|  |
| --- |
| **Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.** |
| **Signed:** | **Officer:** | **LW** | **Date:** | **15/04/24** | **Manager:** | **KH** | **Date:** | **16/04/24** |
|  |
| **Application Ref:** | 3/2024/0067 |  |
| **Date Inspected:** | 07/03/24 | **Site Notice:** | N/A |
| **Officer:** | LW |
| **DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:**  | **APPROVAL** |
|  |
| **Development Description:** | Proposed demolition of rear conservatory and construction of single-storey garden room to rear, demolition of front porch and construction of new porch, conversion of garage to habitable room and first floor extension above, creation of new vehicular access to front and addition of permeable paving to front garden to create parking area.  |
| **Site Address/Location:** | 56 St Marys Gardens, Mellor, BB2 7JP.  |
|  |
| **CONSULTATIONS:**  | **Parish/Town Council** |
| No comments received in respect to the proposed development.  |
|  |
| **CONSULTATIONS:**  | **Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies** |
| **LCC Highways:** | No objection subject to conditions.  |
|  |
| **CONSULTATIONS:**  | **Additional Representations.** |
| One letter of representation has been received raising concerns in relation to the loss of privacy and overlooking as a result of the proposed window configuration.  |
|  |
| **RELEVANT POLICIES AND SITE PLANNING HISTORY:** |
| **Ribble Valley Core Strategy:**Key Statement DS1: Development StrategyKey Statement DS2: Sustainable DevelopmentKey Statement DMI2: Transport ConsiderationsPolicy DMG1: General ConsiderationsPolicy DMG2: Strategic ConsiderationsPolicy DMG3: Transport & MobilityNational Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) |
| **Relevant Planning History:**No relevant planning history.  |
|  |
| **ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:** |
| **Site Description and Surrounding Area:**The application relates to a two-storey end-terrace dwelling at no.56 St Marys Gardens. The property comprises of red brickwork, concrete roof tiles and white uPVC windows and doors and benefits from an existing single storey integral garage, rear conservatory, and front porch. The site to which the application relates is located within the defined settlement area of Mellor and the surrounding area is predominantly residential in nature. The property benefits from no other designations or constraints.  |
| **Proposed Development for which consent is sought:**Consent is sought for the conversion of the existing garage to a habitable room and the construction of a first-floor side extension above, along with a single storey rear extension and front porch following the demolition of the existing conservatory and porch. The proposed first floor side extension would project 2.74m beyond the southern gable elevation of the main dwellinghouse and would extend a depth of approximately 5.7m. A gable ended roof form would be incorporated measuring 5m to the eaves and 7.7m to the ridge and 1no. window would be featured to both the front and rear elevation of the proposal. The existing ground floor window to the southern side elevation of the garage would also be blocked up, whilst the personnel door to the rear elevation is proposed to be replaced by a set of glazed double doors. The proposed single storey rear extension would have an outward projection of 3m and width of 6.34m and would feature a lean-to roof design with an eaves and ridge height of 2.5m and 3.9m respectively. To the rear elevation, a set of bi-fold doors would be included, along with 2no. roof lights, whilst 1no. window would be featured to the south facing side elevation. The proposed front porch would project approximately 1.34m from the principal elevation of application property and would extend a width of 6m to align with the southern elevation of the existing garage. A lean-to roof form would be featured, which would have a maximum height of 3.8m. To the front elevation of the proposal, an access door and 2no. windows would be included, along with 1no. window to the southern side elevation to serve the proposed W/C. As part of the overall development, the existing vehicular access and dropped kerb would also be extended to accommodate an enlarged driveway to the front of the property. In regard to materiality, the proposed development would be constructed to match that of the existing dwellinghouse including red brickwork, concrete tiles and white uPVC windows and doors.  |
| **Principle of Development:** The application relates to a domestic extension and alterations to an existing residential property and is therefore acceptable in principle subject to an assessment of the material planning considerations.  |
| **Impact Upon Residential Amenity:**The proposed openings to the front and rear elevation of the development would provide views similar to those afforded by the existing window configuration featured to the main dwellinghouse and therefore it is not considered that the proposal would result in any measurable undue harm upon existing privacy levels in the immediate vicinity of the site. The proposal would also include 1no. window to the southern elevation of both the front porch and garden room extension, which would face towards no.55 St Marys Gardens; however, these openings would not have a direct interface with any habitable windows within the neighbouring property. In addition to this the window to the front porch would serve a W/C and is therefore likely to be obscurely glazed, whilst the views provided from the garden room would be similar to those afforded by the existing conservatory which is to be demolished. In this respect, no new opportunities for direct overlooking or loss of privacy are anticipated as a result of the works proposed. The proposed first floor side extension would extend 2.74m from the south facing gable elevation of the application property, sited above the existing single storey integral garage, and approximately 3m from the neighbouring dwellinghouse at no.55 St Marys Gardens. This adjacent property does not feature any habitable windows within its gable elevation and as such the development would not result in any undue impact upon the neighbouring residents at no.55 St Marys Garden by way of overshadowing, loss of outlook or daylight. In regard to the proposed single storey rear extension, this element of the proposal would project 3m beyond the rear elevation of the application property and along the common boundary with no.57 St Marys Gardens. It is acknowledged that the neighbouring property benefits from an existing opening within close proximity to the shared boundary which would likely be impacted by the proposed development, especially given the extensions southerly position in relation to no.57 St Marys Gardens. However, the application dwelling still benefits from permitted development rights which would allow for the construction of an almost identical single storey rear extension without the need for planning consent. Notwithstanding the above, the proposed rear extension would also replace the existing conservatory which extends approximately 2.7m along the common boundary and as such, it is not considered that the resultant impact upon the occupiers of no.57 St Marys Gardens would significantly exceed that of the existing and thus warrant the refusal to grant planning permission. Furthermore, the proposed front porch would project a modest 1.34m beyond the principal elevation of the application dwelling and would not be within close proximity to any neighbouring habitable room windows. Taking account of the above, it is not considered that the proposed development would result in any significantly detrimental harm upon the existing amenity of any nearby residential properties.  |
| **Visual Amenity/External Appearance:**The proposed first floor side extension, sited above the existing single storey garage, was originally proposed to be flush with the principal elevation and roof pitch of the main dwellinghouse, however this was not considered to achieve subservience to the host property. It is noted that the neighbouring property of no.55 St Marys Gardens benefits from an existing two-storey side extension which aligns with the front elevation and ridge of the main property; however, this received planning consent in 1991 under application ref: 3/1991/0747 and was therefore deemed acceptable under different planning policy considerations to that this application and therefore the two are not considered to be directly comparable in this particular instance. Following discussions with the agent, the proposal has subsequently been amended to incorporate a 1m set back at first floor level, with the ridge height also reduced accordingly. The revised scheme is considered to address the afore-mentioned concern, with the extension now appearing wholly subordinate to the original built form of the dwellinghouse and not an incongruous or over-dominant addition to the application site or surrounding area.In relation to the proposed single storey rear extension, this element of the proposal would not take a visually prominent position within the street scene or adjacent public realm, being screened from view by the application dwelling itself, as well as the neighbouring residential properties. Nevertheless, the proposed development would be appropriate in size and scale for a single storey rear extension in relation to the existing property and would therefore not result in any measurable undue harm. Furthermore, whilst the width of the proposed porch would considerably exceed that of the existing, the proposed addition would remain sympathetic to and reflective of the host property by virtue of its modest outward projection and overall design. As such, it is not considered that this element of the proposal would result in any significantly detrimental impact upon the visual amenities of the application dwelling or wider street scene. The materiality of the works proposed would also match the external appearance of the existing dwellinghouse, including brickwork, concrete roof tiles and white uPVC windows and doors, ensuring visual integration and further reducing the impact of the proposal. Accordingly, it is not considered that the proposed development would result in any measurable undue harm upon the visual amenities of the immediate or wider locality that would warrant the refusal to grant planning permission.  |
| **Highways and Parking:**Lancashire County Council Highways have been consulted in respect of the proposed development and raised no objection. As part of the proposal, the existing access would be extended by 4.3m to ensure that a minimum of 2 car parking spaces can be provided on the driveway, thereby complying with the Local Highway Authority’s parking guidance. As such, it is not considered that the proposed development would have a significant impact on highway safety, capacity, or amenity in the immediate vicinity of the site subject to the imposition of conditions.  |
| **Landscape/Ecology:**The application has been accompanied by a Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment Report, dated 20th February 2024. The report concludes that no evidence was recorded to suggest bats were roosting within the building and no bats were observed or recorded using the building for roosting. The property is therefore considered to be of negligible potential for roosting bats and the surveyor considers the survey effort to be reasonable to assess the roost potential of the building and as such, no further survey work is deemed appropriate. Despite this, a cautious approach is advised and in the event that any bats are discovered, disturbed, or harmed during the development, all work must cease immediately, and further advice sought from a licenced ecologist. It is also recommended that a Greenwoods Ecohabitats Two Chamber Bat Box or Kent Bat Box be installed within the site in order to provide roosting potential for the local bat population. This has been secured by way of a planning condition.  |
| **Observations/Consideration of Matters Raised/Conclusion:**As such, for the above reasons and having regard to all material considerations and matters raised the application is recommended for approval. |
| **RECOMMENDATION**: | That planning consent be granted subject to the imposition of conditions. |