

Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.								
Signed:	Officer:	BT	Date:	28/5/2021	Manager:		Date:	
Site Notice displayed	N/A	Photos uploaded	Y					

Application Ref:	3/2021/0376	 Ribble Valley Borough Council www.ribblevalley.gov.uk	
Date Inspected:	12/5/2021		
Officer:	BT		
DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:		Decision	Refusal

Development Description:	Proposed single storey extension to existing garage to create workshop area.
Site Address/Location:	Radley, Ribblesdale Avenue, Clitheroe. BB7 2HZ

CONSULTATIONS:	Parish/Town Council
Clitheroe Town Council have no objections.	

CONSULTATIONS:	Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies
None.	

CONSULTATIONS:	Additional Representations.
Two objections have been received in relation to the proposal. These objections are summarised as: • Impact of the proposal upon residential amenity • Impact of the proposal upon visual amenity These objections are assessed in the corresponding sections of the report below.	

RELEVANT POLICIES AND SITE PLANNING HISTORY:
Ribble Valley Core Strategy: Key Statement DS1 – Development Strategy Key Statement DS2 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development Policy DMG1 – General Considerations Policy DMG2 – Strategic Considerations Policy DMH5 – Residential and Curtilage Extensions NPPF
Relevant Planning History: 3/2015/1031: Certificate of proposed lawful use for a single storey rear extension and internal alterations (Approved)

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:

Site Description and Surrounding Area:

The application relates to a semi-detached property in Clitheroe. The property is constructed from red brick, slate roof tiles and white timber windows. The surrounding area is residential with a large area of open countryside to the North of the proposal site.

Proposed Development for which consent is sought:

Consent is sought for the construction of a single storey extension which will adjoin the property's existing garage.

Principle of development:

The proposal is a domestic extension to a dwelling and is acceptable in principle subject to an assessment of the material planning considerations.

Residential Amenity:

The proposed extension includes three windows on its North-western elevation. These windows will solely provide views into the property's rear garden and as such will not lead to any loss of privacy through overlooking.

The North-eastern elevation of the proposed extension will adjoin the boundary wall with the neighbouring property of Northlands. The extension will project 2.3 metres above the boundary wall which will more than likely lead to some overshadowing within the South-eastern corner of the neighbouring garden however it is worth noting that this level of overshadowing is not considered to be severe enough to warrant refusal of the application in as much that the level of overshadowing would not affect the provision of natural light received through the rear elevation of Northlands.

Visual Amenity:

The extension will measure 8.8 x 3.6 metres with an eaves and roof height of 3 and 4.1 metres respectively which in turn would almost double the volume and footprint of the property's original garage. The extension would span the entire width of the property's rear garden wall and as such would be highly visible and overbearing to the residents of both No. 43 Hawthorn Place and Northlands.

Moreover, the overbearing presence of the extension would be further exacerbated by virtue of its eaves and ridge height both of which would project well above the height of the existing side and rear boundary walls shared with Northlands and No. 43 Hawthorn Place.

Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy states that 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*' and '*not adversely affect the amenities of the surrounding area*' however given the scale, massing and proximity of the proposal to the surrounding neighbouring residents it is considered that the proposed extension would be an over dominant and oppressive addition to the existing pattern of development that would ultimately be harmful to visual amenity and contrary to the aims of the above policy.

The applicant has stated that he would be willing to set the extension back from the common boundaries with Northlands and No. 43 Hawthorn Place in order to reduce the impact of the proposed works however in this case it is not considered that this would reduce the overall impact of the proposal to an acceptable degree.

Furthermore, the extension would be sited in the South-eastern corner of the property's rear garden flush to the property's rear and side boundary walls which both serve as common boundaries with No. 43 Hawthorn Place and Northlands respectively. This proposed layout would result in the creation of an L shaped garage structure that would span both the side and rear elevations of the property's rear garden which in turn would be contrary to the existing spatial arrangement on the South-eastern side of Ribblesdale Avenue which is characterised by detached garages which run along the side boundary of their associated residential curtilages.

Policy DMG1 states that development must '*consider the density, layout and relationship between buildings, which is of major importance*' however in light of the above observations it is considered that the proposal categorically fails to give due consideration to the above policy through attempting to introduce a form of development that would be largely incongruous with and unsympathetic to the existing spatial arrangement between properties on Ribblesdale Avenue.

Landscape/Ecology:

A bat survey carried out at the proposal site on 15/4/21 found no evidence of any bat related activity.

Highways:

Lancashire County Council Highways have not been consulted on the proposal however given that the proposed works will not affect the property's existing parking arrangement it is not considered that the proposal will have any undue impact upon highway safety.

Observations/Consideration of Matters Raised/Conclusion:

The proposal would not be used as a residential dwelling and as such would provide limited opportunities for overlooking into private areas.

The proposal would more than likely lead to some loss of natural light for the adjacent neighbouring residents of Northlands although in this particular case it is worth noting that this is not considered to be severe enough to warrant refusal of the proposal.

However, the proposal fails to accord with Policy DMG1 and Key Statement EN5 and of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy by virtue of its oppressive and overbearing character, proximity to neighbouring residents and incompatibility with the existing spatial layout on Ribblesdale Avenue.

It is for the above reasons and having regard to all material considerations and matters raised that planning consent be refused.

RECOMMENDATION:

That planning permission be refused for the following reason:

01

The proposal is considered to be in conflict with policies DMG1 and DMH5 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy in as much that it would be an overbearing, over dominant, disproportionate and unsympathetic addition to the original property and existing pattern of housing by virtue of its scale, design, siting and adverse impact upon visual amenity.