

12034 Document indicating pre application advice discussions
Application No 3/2013/0509
1 Brookside, Old Langho

Dear Mr Dickinson

Application No: 3/2013/0509
Address: 1 Brookside, Old Langho
Applicant: Mr & Mrs P Newman
Proposal: Proposed 2 storey extension to the side of the house and detached garage.

I am emailing with regard to the above planning application. Following my site visit yesterday and having considered the proposals I have requested that the application be made invalid by our administration team.

The reason for this is that the application that has been made is the incorrect type. The development proposed within this application cannot be considered as Householder Development; this is because part of the proposals involve the extension of the curtilage to the dwellinghouse, which requires a change of use of the land. The application should therefore be upgraded to a full application which propose 'the change of use of existing grass verge to form extension to curtilage and the erection of a two storey extension and detached garage.'

I would therefore advise that amended full application forms should be submitted, rather than householder application forms. The fee for such an application is £385.00, I would therefore also advise that the fee of £172 that has been paid be topped up to make a total of the required £385.00.

Notwithstanding the above; I also have significant concerns regarding the details of the design as is currently proposed, which you may wish to consider, these are as follows:

- The proposed two storey extension is overlarge and over dominant in relation to the existing house. I would advise that the overall scale of the development should be significantly reduced. The proposed development should appear as a subservient addition to the existing dwelling, at present the proposals would nearly double the existing frontage of the dwelling. You may therefore wish to consider measures such as a significant reduction in the projection of the development, which is currently proposed to be 5.7m and other measures such as the setting down of the ridge line of the extension from that of the existing dwelling; and set the elevations of the extension in from those of the existing dwelling.
- Remove the circular window from the gable end that would serve the loft space. This would appear as a stark and incongruous feature by virtue of its high position on the gable. Rooflights in the rear roofslope would be a more suitable solution.
- Re-orientate the roof of the proposed garage so that the ridgeline would run parallel to Old Langho Road. This will give the effect of reducing the height and therefore the prominence of the garage by virtue of moving its highest point away from the boundary. It would also be preferable to set garage in from the site boundary slightly.

As discussed above the current planning application as submitted has been made invalid as it does not constitute householder development. The application should be upgraded to a full application and the outstanding fee paid. The application will remain invalid, and no further work undertaken, until such time the correct forms and appropriate fee have been received.

In forwarding the amended information to the Council please forward it to either of my colleagues Lesley Lund or Jane Tucker.

Yours sincerely

Mark Baldry | **Assistant Planning Officer**

E: mark.baldry@ribblevalley.gov.uk T: 01200 414571

Ribble Valley Borough Council
Council Offices
Church Walk
Clitheroe
BB7 2RA

This is a copy of the email sent by ourselves in reply.

Dear Mr Baldry,

Ref; Planning application No: 3/2013/0509 - 1 Brookside, Old Langho.

Further to your email of 19 June 2013 regarding the above, I have discussed your comments with the applicant and they are keen to progress with the application but would prefer the councils support for their proposals and so we have reviewed these and we comment accordingly.

1) We note that you believe the application to be a change of use due to the change in curtilage of the dwelling and we are happy to make the application as per your recommendation. The applicants have owned the strip of land which this refers to for many years but allowed it to seem to be outside their dwelling curtilage.

The house on the opposite side of the crescent, No 20 Brookside has the corresponding area of land within it's curtilage so we assume there are no issues with correcting this anomaly. We will therefore send the correct application forms and the increased fee.

2) The size of the proposed development has been determined by the requirements of the applicants growing family. The extension still allows a suitable width to access the rear of the property and leaves a substantial garden at the front, side and rear of the property. The inclusion of off road parking for 3 cars is testament to that. The proposed size also allows for a balanced front elevation. Please note that house no 7 Brookside has previously gained approval and constructed an extension of similar width and volume to that proposed here even though it creates a terrace effect.

The extension must use the existing front wall to allow the existing staircase to work and give access to the 1st floor. Therefore no step back at the front would be feasible. We believe therefore that the applicants proposals are in line with previously approved schemes in the area.

3) The purpose of the circular window in the roofspace is to give a delightful view out of the space to open countryside, it is a very minor feature in this context. Rooflights are always a poor solution given the noise transfer of precipitation they transmit as well as the loss of heat.

4) The purpose of designing the roof to the garage as shown is twofold, firstly to mimic the house roof and create family consistency and secondly to create roof storage space.

5) The garage has been set back from the boundary by approx 600mm to allow the creation of a hedge.

I hope the above gives a little more information behind the design principals for the extension and that in turn the council will be able to support the application in it's current form. We would therefore welcome your comments before formalising the application.

This is a copy of the email ten received from Mr Baldry

Dear Mr Dickinson

Whilst I appreciate the need and desires of your clients in relation to formulating a proposed design I still have significant concerns that the proposed development would be an overlarge and over dominant addition to the existing dwelling. The proposal would near double the frontage of the existing property.

I note your comments with regard to the extensions carried out nearby at No.7 Brookside. However I would point out that the consent granted at No.7 Brookside pre-dates the adoption of the Districtwide Local Plan and also the Council's adopted SPG on Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings; (a copy of which I have attached to this email) which details the design principles the LPA look for when considering applications of this nature. In addition to which each proposal and associated site is considered on its own individual merits. A scheme at one site may not be considered suitable when applied to another site. I would argue that your clients property occupies a far more prominent location adjacent to the main road than that of No.7. Any addition should be subservient to the existing dwelling.

With regard to the gable end window serving the loft space I accept the logic behind the preference to have a window rather than rooflights. I still feel however that the circular window may appear somewhat out of place and character; the preference therefore may be to have a rectangular window in this location.

In respect of the garage I still have serious concerns as to its location. It would be situated forward of the building line between No.1 and No.20 on land which is currently outside the curtilage of the property and which contributes to the openness of the street scene. Whilst we have no objections to this land becoming curtilage we do have serious concerns regarding the visual impact of the garage in that location and its prominence within the streetscene. A reduction in the scale of the proposed two storey extension would then provide space for the garage to be repositioned away from the highway and mostly within the existing extent of the curtilage.

The above advice is given without prejudice to the eventual determination of this or any other subsequent applications.

Notwithstanding the above comments, please note that at this stage this application remains invalid. Once we are in receipt of the additional fee and corrected application forms the submission can be made valid and ultimately determined.

Yours sincerely

Mark Baldry | **Assistant Planning Officer**

E: mark.baldry@ribblevalley.gov.uk T: 01200 414571

Ribble Valley Borough Council
Council Offices
Church Walk
Clitheroe
BB7 2RA