|  |
| --- |
| **Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.** |
| **Signed:** | **Officer:** | BT | **Date:** | 25/9/24 | **Manager:** | **LH** | **Date:** | **25.9.24** |
|  |
| **Application Ref:** | 3/2024/0614 |  |
| **Date Inspected:** | 11/4/24 | **Site Notice:** | N/A |
| **Officer:** | BT |
| **DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:**  | **REFUSAL** |
|  |
| **Development Description:** | Retention of and alterations to single-storey extension to side, including alterations to the existing driveway and parking provision, and addition of a partial pitched roof. |
| **Site Address/Location:** | 26 Whalley Road, Langho, BB6 8EJ. |
|  |
| **CONSULTATIONS:**  | **Parish/Town Council** |
| **Billington & Langho Parish Council:** | Consulted 8/8/24 – no response received to date. |
|  |
| **CONSULTATIONS:**  | **Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies** |
| **LCC Highways:** | No objection subject to condition. |
|  |
| **United Utilities:**  | Consulted 8/8/24 – no response received to date. |
|  |
| **RVBC Countryside:**  | No objections. |
|  |
| **CONSULTATIONS:**  | **Additional Representations.** |
| Six objections have been received in relation to the proposal which are summarised as follows:* Impact of the proposal upon visual amenity

Numerous additional references have been made in relation to the application property operating as a children’s care home. For clarity, this use was proposed under previously refused planning application 3/2024/0155 however the development proposed under this application does not relate to any change of use of the application property.  |
|  |
| **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 & MobilityPolicy DMH5: Residential and Curtilage ExtensionsNational Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) |
| **Relevant Planning History:****3/2024/0155:**Retrospective change of use from a dwelling house (C3) to a residential institution (C2) including demolition of garage and construction of a single-storey extension to the side and additional parking to front (Refused)**3/2012/0034:**Proposed dormer windows to the front, together with a side extension to the bungalow and demolition of the existing garage (Approved)**3/2010/0020:**Amendment to approved consent 3/2009/0663P to incorporate a window to the first floor rear elevation (storage area only) (Approved)**3/2009/0663:**Extension to rear of dwelling (Approved) |
|  |
| **ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:** |
| **Site Description and Surrounding Area:**The application relates to a semi-detached dormer bungalow property in Langho. The property comprises rendered elevations, UPVC doors and windows and a cross gabled roof detailed in concrete tiles. The property has previously been extended by way of two gabled front dormer windows, a two storey rear reverse gable extension and an unauthorised single storey flat roof side extension which forms the subject of this application. The property’s front garden area comprises a mixture of sandstone paving and grass with the paved area accommodating off-street parking for the property. Hedges border the front and rear perimeters of the property with panelled timber fencing bordering the North-eastern perimeter of the property. The property occupies a visually prominent corner plot location on the junction between Whalley Road and Springdale Road with the former providing access to the property. No. 24 Whalley Road adjoins the South-western side of the site and bears a similar visual appearance to the application property. The surrounding area predominantly comprises residential housing.  |
| **Proposed Development for which consent is sought:**Planning consent is sought for alterations to an unauthorised single storey flat roof side extension which currently adjoins the North-eastern elevation of the application property and alterations to the property’s existing front driveway. |
| **Impact Upon Residential Amenity:**Paragraph 135 (f) of the National Planning Policy Framework states:*‘Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users’.*Furthermore, Policy DMG1 of the Core Strategy requires all proposals for development to consider the effects of development upon existing amenities.In this instance, the window openings within the unauthorised side extension solely provide views into the front and rear garden areas of the application property. In addition, the modified extension would be screened from the adjoining neighbouring property of No. 24 Whalley Road by virtue of being sited on the North-eastern gable end of the application property. Furthermore, the modified extension would be sited approximately 13 metres away for the adjacent neighbouring property of No. 28 Whalley Road and as such would not have an overbearing impact on this property by virtue of the separation distance that would be in place. As such, no concerns are raised with respect to loss of privacy, outlook or natural light to neighbouring properties from the proposed development.Taking account of all of the above, it is not considered that the proposed development would be harmful to the amenity of any neighbouring residents. The proposed development would therefore be compliant with the aims and objectives of Paragraph 135 (f) of the NPPF and Policy DMG1. |
| **Visual Amenity/External Appearance:**Paragraph 135 (c) 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’.*Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy provides additional general design guidance as follows: *‘All* *development must* *be sympathetic to existing and proposed land uses in terms of its size, intensity and nature as well as scale, massing and style…particular emphasis will be placed on visual appearance and the relationship to surroundings, including impact on landscape character.’*In this instance, a single storey flat roof side extension has been added to the North-eastern gable end of the application property without planning permission. This is of flat roof design which is at odds with the design and appearance of the main dwelling. Photographic analysis and historic plans show that a single storey flat roof garage was previously in place in a similar area however unlike the unauthorised extension this was a detached and considerably smaller structure in terms of its footprint, height, depth and overall bulk and massing with the flat roof profile of the detached garage protruding only slightly above the property’s North-eastern boundary fence line. In contrast, the depth of the unauthorised side extension extends along the entire North-eastern profile of the application property with its front and rear elevations aligned flush with the front and rear elevations of the host property. In addition, the flat roof profile of the extension sits just above the eaves level of the host property and well above the property’s adjacent fence boundary. As such, the unauthorised side extension is more visible than the previous garage, and the unsympathetic flat roof design is more apparent by virtue of it being adjoined to the application property. Furthermore, the application property occupies a visually prominent corner plot location with the unauthorised extension being clearly viewable in the public realm from both Whalley Road and Springdale Road therefore the unauthorised works carry a discernible visual impact. As such, the existing extension reads as an over dominant, unsympathetic and incongruous addition to the application property and existing street scene. The proposed development seeks to retain and modify the unauthorised extension through the addition of a gabled roof which would be aligned flush with the front and rear gabled roof slopes of the application property. In addition, the existing front elevation of the extension would remain flush with the principal elevation of the host dwelling, with no further alterations proposed to the unauthorised extension. Furthermore, the proposed works would involve the replacement of the property’s existing 1.8 metre high fence (which already provides limited screening to the extension) with 1 metre high panels (materiality not specified) which in turn would increase the visibility of the resultant development. As such, the proposed development would further exacerbate the bulk and massing of the existing side extension, fail to appear subservient to the host property and require new roof tiles right up against existing weathered roof tiles thus resulting in an unsightly mis-match of materials. Its appearance would result in further harm to the visual amenities of the area. The proposed development would therefore fail to satisfy the requirements of Paragraphs 135 (C) and Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.The above concerns have been conveyed to the applicant who was asked to make revisions to the current proposal by way of setting the front roof slope of the extension’s proposed gabled roof feature down from the principal roof slope of the application property, and setting the front elevation of the extension back from the principal elevation of the application property, so as to largely mirror the subservient design of the side extension approved for the application property under application 3/2012/0034. Notwithstanding these requests, the applicant has stated that they would only be willing to incorporate the above suggested revisions to the design of the extension’s proposed gabled roof feature. It was subsequently conveyed to the applicant that retaining the front elevation of the unauthorised extension in conjunction with setting the principal roof slope of the proposed gabled roof down from the principal roof slope of the host property was not considered to be an acceptable compromise on the basis that this would result in a somewhat incongruous and asymmetrical form of development. On this basis, the applicant has requested that the application be determined as originally submitted. In terms of justification for this, the application’s planning statement makes reference to the fall-back position afforded by extant planning consent 3/2012/0034 with an assertion that this is not significantly different to the development proposed in the current application. However the Council disagrees with this assertion on the basis of the concerns raised above with respect to the bulk, massing and visibility that would be apparent from the development proposed.  |
| **Highways and Parking:**The proposed development has been subject to review from Lancashire County Council Highways who make reference to the absence of a parking plan in support of the application. As such, the LHA have requested for the provision of a proposed site plan with a similar level of detail to the proposed site plan submitted under previous planning application 3/2024/0155. Notwithstanding this, the current application submission includes a proposed site plan which clearly shows the presence of three proposed vehicle parking spaces in a largely similar vein to the proposed site plan submitted for previous application 3/2024/0155. The response from the LHA also makes reference to ‘proposed changes to the existing vehicular access’ however no alterations are proposed to the property’s existing vehicle access and this has been confirmed by the applicant. No other issues or queries have been raised by the LHA however the LHA response specifies for all parking spaces to be constructed from a bound porous material and this would need to be secured by way of a condition in the event of any future planning consent being granted. In light of the above, it is not considered that the proposed development would have any undue impacts upon highway safety as such the proposal satisfies Policy DMG1 of the Core Strategy (highways). |
| **Landscape/Ecology:**No ecological constraints were identified in relation to the proposal. |
| **Other Matters:**Sewer infrastructure Constraint analysis shows the presence of a sewer which runs directly beneath the ground floor area of the unauthorised single storey side extension. It is unclear whether construction of the unauthorised extension has compromised the sewer infrastructure on site and no response has been received from United Utilities who have been formally consulted on the application. However, this is considered to be a matter covered by separate legislation and the applicant is advised to make contact with United Utilities if they have not done so already to discuss the works implemented on site. |
| **Observations/Consideration of Matters Raised/Conclusion:**The proposed development would further exacerbate the discernible bulk and massing of the unauthorised side extension and fail to be subservient to the host property which in turn would result in further harm to the visual amenities of the area. The proposed development would therefore fail to satisfy the requirements of Paragraphs 135 (C) and Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.Furthermore, Paragraph 139 of the NPPF 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 planning consent be refused for the following reason: |
| **01:** | The proposed development, by virtue of its roof symmetry and overall scale, bulk and massing, is considered to be of poor design and would read as an unsympathetic, incongruous and over dominant addition to the application property. Furthermore its prominent corner siting would mean that the resultant development would be clearly visible in the street scene and as such is considered harmful to the visual amenities of the area. The proposed development would therefore fail to satisfy the requirements of Paragraphs 135 (C) and Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy. |