting by bats and further concludes that the buildings are of negligible potential to accommodate roosting bats.  As such no mitigation is required to offset the potential impacts upon protected species as a result of the proposal. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Observations/Consideration of Matters Raised/Conclusion:**  As such, for the above reasons and having regard to all material considerations and matters raised that the application is recommended for refusal. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **RECOMMENDATION**: | | | | That planning consent be refused for the following reason(s). | | | | | | | | | |
| **01:** | The proposal, by virtue of the design and external appearance of the proposed two storey side and rear extension, in concert with the high-level of visual prominence afforded to the proposal from the public realm would result in the introduction of an unsympathetic, overbearing, incongruous, anomalous, and discordant from of development that would be of significant harm to the character and visual amenities of the area and immediate streetscene.  As such the proposal is considered to be in direct conflict with Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy. | | | | | | | | | | | | |