|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Signed:** | | **Officer:** | **WH** | | | | **Date:** | | **08/03/23** | | **Manager:** | | **LH** | **Date:** | **21.3.23** |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Application Ref:** | | | | | 2023/0102 | | | | | | |  | | | |
| **Date Inspected:** | | | | | 23/02/23 | | | **Site Notice:** | | N/A | |
| **Officer:** | | | | | Will Hopcroft | | | | | | |
| **DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:** | | | | | | | | | | | | **REFUSAL** | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Development Description:** | | | | | | Proposed single storey rear extension | | | | | | | | | |
| **Site Address/Location:** | | | | | | 17 Blackburn Road, Ribchester | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | | | **Parish/Town Council** | | | | | | | | | |
| No response. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | | | **Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies** | | | | | | | | | |
| **LCC Highways:** | | | | | | Objection raised. The proposal will remove the rear parking area of 17 Blackburn Road and likely cause displacement of parking onto Blackburn Road. This is unacceptable; while on-street parking does occur along Blackburn Road, the area is used for the terraced housing opposite the dwelling, with some dwellings not having access to any off-street parking facilities.  The on-street parking area, as a result of some dwellings not having access to off-street parking facilities, is close to full capacity. Therefore, the LHA are concerned that should the LHA not object to the application, the occupants of the dwelling will park on-street causing neighbour's vehicles to be displaced elsewhere, which could cause inappropriate parking to occur. | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **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  Key Statement EN5 – Heritage Assets  Policy DME2 – Landscape and Townscape Protection  Policy DME4 – Protecting Heritage Asset  Policy DMG1 – General Considerations  Policy DMG2 – Strategic Considerations  Policy DMH5 – Residential and Curtilage Extensions  Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act  National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)  Ribchester Conservation Area Appraisal | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Relevant Planning History:**  **2002/0825:**  Conservatory and carport extension (Approved with Conditions) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Site Description and Surrounding Area:**  The site is comprised of an end-terrace, stone dwelling with a pitched roof. There is a small garden area and pedestrian access to the front. To the rear the dwelling opens out into an open rear alleyway that is used by the existing residents for a variety of purposes. The curtilage of the dwelling has no clear boundary but there is a variety of miscellaneous outdoor furniture and decorations you would associate with the use of a dwellinghouse.  The attached dwelling to the west is 16 Blackburn Road. The dwelling to the east is the Grade II Listed Stone House, the curtilage of which sits 3-4m adjacent to the rear of the application site. The actual house itself sits further away at approximately 20m to the east of the rear of the application site. The site also sits within the Ribchester Conservation Area, and roughly 70m north of a Scheduled Monument (Ribchester Roman Fort).  The dwelling sits in the Tier 2 Village settlement of Ribchester which has reasonable access to local services and amenities. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Proposed Development for which consent is sought:**  The proposal seeks to extend the dwelling to the rear by a single-storey, incorporating the existing rear outhouse. The proposed roof form is mixed – the majority is mono-pitched, in a similar manner to that of similar rear extensions along the terrace, although there is a small section of the roof that is pitched in an alternate direction, to align with the existing rear extension. 2no. roof lights are proposed, as well as an external access door and 2no. windows. The materials proposed are render; to avoid a non-exact brick match, and white uPVC to the window frames to match those on the rear elevation. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **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 Listed Building and Setting:**  The application site does sit in close proximity to the curtilage and structure of the GII Listed Stone House and as such is required to comply with CS Policies EN5, DME4 and NPPF Paragraph 202.  EN5 states that there will be a presumption in favour of conservation and enhancement of the significance of heritage assets, and DME4 states that proposals on sites within the setting of a building which cause harm to their significance will not be supported.  NPPF Paragraph 202 states that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including securing its optimum viable use.  In this sense, the harm to the significance of the Stone House has been considered. Officers are of the opinion that, given the distance from the structure of the Stone House, the sufficient level of screening and visual barriers to the Stone House from the application site (including a ~1.8m wall and significant hedge and tree growth), there is no harm to the significance of the Stone House. As such the proposal is considered compliant with EN5, DME4 and NPPF Paragraph 202 solely in relation to harm to the Listed Building. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Impact upon Character/appearance of Conservation Area:**  CS Policies EN5 and DME4 and NPPF Paragraph 202 are also relevant in relation to the Ribchester Conservation Area, in which the dwelling sits. It is unclear exactly when the terraced row in question was built but it is likely to have been late 19th century, given the large bay windows and small front gardens that were typical of the time – albeit the stonework to the front elevation differs from the terraced row directly across.  Alterations to the rear elevation of this terraced row are, by their nature, going to have a more subtle impact on the significance of the Conservation Area given they are not visible from the public highway and have little impact on the streetscene. In this case, greater consideration is given to the wider public use of the rear alleyway by adjacent residents of the terraced row. It is evident that this area has been ‘adopted’ in an informal sense by residents by the range of external domestic furniture, vehicles and miscellanea present.  Whilst the rear elevations of the terrace are varied in nature, incorporating a wide variety of extensions and elevational treatments, they tend to be consistent with roof-types. The majority of rear extensions incorporate a single storey mono-pitch, projecting off the existing two-storey outrigger, and this simple style is considered to have some significance in relation to the Conservation Area, particularly given the high level of use the rear alleyway that is likely by way of its ‘adoption’ as noted above. The proposed roof design would be more convoluted in its attempt to tie in different roof forms and the use of render as an elevation treatment is not in keeping. As the proposal would be clearly visible in the rear streetscene, the impact on the rear streetscene and subsequently the significance of the Conservation Area is considered to be harmful. Whilst this harm is less than substantial, there are no discernible public benefits to the proposal (and as noted below, quite a significant detriment in terms of the loss of an off-street parking space) and as such the proposal is considered to fail the test as outlined in NPPF Paragraph 202 and is not compliant with CS policies EN5 and DME4 in relation to the Ribchester Conservation Area. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **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 no impact upon residential amenity. There is no projection along the common boundary as a result of existing development at the adjoining property, and no intrusive fenestration proposed. The proposal is single-storey and as such will not result in the extension being dominant or overbearing. Given the above the proposal is deemed compliant with CS Policy DMG1 (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.  DME2 also states that development proposed will be refused which significantly harm important townscape elements, such as the scale, form and materials that contribute to the characteristic townscapes of the area.  In this sense, the design of the proposal is not considered acceptable particularly in regard to the existing building and the proposed roof form as noted above. The design is out-of-keeping and unsympathetic with regards to the fairly consistent existing rear elevations of the terrace in question by way of the proposed convoluted roof form. The material used on the elevation (that being render) has been considered and is also not appropriate – the existing dwelling already incorporates a range of elevational treatments to the rear elevation, including stonework to an existing extension and what is believed to be original brickwork to the existing storeroom. The introduction of a third substantially different elevational treatment – that being render – would further exacerbate the already jumbled nature of the materiality to the rear elevation and as such is not considered acceptable in design terms. The proposal is therefore not compliant with CS Policy DMG1 (Design) or DME2. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Highways and Parking:**  As per CS Policy DMG1, development must:   1. Consider the potential traffic and car parking implications. 2. Ensure safe access can be provided which is suitable to accommodate the scale and type of traffic likely to be generated. 3. Consider the protection and enhancement of public rights of way and access.   Following consultation with LCC Highways, the proposal is considered to be non-compliant with the above policy. Off-street parking facilities for the terrace in question are located to the rear of the properties for 10-17 Blackburn Road (with the exception of no. 10 who utilises an adjacent garage, as built under permission reference 3/2016/0208). The proposal would remove the rear parking facilities for no. 17 and likely cause a displacement of parking onto Blackburn Road. This is unacceptable as, whilst on-street parking does occur along Blackburn Road, this is predominately used by the terrace opposite (28-37 Blackburn Road) which the LHA consider to be close to full capacity.  The LHA go on to say the following:  *‘The need to ensure that inappropriate parking does not occur in the area is key because the existing vehicles who park on- street, prevent two-way vehicle movements to occur along this stretch of Blackburn Road, due to the narrowness of the adopted highway. Vehicles, when two-way movements are occurring, sometimes have to find gaps between the on-street parked vehicles to allow the other flow of traffic to pass without conflict. Allowing further vehicles to park on the street, as a result of this application, could prevent gaps between parked vehicles, meaning that vehicles will have to reverse to find an area to wait should two- way movements be occurring simultaneously. This will cause likely vehicle to vehicle and vehicle to pedestrian conflicts to occur…’*  Given the above it is considered that the application is not compliant with DMG1 (Access) as there would be significant car parking implications and potential vehicle-vehicle and vehicle-pedestrian conflict. It is also considered that the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe and as such the proposal should be refused. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Flooding:**  A flood risk assessment has been submitted with the application. The site lies in Flood Zone 1 and as such has a low probability of flooding. Given the above no measures are considered necessary and 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 for the following reasons. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **RECOMMENDATION**: | | | |  | | | | | | | | | | | |
| That planning consent be refused for the following reason(s). | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **01:** | The proposal, by virtue of its design and materials, would result in unsympathetic and inappropriate 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 (Design), DME2 and DMH5 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and Paragraph 130 of the NPPF. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **02:** | The proposal, by virtue of its design and materials, would result in less than significant harm to the Ribchester Conservation Area. It is considered that this harm outweighs any public benefits of the proposal. As such the proposal is considered to be in direct conflict with Policies EN5 and DME4 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and Paragraph 202 of the NPPF. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **03:** | The proposal would result in the loss of on-site parking and so would be likely to displace parking on-street within the vicinity of the site. This would be to the detriment of highway safety and the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe. This is contrary to CS Policy DMG1 (Access) Ribble Valley Core Strategy and Paragraph 111 of the NPPF. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |