|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Signed:** | | **Officer:** | BT | | | | **Date:** | 18/11/22 | **Manager:** | | **KH** | | **Date:** | **18/11/22** |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Application Ref:** | | | | 3/2022/0917 | | | | | |  | | | | |
| **Date Inspected:** | | | | 11/10/2021 & 10/11/21 | | | | | |
| **Officer:** | | | | BT | | | | | |
| **DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:** | | | | | | | | | | **Decision** | | **REFUSAL** | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Development Description:** | | | | | | Proposed orangery to the rear of the property. | | | | | | | | |
| **Site Address/Location:** | | | | | | 2 Northacre Drive, Barrow. BB7 9XT | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | | | **Parish/Town Council** | | | | | | | | |
| Barrow Parish Council consulted on 11/10/22 – no response. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | | | **Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies** | | | | | | | | |
| None. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **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:**  **3/2021/0874:**  Proposed two storey rear extension (Refused)  **3/2015/0101:**  Substitution of 16 house-types approved under planning permissions 3/2013/0771 and 3/2014/0944 together with the addition of 3 new dwellings (Approved)  **3/2013/0771:**  Proposed residential development of 102 dwellings (Approved) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Site Description and Surrounding Area:**  The application relates to a detached property in Barrow. The property consists of brick, concrete roof tiles and white UPVC doors and windows. The surrounding area is residential comprising numerous detached dwellings within with a recently constructed housing development. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Proposed Development for which consent is sought:**  Consent is sought for the construction of a single storey rear extension. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Residential Amenity:**  The North-western side elevation of the extension would be set well in from the common boundary shared with No. 4 Northacre Drive with the rear and side elevation windows of the extension solely providing views into the property’s rear garden. Accordingly, it is not anticipated that the proposal would be harmful to the amenity of any neighbouring residents. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Visual Amenity:**  No. 2 Northacre Drive occupies a corner plot within the surrounding pattern of development with its South-eastern gable end and rear North-eastern elevation both being clearly visible within the public realm from the South-eastern section of Middle Lodge Road.  The property’s existing rear elevation comprises a simple linear design with a modestly sized kitchen outrigger which mirrors the main roof profile of the property in terms of gradient and materials. The works proposed would involve a sidewards infill extension to the property’s existing lean-to outrigger which in turn would be adjoined by a single storey flat roof extension topped with a hipped roof lantern. The extension would comprise an outwards projection of 5 metres from the rear elevation of the property on its South-eastern side elevation with the width of the extension spanning approximately two thirds the width of the host property.  As such, the proposed extension would read as a bulky and disjointed addition to the property by virtue of its projecting South-eastern side profile, flat roof design and roof lantern, all of which would be visually at odds with the unadorned linear elevations and lean-to roof profile of the host dwelling. Furthermore, the proposed extension would be clearly viewable within the public realm therefore the visual impact of the proposal would be significant.  Paragraph 130 of the NPPF states:  *‘Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting’.*  In addition, 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’.*  Taking account of the above, it is considered that the proposal would be a largely unsympathetic addition to the host property by virtue of its outwards projection, width and roof profile, being contrary to the aims and objectives of Policy DMG1 and DMH5 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and Paragraph 130 of the NPPF. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ecology:**  No ecological constraints were identified in relation to the proposal. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Highways:**  LCC Highways have not been consulted on the proposal however given that the proposed works would not affect the existing parking arrangement at the property it is not considered that the proposed development would have any undue impact upon highway safety. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Observations/Consideration of Matters Raised/Conclusion:**  The proposed development does not raise any concerns with regards to the amenity of any surrounding residents however in this instance it is considered that the proposed extension would be an unsympathetic and incongruous addition that would be harmful to both the character of the host property and visual amenities of the surrounding area.  Furthermore, Paragraph 134 of the NPPF states that:  *‘Development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design’.*  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 proposed extension would be a conspicuous, disjointed and bulky addition to the property that would be largely at odds with the simple linear form of the host dwelling and other properties within the locality. The proposal by virtue of its outwards projection, width and roof profile would result in an unsympathetic form of development that would be contrary to the aims and objectives of Policies DMG1 and DMH5 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and Paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |