



REPORT FROM: PLANNING, ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND
REGULATORY SERVICES MANAGER

TO: BRIERFIELD AND REEDLEY COMMITTEE

DATE: 8th July 2020

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 application.

REPORT TO BRIERFIELD AND REEDLEY COMMITTEE ON 8TH JULY 2020

Application Ref: 20/0200/HHO

Proposal: Full: Erection of part two storey extension and part single storey extension to rear, front porch with balcony above and extension to driveway (Re-Submission).

At: 11 Clements Drive, Reedley

On Behalf of: Mr Attiq Raza Azam

Date Registered: 18 March, 2020

Expiry Date: 10 July 2020

Case Officer: Christian Barton

Site Description and Proposal

This application is to be decided at committee as it has received more than 3 objections.

The application site is a detached two-storey dwelling located in the settlement of Reedley. It is surrounded by similar dwellings to three sides with bungalows to the west. The house has brick elevations, a concrete tiled roof, white uPVC windows and garden areas to the front and rear.

This proposed development involves the erection of a split level rear extension. The extension would project 3m from the rear at two-stories with a further 2.3m provided by a single-storey element. The two-storey extension would have a dual-pitched roof with a mono-pitched roof proposed for the single-storey element. Brick and concrete tiles would be used to finish the extension with uPVC windows also proposed. Alterations to the front elevation including a balcony and canopy are also shown on the submitted plans together with windows alterations which have been approved previously.

Relevant Planning History

19/0749/HHO – Full: Erection of two-storey extension to rear, front porch with balcony above and extension to driveway – Approved with Conditions – January 2020.

Consultee Response

LCC Highways

The Highway Development Support Section would raise no objection to this proposed development subject to three appropriately surfaced parking spaces being provided within the site.

Reedley Hallows Parish Council

The Parish Council wish to object to this application on the ground that they consider there is over development on a plot designed for a smaller property. Furthermore the Parish Council understand that work has been carried out at the rear of the property without permission.

Public Response

A site notice has been posted and public comments have been received objecting on the following

grounds;

- The extensions scale, balcony and front canopy is not in keeping to the area;
- Losses of privacy;
- Increased parking demands;
- The potential for highway safety impacts;
- People may smoke on the balcony;
- The site address is incorrect;
- The site notice may potentially have been tampered with.

Officer Comments

The main considerations for this application are the design, residential amenity and highways.

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

- CS Policy ENV2 (Achieving Quality in Design) identifies the need to protect and enhance the character of the Borough and quality of life for its residents by encouraging high standards of quality and design in new development. It states that the siting and design of development should be in scale, context and harmony with the wider locality.

Other policies and guidance are also relevant:

- Saved Policy 31 of the Replacement Local Plan (Parking) sets out appropriate parking standards for new developments;
- The Design Principles Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) applies to domestic developments and sets out the aspects required for good design.

The principle policy relating to this development proposal is 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 is also relevant given the proposed addition of bedrooms.

2. Design and Visual Amenity

The Design Principles SPD states that the style, design and scale of domestic developments should respect the existing character of the location which is predominantly defined by modern brick built dwellings of varying styles. The materials proposed for the extensions walls and roof would match the dwelling and are acceptable. Concerns have been raised regarding the balcony and canopy yet those elements were approved under the previous scheme and any required design alterations were appropriately addressed through that previous submission. The proposed driveway alterations would also be appropriate for this modern dwelling.

Concerns have also been raised regarding the rear extensions scale. This scheme would include a larger extension in terms of volume when compared to the previous submission yet all of the new elements would be located to the rear and this revised scheme would be acceptable within a modern housing estate. The additional massing provided by the new elements would not alter the character of the property to the extent which would justify refusing this application and the scheme would be acceptable in visual design terms thereby according with Policy ENV2 and the guidance of the Design Principles SPD.

3. Residential Amenity

In general terms, the Design Principles SPD states that two-storey rear extensions should be designed to avoid having an overbearing impact, or causing unacceptable losses of light or privacy for neighbours. Balconies should also be considered carefully in relation to their siting and potential to overlook adjacent dwellings.

The extension would project less than 1m beyond the rear elevation of number 9 to the east. Given that relationship its scale would not appear overbearing, or cause any unacceptable losses of light for those neighbours with ample separation maintained between the other immediate adjacent dwellings to prevent any similar impacts.

Concerns have been raised regarding the potential for privacy impacts. New windows are proposed facing in three directions with this scheme together with a front balcony. The porch windows would not serve a main habitable room and the limited footprint of that element would prevent any uses alternate to an entrance point. Facing west a glazed kitchen door would be installed in excess of 21m from windows to the front of 4 Eagley Road. The windows proposed for the rear and east side elevation would not face any main habitable room windows in adjacent dwellings. 18m and a highway would separate the front balcony from windows at 1 Watkins Close which is sufficient to prevent that element having an adverse impact on the privacy of those neighbours.

As proposed the scheme would therefore have no material impacts on the domestic privacy of the immediate neighbours and would be acceptable in relation to residential amenity in compliance with Policy ENV2 and the guidance of the Design Principles SPD.

4. Highways

The proposal would provide two additional bedrooms to the site increasing parking demand. Concerns have been raised regarding parking and highway safety impacts. With additional parking in place within the site for at least three cars the scheme would not compromise highway safety to an unacceptable extent.

A condition has therefore been added to ensure additional parking is provided and appropriately surfaced in order to minimise the impacts of on-street parking. LCC Highways have raised no objections and I concur with their findings. Subject to additional parking being provided, the proposal would have no unacceptable impacts on highway safety.

5. Other Issues

Concerns have been raised regarding potential discrepancies with the site address yet the postcode added to the submitted application form removes all ambiguity in that respect. Comments have also been made regarding the site notice potentially being tampered with. Photos are on file of the site notice correctly displayed and the Council cannot reasonably monitor the position of site notices once in place. People potentially smoking on the balcony has also been cited as a concern though that comment is immaterial to the assessment of this householder application.

6. Summary

The application involves the erection of a two-storey rear extension with a front porch, balcony and associated works. Subject to appropriate conditions, the proposal would be acceptable in terms of design, residential amenity and highways in the accordance with Policy ENV2, Saved Policy 31 and the guidance of the Design Principles SPD.

Reason for Decision

Section 38 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that applications be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Subject to appropriate conditions, the development would be acceptable in terms of design, residential amenity and highways. The development therefore complies with the development plan. There is a positive presumption in favour of approving the development and there are no material reasons to object to the application.

RECOMMENDATION: Approve

1. The proposed development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: Required to be imposed by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in strict accordance with the following approved plans: U54: P01 and P02E.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

3. All materials to be used for the proposed development hereby approved shall be as stated on the application form and approved drawings and they shall not be varied without the prior written permission of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: Those materials are appropriate for the development and site.

4. The additional bedrooms hereby approved shall not be brought into use unless and until, the parking area as shown on the approved plan 'U54 P02E' has first been constructed, laid out and surfaced in a bound porous material, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The parking spaces shall thereafter remain free from obstruction and be available for the parking of vehicles associated with the occupants of the dwelling.

Reason: To provide adequate parking to service the development and to prevent loose surface material from being carried on to the public highway thus causing a potential source of danger to other road users.

Informative

This consent requires the construction, improvement or alteration of an access to the public highway. Under the Highways Act 1980 Section 184 (Vehicle crossings over footways and verges) Lancashire County Council as Highway Authority must specify the works to be carried out. Only the Highway Authority or a contractor approved by the Highway Authority can carry out these works. Therefore, before any works can start, the applicant must complete the online quotation form found on Lancashire County Council's website using the A-Z search facility for vehicular crossings at <http://www.lancashire.gov.uk/roads-parking-and-travel/roads/vehicle-crossings.aspx>.

Application Ref: 20/0200/HHO

Proposal: Full: Erection of part two storey extension and part single storey extension to rear, front porch with balcony above and extension to driveway (Re-Submission).

At: 11 Clements Drive, Reedley

On Behalf of: Mr Attiq Raza Azam

LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS

Planning Applications

NW/MP

Date: 23rd June 2020