

REPORT FROM: PLANNING, BUILDING CONTROL AND LICENSING
SERVICES MANAGER

TO: BRIERFIELD AND REEDLEY COMMITTEE

DATE: 6th November 2018

Report Author: Neil Watson
Tel. No: 01282 661706
E-mail: neil.watson@pendle.gov.uk

PLANNING APPLICATIONS

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To determine the attached planning applications.

REPORT TO BRIERFIELD AND REEDLEY COMMITTEE ON 6TH NOVEMBER 2018

Application Ref: 18/0676/HHO

Proposal: Full: Erection of two-storey extension to side (South), part single, part double storey extension to rear and front canopy (Resubmission).

At: 11a Edge End Avenue, Brierfield

On Behalf of: Mr Rashid Iqbal

Date Registered: 27 September, 2018

Expiry Date: 22 November, 2018

Case Officer: Christian Barton

The application has been referred to committee as 3 objections have been received.

Site Description and Proposal

This application is a resubmission of a scheme previously refused due to the massing and impacts on neighbours. It seeks to erect a two-storey side extension, a part double, part single-storey rear extension and a front canopy.

The site sits on Edge End Avenue that has a varied street scene. The dwelling is a semi-detached property of modern design. It has rendered elevations, concrete pan roofing tiles and a white uPVC fenestration. It is surrounded by houses to all sides and has garden areas to the front and rear.

The site is within the settlement boundary of Brierfield and has no special designations as part of the Pendle Local Plan. The scheme would provide additional living areas and two bedrooms. New hardstanding to the front is also proposed for parking.

Relevant Planning History

18/0471/HHO - Full: Erection of two storey extension to side (South), part single, part double storey extension to rear and front canopy – Refused – August 2018.

Consultee Response

LCC Highways - There are no objections to the proposal subject to the following conditions. The planning drawing E1 & P2, which shows the parking layout is acceptable.

Conditions have been advised suggesting applying bound surfacing materials to the driveway and limiting the times of construction deliveries.

Brierfield Town Council - No comments received.

Public Response

The nearest neighbours have been notified by letter. Comments have been received objecting on the following grounds;

- Size and scale of the development
- Effects on light availability
- Impacts on the sewer network
- Effects on views.

Officer Comments

The starting point for consideration of any planning application is the development plan. Policies which are up to date and which conform to the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) must be given full weight in the decision making process. Other material considerations may then be set against the Local Plan policies so far as they are relevant.

The main considerations for this application are any potential impacts on residential amenity, design and materials, highways and parking along with the wider issues that have been raised by neighbours.

1. The relevant Pendle Borough Council Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy (2011 – 2030) policies are:

- CS Policy ENV2 sets out general design principles, historic environment and climate change.

Other policies and guidance's are also relevant:

- The Design Principles Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) applies to extension and sets out the aspects required for good design.
- Saved Replacement Local Plan Policy 31 that sets out the parking standards for developments.

The policy background of the scheme is principally contained with Policy ENV2 of the Pendle Local Plan requiring good design. The adopted Design Principles SPD provides further clarity on what is an acceptable design in relation to neighbouring properties and the street scene. Saved Policy 31 relating to off-street parking is also relevant given the proposed addition of bedrooms.

2. Design and Amenity

The Design SPD states that domestic extensions should be designed to avoid causing overshadowing, loss of outlook or loss of privacy for neighbours, or appear unduly dominant to neighbours. Single-storey rear extensions are generally acceptable where they do not detrimentally impact on the living environments of neighbours. Two-storey side extensions to semi-detached properties should respect the balance and symmetry of such properties and have a pitched roof. They should be built from appropriate facing materials and be set off the side boundary by at least 1m.

The proposed rear extension would have a depth of 4.2m, a width of 8.4m spread over two levels and a total height of 6.8m. The two-storey side extension would project 3.3m from the south elevation. It would have a pitched roof 8.4m in height and would be visible from public vantage points to the east.

The scheme would be of an appropriate scale in relation to the size of the house. There would be no level of set down from the ridge for the two-storey side aspect however, the irregular positions of the houses on the street reduces the potential for terracing. This effect would be further avoided by separating any two-storey elevations at least 1m from the side boundary. This approach has been advised.

The extension would have rendered elevations, slate roofing tiles and a white uPVC fenestration to complement the existing house. A tarmac driveway is proposed to the front. The front canopy and columns would have no detrimental impacts on the overall character of the area. The development is therefore acceptable in relation to the design along with the wider effects on visual amenity.

Concerns have been raised about the single-storey rear extension. This aspect would follow the footprint of an existing outrigger. It would also be the same height. It would therefore have no additional impacts on the living environments of the immediate neighbours. The side elevation, facing 15 Edge End Avenue would be a blank elevation. The scheme would not affect the domestic privacy of those neighbours.

Concerns have been raised about loss of views. Losses of private views are not material planning considerations. There would be no loss of public views of value that would lead to the conclusion that the application should be refused on those grounds.

The development would have no effects on the living environments of the neighbours to the west owing to ample separation of 21m+. It would bring primary openings 4.2m closer to the garden areas to the west, notably those as part of 264 Hibson Road. It would have negligible further impacts on the privacy and enjoyment of those areas when the relationship with existing windows is considered. In this situation it would be unreasonable to refuse an application based on an impact that is similar to the current situation.

10 Edge End Avenue, to the east is 22m from the proposed side extension. Additional primary windows are proposed for the front elevation however adequate separation would prevent any detrimental impacts on the living environments and privacy of those neighbours. 11 Edge End Avenue sits to the south. No primary windows are proposed for the side elevation facing number 11. The ground floor bathroom window should be obscurely glazed in order to maintain domestic privacy. With this in place the scheme would not detrimentally affect the privacy of those neighbours.

Within the garden of number 11 a patio is immediately adjacent to the proposed side extension. The extension would follow an irregular line adjacent to the shared boundary with number 11 separated by 0.4m and 0.7m at its closest points, at two stories. The Applicant has been advised to reduce the massing of this aspect in alignment with the Design SPD however amended Floor and Elevation Plans are yet to be received.

The scheme in its current format would result in severely detrimental impacts on the living conditions of the occupiers of number 11. It would result in a two-storey elevation insufficiently separated off the shared boundary which would be inimical to the enjoyment of adjacent property. The development is therefore unacceptable for the site and fails to comply with Policy ENV2 and the Design SPD.

3. Highways and Parking

The scheme would increase the number of bedrooms within the house from three to five. The submitted Site Plan shows three parking spaces to the front as part of a new driveway. This is ample parking for a five bedroom house and the scheme complies with Policy 31.

LCC Highways have suggested conditions regarding the use of bound surfacing materials for the driveway and limiting the times of materials deliveries. Bound materials should be applied to the driveway in order to maintain highway safety. The use of a condition limiting deliveries would not be prudent as this cannot be controlled through such mechanisms.

LCC Highways have raised no principle objections and I concur with their findings. The development would not generate significant numbers of vehicular movements and it therefore raises no adverse highway safety concerns regarding the local highway network.

4. Drainage

Comments have been received about the potential for negative impacts on the sewage network. Drainage for domestic extensions is finalised post application at the Building Regulations stage. Any previous drainage issues in the local area ultimately do not affect the determination of this application.

5. Summary

The proposal seeks to erect a two-storey extension to the side, a part double, part single-storey extension to the rear and a front canopy. It would have no detrimental effects on the privacy of neighbours. It is also acceptable in terms of the design, impacts on the local highway network and drainage.

The scheme would however introduce two stories inadequately separated off the shared boundary with 11 Edge End Avenue. The proposed siting and massing of the two-storey side extension would result in severely detrimental impacts on the living environments of the occupiers of adjacent property.

Based on the submitted plans the application is not acceptable however the Applicant has suggested amendments might be forthcoming which may address the concerns raised regarding the impacts on neighbours. These will be provided as part of a Committee Update Report if submitted.

The proposal in its current format is therefore unacceptable for the site and fails to comply with Policy ENV2 of the Pendle Borough Council Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy (2011 – 2030), the Design Principles Supplementary Planning Document.

RECOMMENDATION: Refuse

For the following reasons;

1. The proposed two-storey side extension, by virtue of its siting and massing would result in severely detrimental impacts on the living environments of neighbours and reduced enjoyment of adjacent neighbouring property. The development would thus fail to accord with Policy ENV2 of the Pendle Borough Council Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy (2011 – 2030) and the adopted Design Principles Supplementary Planning Document.

