|  |
| --- |
| **Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.** |
| **Signed:** | **Officer:** | BT | **Date:** |  | **Manager:** |  | **Date:** |  |
|  |
| **Application Ref:** | 3/2023/0044 |  |
| **Date Inspected:** | 13/2/23 | **Site Notice:** | N/A |
| **Officer:** | BT |
| **DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:**  | **REFUSAL** |
|  |
| **Development Description:** | Variation of Condition 2 (Plans) of planning application 3/2020/0050. Proposed change in window/door configuration and new single storey entrance porch added. |
| **Site Address/Location:** | Plot 4, Cherry Drive, Brockhall Village. BB6 8HJ |
|  |
| **CONSULTATIONS:**  | **Parish/Town Council** |
| **Billington & Langho Parish Council:** | Consulted 23/1/23 – 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 StrategyKey Statement DS2 – Sustainable DevelopmentPolicy DMG1 – General ConsiderationsPolicy DMG2 – Strategic ConsiderationsPolicy DMH5 – Residential And Curtilage ExtensionsNational Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) |
| **Relevant Planning History:****3/2020/0050:**Resubmission of planning permission 3/2016/0926 granted 5/12/2016 now out of date. Revision to planning permission 3/2007/1071 to include one 5 Bed detached house. (Approved)**3/2016/0926:**Revision to planning permission 3/2007/1071 to include one five-bedroom detached house (Approved)**3/2007/1071:**7 no. detached dwellings each with associated work unit together with associated infrastructure (Resubmission). (Refused) |
|  |
| **ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:** |
| **Site Description and Surrounding Area:**The application relates to a vacant land plot situated adjacent to the North-eastern gable end of No. 10 Cherry Drive, Brockhall Village. Planning consent was first granted for a detached five bedroom property on the land parcel in 2016 and then subsequently in 2020. The application site is situated within a gated residential development comprised of both terraced and detached properties of varying house types with the wider area comprising a mixture of woodland, agricultural land and open countryside. |
| **Proposed Development for which consent is sought:**Planning consent was granted as part of application 3/2020/0050 for the construction of a detached five bedroom property.Consent is sought to make the following variations to the above approved development:* Addition of a flat roof single storey entrance porch extension to the front elevation of the approved dwelling
* Alterations to the fenestration of the approved dwelling

Accordingly, consent is sought to replace the approved plan numbers forming part of previous planning application 3/2020/0050 with revised plans submitted as part of this S73 application.  |
| **Impact Upon Residential Amenity:**The door and window openings proposed for the side elevations of the front extension would primarily provide views into the curtilage of the approved dwelling and towards the North-western end of Cherry Drive which is publicly viewable. In addition, the proposed alterations to the fenestration of the approved dwelling would largely feature window openings with identical or similar orientations to those originally approved. Notwithstanding the above, the amended plans show that the South-western gable end of the approved dwelling would incorporate a dressing room window at the second floor level which would face towards the adjacent neighbouring property of No. 10 Cherry Drive. It remains unclear as to whether this window would be obscure glazed however the window in question has the potential to compromise the privacy of the adjacent neighbouring dwelling therefore an appropriate condition would need to be imposed on any future planning consent with regards to obscured glazing.The front extension proposed would be modest in terms of height and sited to the North of the common boundary shared with No. 10 and as such would have no impact upon the adjacent neighbouring property.Taking account of the above, it is not considered that the proposed amendments sought would be harmful to the amenity of any neighbouring residents. |
| **Visual Amenity/External Appearance:**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’.*Furthermore, Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy states:*‘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 material…particular emphasis will be placed on visual appearance and the relationship to surroundings, including impact on landscape character, as well as the effects of development on existing amenities.’*The proposed alterations to the door and window configuration of the approved dwelling would for the most part amount to minimal deviations from the solid to void ratio approved originally. Large extents of glazing are proposed to the rear North-western elevation of the dwelling however large glazed openings are not an uncommon feature on properties within the surrounding street scene and fenestrations in general varying widely between properties within Brockhall Village. As such, the proposed alterations to the door and window configuration originally approved are considered to be acceptable.The proposed amendments sought also include the addition of a single storey entrance porch extension to the front elevation of the originally approved dwelling. As a general rule, extensions that project forward of the original building have a significant effect on the building itself and on the wider street scene. Front extensions often upset building lines and architectural rhythms, and appear unduly prominent in the street scene. In general terms, they are rarely acceptable. In this instance, the front extension proposed would project almost 7 metres out from the principal elevation of the approved dwelling. The application’s proposed site plan shows symmetrical alignment between the front elevations of the approved dwelling and adjacent neighbouring property of No. 10 Cherry Drive therefore the proposed extension would disrupt the building line shared between the application property and the adjacent neighbouring property, with the proposed extension also being fully viewable within the public realm from the North-western end of Cherry Drive. In addition, the flat roof design of the extension would be visually at odds with the gabled roof profile of the host property.Taking account of the above, it is considered that the proposed front extension would be an incongruous and unsympathetic addition to the dwelling that would be harmful to the visual amenities of the area and, by extension, in conflict with the aims and objectives set out in Paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy. |
| **Highways and Parking:**The proposed amendments sought would have no bearing on the property’s parking arrangement therefore it is not considered that the proposed works would have any undue impact upon highway safety. |
| **Landscape/Ecology:**No ecological constraints were identified in relation to the proposal. |
| **Observations/Consideration of Matters Raised/Conclusion:**The proposed front extension would read as an incongruous and unsympathetic addition to the development originally approved and would fail to assimilate within the surrounding built environment, resulting in undue harm to the visual amenities of the area.Moreover, Paragraph 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework states:*‘Development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design’.*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 the variation to condition 2 be refused for the following reason: |
| **01:** | The proposed front extension, by virtue of its outwards projection, flat roof design and visual prominence would be an incongruous and unsympathetic form of development that would be harmful to the visual amenities and inherent character of the area. As such, the proposal would be in direct conflict with Paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy. |