|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Signed:** | **Officer:** | **LW** | | | | **Date:** | | **04/04/24** | | **Manager:** | | **KH** | **Date:** | **09/04/24** |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Application Ref:** | | | | 3/2024/0094 | | | | | | |  | | | |
| **Date Inspected:** | | | | 12/03/24 | | | **Site Notice:** | | 12/03/24 | |
| **Officer:** | | | | LW | | | | | | |
| **DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:** | | | | | | | | | | | **APPROVAL** | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Development Description:** | | | | | Proposed two-storey and single-storey extension to rear. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Site Address/Location:** | | | | | 67 Higher Road, Longridge, PR3 3SY | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | | **Parish/Town Council** | | | | | | | | | |
| A consultation response from Longridge Town Council was received 14th March 2024 stating that the Town Council has no observations. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | | **Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies** | | | | | | | | | |
| **LCC Highways:** | | | | | No objection. | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | | **Additional Representations.** | | | | | | | | | |
| No representations received. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **RELEVANT POLICIES AND SITE PLANNING HISTORY:** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ribble Valley Core Strategy:**  Key Statement DS1: Development Strategy  Key Statement DS2: Sustainable Development  Key Statement DMI2: Transport Considerations  Policy DMG1: General Considerations  Policy DMG2: Strategic Considerations  Policy DMG3: Transport & Mobility  Policy DME3: Site and Species Protection and Conservation  Policy DMH5: Residential and Curtilage Extensions  National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Relevant Planning History:**  3/2023/0159: Proposed two-storey and single storey rear extension (resubmission of 3/2022/0740) (Refused).  3/2022/0740: Proposed first floor extension of existing single storey extension to rear (Refused). | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Site Description and Surrounding Area:**  The application relates to a mid-terrace property at no.67 Higher Road, located within the defined settlement area of Longridge. The property features an existing flat roof single storey rear extension which projects 5.2m from the rear elevation and extends a width of 2.9m with a height of 2.5m. The property consists of natural stone to the front elevation and render to the rear elevation, along with slate roof tiles and woodgrain effect uPVC windows and doors. The surrounding area is pre-dominantly residential and the site itself is not situated on any designated land. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Proposed Development for which consent is sought:**  Consent is sought for a proposed two-storey and single storey rear extension. The proposal is a re-submission of planning applications 3/2022/0740 and 3/2023/0159, with the former being refused on both visual and residential amenity, and the latter solely on residential amenity.  The single storey element of the current proposal would project 5.17m beyond the rear elevation of the application property and extend a width of 3.14m. A flat roof form would be featured which would measure 2.71m in height and would include the installation of 1no. roof light. To the rear elevation of the proposal, a set of glazed double doors would be featured.  The proposed first floor rear extension would project 2.54m from the rear elevation of the primary dwellinghouse and would have a width of 3.14m. A reverse gable roof form would be incorporated with an eaves and ridge height of 5.31m and 6.13m respectively, whilst 1no. window would be installed to the rear elevation in order to serve the proposed bedroom.  In regard to materiality, the proposal would be constructed in materials to match that of the existing dwellinghouse, including smooth off-white render, natural slate roof tiles and woodgrain effect uPVC windows and doors. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Principle of Development:**  The proposal 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 rear elevation of the proposed development would feature a set of glazed double doors at ground floor and 1no. window at first floor which would face towards the residential properties along Wellbrow Drive. The ground floor opening would provide views solely within the rear garden area of the application property, whilst the proposed first floor window would provide views similar to those afforded by the existing first floor windows featured to the rear elevation of the main dwellinghouse. As such, no new opportunities for direct overlooking or loss of privacy are anticipated as a result of the proposed development.  Following the refusal of the previous application (3/2023/0159), the ground floor element of the proposal has been reduced in width, along with the rearward projection of the first-floor element.  The neighbouring property of no.65 Higher Road features an existing single storey rear extension which has an outward projection of approximately 4.9m, and a first-floor rear extension which projects approximately 1m beyond the rear elevation of the application property. The proposal would therefore project just 0.4m and 1.5m beyond the rear elevation of the no.65 Higher Road at ground and first floor level respectively. In addition to this, the proposal would be sited approximately 0.64m from the common boundary and would not be sited within close proximity to any neighbouring first floor windows. Accordingly, it is not anticipated that the proposed development would result in any measurable undue impact upon the occupiers of no.65 Higher Road, by way of overshadowing, loss of outlook or daylight.  The rear elevation of no.69 Higher Road is set back from the application property by approximately 1.8m, resulting in the proposal projecting 3.4m and 0.7m beyond the rear elevation of this adjoined property at ground and first floor respectively. However, no.69 Higher Road benefits from an existing two-storey outrigger which has an outward projection of approximately 2.8m, whilst 1no. ground floor and first floor window are included to the rear elevation of the main dwellinghouse, situated immediately adjacent to the common boundary with the application site.  Whilst analysis shows that the proposed first floor extension would not be in breach of a 45-degree line drawn from the centre of the neighbouring windows, the proposed development would likely result in some degree of tunnelling effect and sense of enclosure upon the ground floor window of no.69 Higher Road.  Despite this, it is acknowledged that the daylight received by the ground floor neighbouring window is already somewhat compromised by the existing two-storey outrigger at no.69 Higher Road and single storey rear extension at the application property. In addition to this, the rearward projection of the proposed single storey extension would match that of the existing and the proposal would be sited only marginally closer (0.2m) to the shared boundary than that of the existing. In addition to this, the proposed first-floor extension would project just 0.7m beyond the rear of no.69 Higher Road. In this context, whilst the proposed development, in combination, would likely result in some degree of overshadowing and loss of outlook upon the occupiers of no.69 Higher Road, it is not considered that the resultant impact would significant exceed that of the existing and thus warrant the refusal to grant planning permission. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Visual Amenity/External Appearance:**  The proposed extension would be situated to the rear of the property and would therefore not take a visually prominent position within the adjacent public realm, being screened from view by the host property and the neighbouring terraced properties. As such, the proposal would only be visible from the dwellings situated to the rear of the application property’s residential curtilage. Despite this, consideration still needs to be made with regard to the impact of the proposal on the character of the host property and the wider locality.  The proposed extension would be set in from the side boundaries of the main dwellinghouse and below the main ridgeline of the property, therefore appearing as a subordinate addition to the main dwellinghouse. Furthermore, the application property is one of 8 terraced properties which vary in size, ridge height and rear building line and with many benefiting from existing rear extensions including two storey additions (namely at no.65, no.69 and no.71 Higher Road). As such, it is not considered that the proposed development would appear at odds with the visual character of the existing property or the prevailing character of the surrounding area.  The proposal would also be constructed in materials to match the external appearance of the host dwelling, including render, slate roof tiles and woodgrain effect uPVC windows and doors, further limiting the visual impact of the proposal. In view of the above, it is not considered that the proposal would result in any significantly detrimental impact upon the visual amenity of the host property or the wider locality. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Highways and Parking:**  Lancashire County Council Highways have been consulted in relation to the proposed development and raised no objections. As such, it is not considered that the proposal would result in any measurable undue harm upon highway safety or parking. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Landscape/Ecology:**  A Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment Report has been submitted with the application, dated 13th March 2023. 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. The surveyor considers the survey effort to be reasonable to assess the roost potential of the building and 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. The installation of a Greenwoods Ecohabitats Two Chamber Bat Box or Kent Bat Box is also recommended, 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. | | | | | | | | | | | |