

Ribble Valley Borough Council

DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT - REFUSAL

Ref: RH

Application No:	3/2011/0671
Development Proposed:	Two-storey side extension with single storey wood store, water filtration system and double garage at Shays Farm, Tosside.

CONSULTATIONS: Parish/Town Council

No observations received.

CONSULTATIONS: Highway/Water Authority/Other Bodies

United Utilities – No Objection.

CONSULTATIONS: Additional Representations

No representations have been received.

RELEVANT POLICIES:

Policy G1 - Development Control
 Policy ENV1 – Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty
 Policy H10 - Residential Extensions
 SPG – 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'

POLICY REASONS FOR REFUSAL:

G1, ENV1, H10, SPG – Detrimental impact upon the appearance of the property to the visual detriment of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

COMMENTS/ENVIRONMENTAL/AONB/HUMAN RIGHTS ISSUES/RECOMMENDATION:

Shays Farm is attached to Shays Cottage, located south-west of Tosside down a long farm track off the B6478 to the south of Gisburn Forest within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

Permission was granted in June 2011 (3/2011/0276) for the erection of a two-storey side extension with attached single storey lean-to extension and single storey garage/store. It was considered that the scheme was appropriate in scale, size and design as the two-storey side extension appeared subservient to the main property and the single storey garage/store to the front elevation would appear as a traditional outbuilding to a farmhouse.

The description of this application is not dissimilar to that which was previously approved, but the design of the proposed works and its visual appearance has fundamentally changed.

The two-storey side extension to the western gable elevation of the property is to measure 6.9m x 7.5m x 7.2 metres in height to match the existing property. The extension to the front elevation of the property is to measure 6.3m x 9.2m. A cat-slide roof is proposed in order to link the two proposals.

As expressed in my previous report it is considered that any impact of the proposal upon neighbouring residential amenity will be minimal. There are no residential properties immediately to the north, south or west of the property, and as only one window is to be inserted to the south-eastern facing gable of the extension it is considered that any impact upon the amenity of residents of the adjoining property will be minimal. Therefore the main consideration in the determination of this application is the visual impact upon the appearance of the property and the locality.

The submitted Design and Access Statement states that '*the volume of the extensions now proposed are less than the volume of the previously approved extensions*'. Whilst this may be the case, the previous scheme appeared subservient to the main dwelling as there was a clear visual break between the two-storey side extension and single storey extension to the front elevation, which were connected by a glazed link.

Policy G1 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan states that *'development should be sympathetic to existing and proposed land uses in terms of its size, intensity and nature'* and in addition, that *'particular emphasis will be placed on visual appearance. As a general rule any extension should not dominate the original house and there should be a good visual relationship between the original dwelling and any subsequent additions'* It is considered that in relation to scale and size the proposal is wholly inappropriate, as it would dominate the main property.

The width of the two-storey extension to the rear measures 7metres, which is more than half the width of the main property. Therefore due to its size, and that the ridge height matches the main dwelling; the extension would dominate the original property rather than appearing subservient to it. As such, when viewed from the northern elevation the proposal would appear visually prominent within the locality.

The design of the extension also results in the visual dominance of the proposal against the main property. The Councils SPG states that *'development should contribute to and reflect the character of the original house. Over large extensions are to be avoided which are bulky and effect the overall mass of the dwelling to an extent where the extension is highly prominent'*. Shays Farm consists of a linear and simplistic block of traditional farmhouse with attached cottage. The inclusion of a cat-slide roof will not only dominate and subsume the front elevation of the main property, but also appear as a discordant feature more akin to that of a barn conversion, which bears no historic relevance, and is an alien feature to this particular property.

The Councils SPG states that *'it is normally better not to introduce design features which are not in keeping with the original house. The form and shape of the original dwelling should be respected and reflected in the extension'*. In addition, part 33. of national Planning Policy Statement 1 (PPS1) *'Delivering Sustainable Development'* with regards to design states that *'design which is inappropriate in its context, or which fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area should not be accepted'*. Part 36. of the same document states that development should ensure that *'it responds to their local context and create or reinforce local distinctiveness'*. The introduction of a dominant extension, which gives the appearance of a barn conversion, does not respect the proportion form or detailing of the original dwelling contrary to the Councils SPG *'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'*. The extension by virtue of its size and design will be out of keeping with the original house, which maintains the appearance of a traditional linear and simplistic farm building. The proposal will appear as the most prominent feature, thus interrupting the simple vernacular style of the property to the front elevation that is considered makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of this traditional farm building when viewed in the public realm from the bridleway to the front elevation.

With regards to the impact upon this Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Policy ENV1 of the Districtwide Local Plan states that development should contribute to the conservation of the natural beauty of the area – *'the protection, conservation and enhancement of the natural environment will be the most important considerations in the assessment of any development proposal'*. It is considered that the proposal will neither protect, conserve or enhance the landscape character of this area. The proposal will dominate the front elevation, and as a result, the property would appear unduly prominent and have an adverse impact upon the visual qualities of this area, which as stated in paragraph 21. of PPS7 *'as having the highest status of protection in relation to landscape quality and scenic beauty'*.

I therefore recommend that planning permission be refused for the above reasons

RECOMMENDATION: That permission be refused.