|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Signed:** | | **Officer:** | **WH** | | | | **Date:** | | **17/04/23** | | **Manager:** | | **LH** | **Date:** | **18/4/23** |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Application Ref:** | | | | | 2022/0996 | | | | | | |  | | | |
| **Date Inspected:** | | | | | 05/04/23 | | | **Site Notice:** | | N/A | |
| **Officer:** | | | | | Will Hopcroft | | | | | | |
| **DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:** | | | | | | | | | | | | **REFUSAL** | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Development Description:** | | | | | | Proposed two storey side and front extension to replace existing garage and proposed rear single storey extension. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Site Address/Location:** | | | | | | 1 Holly Grove, Longridge PR3 3HR | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | | | **Parish/Town Council** | | | | | | | | | |
| No response. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | | | **Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies** | | | | | | | | | |
| **LCC Highways:** | | | | | | No objection subject to confirmation that an additional parking space can be provided. | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | | | **Additional Representations.** | | | | | | | | | |
| None received. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **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 DMG2 – Strategic Considerations  Policy DMH5 – Residential and Curtilage Extensions  National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)  **Longridge Neighbourhood Plan:**  Policy LNDP3 – Longridge Design Principles | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Relevant Planning History:**  None. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Site Description and Surrounding Area:**  The site is comprised of a detached two-storey dwelling on the corner of Holly Grove and Poplar Grove. To the front, facing onto Holly Grove includes a small driveway and curtilage space, and to the side a larger area of front garden leading into the rear garden. The dwelling incorporates a small rear extension with a pitched roof, with the main roof being pitched/mono-pitch incorporating a small front porch/integrated garage projection.  The dwelling to the south is 3 Holly Grove, and to the east sits 1 Poplar Drive. The site sits in a broadly residential context in the Principal Settlement of Longridge. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Proposed Development for which consent is sought:**  The application seeks consent for the following:   * Two-storey side and front extension, incorporating 2no. reverse gable roof-forms and alteration to existing fenestration * In-filling of garage door to provide habitable space * Alteration to porch to incorporate pitched roof and additional fenestration * Single-storey rear extension incorporating a flat-roof and sun-lantern * Changes to fenestration to existing rear extension | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Principle of Development:**  The proposal relates to a domestic extension to an established residential dwelling and as such is acceptable in principle subject to further detailed assessment of the relevant material planning considerations. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Impact Upon Residential Amenity:**  As per Core Strategy Policy DMG1, development must:   1. Not adversely affect the amenities of the surrounding area. 2. Provide adequate day lighting and privacy distances. 3. Have regard to public safety and secured by design principles. 4. Consider air quality and mitigate adverse impacts where possible.   In this sense the proposal is considered to have a negligible impact on residential amenity. There is no additional projection along the common boundary with 3 Holly Grove and as such would not form a dominant or overbearing addition in that respect. Whilst there may be a minor loss of sunlight to 3 Poplar Drive by way of the two-storey extension, this is not likely to be significant or unacceptable and is only likely to occur in the evening hours of the summer months. As such this deemed acceptable.  In addition, there is no proposed intrusive fenestration and therefore no risk of a loss of privacy or overlooking, nor will the proposal result in an unacceptable loss of outlook. The proposal is considered acceptable with regard to DMG 1 (Amenity). | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Visual Amenity/External Appearance:**  As per CS Policy DMG1, all development must be sympathetic to existing and proposed land uses in terms of its size, intensity and nature as well as scale, massing, style, features and building materials.  In this sense it is important to note that, whilst the existing streetscene is varied in character and vernacular with no real common themes or features of note, the dwelling is situated on a prominent corner plot and as such incorporates two primary elevations.  As such, it is considered that the two-storey side and front extension would not be subordinate to the existing dwelling by way of its significant additional massing to both of these elevations, as well as substantial additional built roof-form. The resulting dwelling would dominate the streetscene with particular reverence given to the outlook from both Holly Grove and Poplar Drive.  In addition, the single-storey rear extension would be immediately visible from the public highway of Poplar Drive and incorporates an unsightly and incongruous flat roof inclusive of sun lantern. It is noted that there is little precedence for this roof-form facing onto a primary elevation in the immediate area and as such, taking into account the two-storey side and front extension it is considered that a proposal of this nature would result in an incongruous and unsympathetic addition that would be harmful to the character, setting and visual amenities of the existing residential dwellings and fail to respond positively to or enhance its immediate context. Given the above the proposal is not considered compliant with CS Policies DMG1 and DMH5, Policy LNDP3 of the Longridge Neighbourhood Plan and the design objectives found within the NPPF. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Highways and Parking:**  The proposal does not seek to alter existing access arrangements, nor does it seek to alter the level of existing parking. Following consultations with LCC Highways, if the proposal was to be recommended for approval it would be necessary to indicate on an amended plan the provision of 1no. additional space, as a result of the proposal providing an additional bedroom. It is considered that this could be achieved given the driveway space available at the front of the dwelling. As such no further assessment is required and the proposal is considered compliant with DMG1 (Access). | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Landscape/Ecology:**  A Bat Survey was submitted as part of the application, concluding that the proposed development does not require an EPS License to proceed lawfully. Upon review, Officers are considered to be in agreement with this report. As such no further assessment is required. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **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 its design, size and scale would result in bulky, unsympathetic and disproportionate additions that would be harmful to the character, setting and visual amenities of the existing residential dwellings and fails to respond positively to or enhance the immediate context. As such the proposal is considered to be in direct conflict with Policies DMG1 and DMH5 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy, Policy LNDP3 of the Longridge Neighbourhood Plan and Paragraph 130 of the NPPF. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |