


Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.

| | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|-----------------|------------------------|--------------|-----------|-----------------|--|--------------|--|
| Signed: | Officer: | BT | Date: | 24/5/2021 | Manager: | | Date: | |
| Site Notice displayed | N/A | Photos uploaded | Y | | | | | |

| | | | |
|------------------------------------|-------------|--|---------|
| Application Ref: | 3/2021/0377 |  <p>Ribble Valley Borough Council www.ribblevalley.gov.uk</p> | |
| Date Inspected: | 22/4/2021 | | |
| Officer: | BT | | |
| DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT: | | Decision | Refusal |

| | |
|---------------------------------|---|
| Development Description: | Proposed conversion of the existing integral garage and erection of a proposed double garage. |
| Site Address/Location: | 43 Hawthorne Place, Clitheroe, Lancashire. BB7 2HU |

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

| | |
|-----------------------|--|
| CONSULTATIONS: | Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies |
| None. | |

| | |
|--|------------------------------------|
| CONSULTATIONS: | Additional Representations. |
| <p>Three objections have been received in respect to the application. These objections are summarised as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact of the proposal upon residential amenity • Impact of the proposal upon visual amenity <p>The above objections are addressed in the corresponding sections of the report.</p> | |

| |
|---|
| RELEVANT POLICIES AND SITE PLANNING HISTORY: |
| <p>Ribble Valley Core Strategy:</p> <p>Key Statement DS1 – Development Strategy Key Statement DS2 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development Policy DMG1 – General Considerations Policy DMG2 – Strategic Considerations Policy DMG3 – Transport and Mobility Policy DMH5 – Residential and Curtilage Extensions</p> <p>NPPF</p> |
| <p>Relevant Planning History:</p> <p>3/2011/0315: Erection of 4-bedroom two-storey detached dwelling (withdrawn)</p> |

3/2011/0703:

Proposed erection of a three bedroom, two-storey detached dwelling with attached garage. Re-submission of 3/2011/0315P (refused, dismissed on appeal)

3/2019/0262:

Erection of a single dwelling with associated access, landscaping and all other works (refused, dismissed on appeal)

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:**Site Description and Surrounding Area:**

The application relates to a detached property in Clitheroe. The property is constructed from red brick, concrete roof tiles and white UPVC doors and windows. The surrounding area is residential and is characterised by numerous detached properties.

Proposed Development for which consent is sought:

Consent is sought for the construction of a double 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 internal conversion of the property's existing garage will incorporate an additional window and a set of bi-folding doors however each of these will be sited in an identical position to the property's existing ground floor windows and as such will not provide any new opportunities for overlooking.

The proposed double garage includes windows on its rear and side elevations however given that the garage will not be used for residential purposes it is not anticipated that the proposed works will lead to any loss of privacy.

The proposed double garage be in close proximity to the conservatory of No. 41 Hawthorne Place which is situated on the rear elevation of this property approximately 5 metres away to the North-east. The garage would also be in close proximity to the rear garden of this property in as much that it will be sited just 1.1 metres away from the neighbouring boundary fence.

Accordingly, it is considered that the siting, height and proximity of the proposal to the neighbouring property of No. 41 Hawthorne Place would lead to a significant occurrence of overshadowing within the directly adjacent rear garden which in turn would result in an unacceptable loss of natural light provision for the residents of this property.

Visual Amenity:

Standing at just over 16 feet tall and covering a ground floor area of over 58m², the proposed garage would be considerably larger than the other garages on Hawthorne Place and more reminiscent of a residential annex in terms of its size and appearance. Moreover, the garage would be sited within the front garden of the main property and as such the proposal would command a significant visual presence by virtue of its oversized height, footprint and high level of visibility within the public realm.

The proposal would also be visually prominent to the neighbouring residents of No. 41 Hawthorn Place and Ashdown in as much that the garage would project well above the height of the boundary fence with these neighbours of which it would be in close proximity to.

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, public visibility and proximity of the proposal to the adjacent neighbouring residents it is considered that the proposed garage would be an over dominant and anomalous addition to the existing pattern of development that would ultimately be harmful to visual amenity and contrary to the aims of the above policy.

Furthermore, the garage would be sited 3 metres from the boundary fence with Ashdown, 2 metres from the side elevation of No. 43 Hawthorne Place and just 1.1 metres from the boundary fence with No. 41 Hawthorne Place which in turn would result in a particularly confined and cramped arrangement.

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 unsympathetic to the existing spatial arrangement between properties on Hawthorne Place.

Landscape/Ecology:

No ecological constraints were identified in relation to the proposal.

Highways:

Lancashire County Council Highways have not been consulted on the proposal however the loss of two off-street parking spaces through the proposed internal alterations to the property's existing garage would be mitigated through the creation of the proposed detached double garage. As such, it is not considered that the proposed works would lead to any adverse impact upon highway safety.

Observations/Consideration of Matters Raised/Conclusion:

The proposal would not be used a residential dwelling and as such would provide limited opportunities for overlooking into private areas however the detached garage would result in an unacceptable loss of natural light provision for the residents of No. 41 Hawthorn Place.

Furthermore, 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 Hawthorne Place.

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(s):

- | | |
|-----------|---|
| 01 | The proposal is considered to be in conflict with policies DMG1 and DMH5 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy in as much that the proposed detached garage would be an 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. |
|-----------|---|

| | |
|-----------|--|
| 02 | The proposal is considered to be in conflict with policies DMG1 and DMH5 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy in as much that the proposed detached garage would have an overbearing impact on surrounding dwellings which in turn would lead to an unacceptable loss of natural light for neighbouring residents. |
|-----------|--|