

## **Nelson Committee Update Report – 7<sup>th</sup> January 2019**

### **18/0660/FUL – Land Adj. No. 8 Rakes House Road, Nelson**

Amended plans have been received.

These plans remove the balcony element from the front elevation onto Algar St and include two off-street parking spaces which addresses the concern regarding the balcony and overlooking. Comments are awaited from LCC regarding these two proposed off street spaces. If LCC find these acceptable then this will address the concern over lack of parking provision. Additional conditions may be required.

The issue of the two windows facing the back street and potential overlooking of no.'s 21-25 Lee Road still stands and it is recommended that that conditions be required for obscure glazing and no further fenestration on this elevation and these can be attached to any grant of permission.

Recommendation to Refuse still stands for the following reason.

1. The proposed block of flats would represent poor design in terms of its siting, scale and massing. The two storey block would be out of keeping with the area and would introduce an incongruous feature in this prominent location and streetscene. The proposed scheme therefore fails to demonstrate good design contrary to Policy ENV2 of the Pendle Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy (2011-2030), the Design Principles Supplementary Planning Document and Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

### **18/0731/HHO – 6 Ethersall Road, Nelson**

Additional supporting photographs and amended plans were received on 3<sup>rd</sup> January 2019. The amended plan showed the extension to be reduced in depth by 1 metre, from 9.3 metres to 8.3 metres.

Despite the reduction in depth by 1 metre, when a 45 degree line is drawn from the ground floor rear facing windows of No.4 and No.8 Ethersall Road towards the proposed extension, there is still a substantial breach. Whilst this would be mitigated by level differences in relation to No.8, it would result in a significant detrimental impact on light to occupants of the adjoining dwelling at No.4.

Therefore, the application is not acceptable due to the detrimental impact on residential amenity.

Recommendation to Refuse still stands.