|  |
| --- |
| **Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.** |
| **Signed:** | **Officer:** | **WH** | **Date:** | **15/06/23** | **Manager:** | **LH** | **Date:** | **16/6/23** |
|  |
| **Application Ref:** | 2023/0258 |  |
| **Date Inspected:** | 05/05/23 | **Site Notice:** | N/A |
| **Officer:** | Will Hopcroft |
| **DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:**  | **APPROVAL** |
|  |
| **Development Description:** | Proposed front porch extension and two-storey side extension (resubmission of approved permission 3/2022/0562). |
| **Site Address/Location:** | 10 Fairsnape Avenue, Longridge |
|  |
| **CONSULTATIONS:**  | **Parish/Town Council** |
| No response.  |
|  |
| **CONSULTATIONS:**  | **Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies** |
| **LCC Highways:** | No objection.  |
|  |
| **CONSULTATIONS:**  | **Additional Representations.** |
| None received.  |
|  |
| **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)Longridge Neighbourhood Plan |
| **Relevant Planning History:****2022/0562:**Proposed front porch extension and 1.5 storey side extension – Approved**2014/0009:**Demolition of existing garage and erection of 2 bed house in vacant garden area (resubmission) – Withdrawn**2013/0781:**Demolition of existing garage and erection of 2 bed house in vacant garden area – Refused |
|  |
| **ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:** |
| **Site Description and Surrounding Area:**The application relates to an end terraced property in Longridge. The property consists of render, concrete roof tiles and UPVC doors and windows. The surrounding area is residential and comprises numerous terraced and semi-detached two storey dwellings. |
| **Proposed Development for which consent is sought:**The proposal seeks a front porch, with the exact same dimensions, style and treatments as already approved under 2022/0562. Where it differs is the two-storey proposed side extension, that will measure 5100mm to the eaves, 6845mm to the ridge and incorporate a reverse gable roof form off the existing roof. The ridge-line is set lower than the existing, and the side extension incorporates a set-back of approximately 1490mm off the front porch. Fenestration is proposed to the 1st storey of the west elevation, and the ground floor of the south and east elevation including a set of double doors. Materials are to match those of the existing property. In addition there are some minor external alterations, including provision of additional decking, extension of footpath and provision of a gate.  |
| **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 intrusive fenestration proposed, with the only upper-level window located on the front elevation. There is no projection along a common boundary and due to the distance from neighbouring dwellings, the extension will not appear dominant or overbearing. There may be some increase in overshadowing, but this will be limited to the dwelling at 4 Belmont Court and in any case will only really be prevalent for a short time in the summer evenings and does not constitute an unacceptable impact on amenity and quality of life. Given the above the proposal is considered compliant with DMG1 (Amenity) and LNDP3.  |
| **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, the front porch is considered acceptable given it is identical the one approved under reference 2022/0562, and is modest enough that it can be absorbed into the existing streetscene. The dwelling itself ‘book-ends’ the row of terraces at Fairsnape Avenue by reversing the ridgeline and incorporating a front-facing gable. The two-storey side extension incorporates a reverse-gable roof off the existing roofline, with a ridge set lower than the existing terrace (although it is noted the existing terraces incorporate a staggered ridge height). Nevertheless, the result gives the impression that the terrace is continued past the bookend, which is Officers consider is an acceptable impact on the streetscene and clearly subordinate to the existing dwelling, by way of the smaller ridgeline and also the incorporated set-back. This is also considered preferable to the saltbox roof approved under 2022/0562 which is not particularly common in residential areas and, generally speaking, is more associated with agricultural dwellings. The fenestration arrangement is slightly unusual in that there is only 1 new opening created on elevation, but this does not form an unacceptable impact on visual amenity and the streetscene particularly given existing fenestration arrangements which are scattered and inconsistent. In addition, the materials proposed match those of the existing dwelling and as such are deemed acceptable. The external alterations are minor in scope and evidently residential in nature, providing no undue impact on visual amenity. Given the above, the proposal is considered compliant with DMG1 (Design) and LNDP3.  |
| **Highways and Parking:**The proposal does not seek to alter existing access arrangements, nor does it seek to alter the level of existing parking. 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 approval. |
| **RECOMMENDATION**: |  |
| That planning consent be granted subject to the imposition of conditions. |