

REPORT OF: ASSISTANT DIRECTOR PLANNING, BUILDING
CONTROL AND REGULATORY SERVICES

TO: DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

DATES: 18TH JUNE 2024

Contact Details: 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 DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE 18th JUNE 2024

Application Ref: 24/0240/FUL

Proposal: Full: Installation of a new shop front with shutter.

At: 88 Manchester Road, Nelson

On behalf of: Mr Zaka Mohammed Alnoor

Date Registered: 29/04/2024

Expiry Date: 24/06/2024

Case Officer: Laura Barnes

This report has been referred from Nelson, Brierfield & Reedley Committee as Members were minded to approve the application contrary to officer recommendation. The development results in the removal of a timber shopfront including stallriser, the removed of traditional features results in harm to the significance of the Whitefield Conservation Area and would represent a significant departure from the guidance of the Conservation Area Design & Development SPD, Design Principles SPD and Policies ENV1 and ENV2 of the Core Strategy.

Site Description and Proposal

The application site relates to an existing office on Manchester Road, within the settlement boundary of Nelson, the Town Centre Boundary and within the Whitefield Conservation Area.

The application does not involve the change of use of any part of the building, it is simply for an external alteration including the insertion of a shop front and a shutter. The application is retrospective. At the time of the site visit the shop front and shutter had already been installed. The shutter which had been installed was a solid metal style, with no perforation. However, the application form indicates that the proposed shutter would have perforation.

Relevant Planning History

23/0544/FUL: Full: Erection of a single storey extension to the ground floor living accommodation at rear of shop.

Approved with conditions.

Consultee Response

LCC Highways

Having reviewed the documents submitted, Lancashire County Council acting as the Local Highway Authority does not raise an objection regarding this retrospective application and are of the opinion that the development will not have a significant impact on highway safety, capacity or amenity in the immediate vicinity of the site.

Environmental Health

Do you know if there are residential properties above the commercial properties on this block?

If there is can we condition the development so that the shutters up and close on a motor, so that the descent is controlled and doesn't make loads of noise?

Public Response

Nearest neighbours have been notified, a site & press notice have been displayed and no response has been received.

Officer Comments

Policy

Pendle Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy (LPP1)

Policy ENV1 (Protecting and Enhancing our Natural and Historic Environments) seeks to support development which make a positive contribution to the protection, enhancement, conservation and interpretation of our natural and historic environments.

Policy ENV2 states that all new development should seek to deliver the highest possible standards of design, in form and sustainability, and be designed to meet future demands whilst enhancing and conserving heritage assets.

ENV4 sets out that where an adverse impact [upon highway safety] is identified, applicants should ensure adequate cost effective mitigation measures can be put in place. Where the residual cumulative impacts of the development are severe, planning permission should be refused.

Policy WRK4 (Retailing and Town Centres) states that main town centre uses should follow the following sequential approach:

- 1: Town and local shopping centres
- 2: Edge of centre locations

3: Out-of-centre sites which are well serviced by a choice of means of transport and have a higher likelihood of forming links with a nearby centre

Replacement Pendle Local Plan (RPLP)

Policy 25 states that new retail and service development should be located within a defined town centre as the first order of priority. The supporting text states that where existing commercial uses exist outside of a town centre they can be replaced by some other commercial use of the same scale.

Policy 31 (Parking) requires that new developments provide parking in line with the levels set out in Appendix 1 of the RPLP.

Conservation Area Design & Development Guidance SPD.

Design & Heritage

The site is located inside the town centre boundary and the settlement boundary. The application site is also located in the Conservation Area. The Conservation Area Design & Development SPD sets out the Council's approach to development including shop fronts. It states that new and replacement shopfronts should be of a high standard of design, of good quality materials, and well related to the individual building and the streetscene. New and replacement shopfronts will normally be approved only if they maintain or improve upon the quality of the front they are to replace, and where they relate well to the building and to the street scene in materials, form and proportion. In this case the applicant has removed a traditional shop front which had traditional features such as a stallriser, with a full height window pane. This removes the traditional shop front elements. The development would not maintain or improve the quality of the shop front which it replaces. It amounts to poor design, contrary to paragraph 139 of the Framework.

As such, in principle the development of this nature is not supported. It amounts to poor design which would have an unacceptable impact upon the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The unacceptable impact would result in less than substantial harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, which is not outweighed by public benefit. This is contrary to paragraph 208 of the Framework.

The proposed plans indicate that there will be a shutter installed which has perforation / slots allowing visibility through to the shop even with the shutter in the closed position. However, at the time of the site visit the shutter was a solid metal shutter with no perforation and therefore no visibility to the shop, creating a completely vacant / blank frontage. If the applicant were to install a shutter which has some visibility / perforation this would not be as harmful to the wider character and appearance as the existing solid metal shutter.

Overall, the development results in less than substantial harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. This conflicts with paragraph 208 of the Framework as there are no public benefits outweighing this harm. The development conflicts with Policies ENV1 and ENV2 of the Local Plan: Part 1 Core Strategy, the Conservation Area Design & Development Guidance SPD and the Design Principles SPD.

Amenity

There would be no unacceptable impact in terms of residential amenity as a result of the proposed shop front, it does not involve any habitable living accommodation at the ground floor level, neither are there any habitable room windows within a 21m distance of the development site.

The Council's Environmental Health Officer has raised concerns about the noise associated with the roller shutter mechanism. The shutter has been installed for some time and there have been no noise complaints associated with this issue. As such, it would be an unreasonable request to condition that the applicant must install a motorised shutter in the interests of neighbouring amenity.

Overall, in terms of amenity issues there would be no unacceptable impacts, in accordance with Policy ENV2 of the Local Plan: Part 1 Core Strategy.

Highways

The development would not result in any unacceptable highway impact.

As such, the proposed development accords with Policy ENV4 of the Local Plan: Part 1 Core Strategy.

RECOMMENDATION: Refuse

1. The retrospectively proposed shopfront removes traditional features present in the previously existing shopfront and represents poor design which would result in harm to the visual amenity of the area and less than substantial harm to the significance of Conservation Area which is not outweighed by any public benefit, contrary to Policies ENV1 & ENV2 of the Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy, the Conservation Area Design & Development Guidance Supplementary Planning Document, Design Principles Supplementary Planning Document and paragraphs 139 and 208 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Application Ref: 24/0240/FUL

Proposal: Full: Installation of a new shop front with shutter.

At: 88 Manchester Road, Nelson

On behalf of: Mr Zaka Mohammed Alnoor

REPORT TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE 18th JUNE 2024

Application Ref: 24/0267/HHO

Proposal: Full: Erection of a front and rear dormer to facilitate a loft conversion and a first-floor rear extension.

At 119 Clayton Street, Nelson, Lancashire

On behalf of: Ms Shabnam Kanval

Date Registered: 26.04.2024

Expiry Date: 21.06.2024

Case Officer: Athira Pushpagaran

This report has been referred from Nelson, Brierfield & Reedley Committee as Members were minded to approve the application contrary to officer recommendation. The development would result in harm to the significance of the Whitefield Conservation Area and would represent a significant departure from the guidance of the Design Principles SPD and Policies ENV1 and ENV2 of the Core Strategy.

Site Description and Proposal

The application site is an end terrace dwelling situated within a predominantly residential neighbourhood within the settlement boundary of Nelson. The dwelling is situated at the corner where Clayton Street meets Albert Street. The main access is from Clayton Street, with the gable elevation facing the street. There is an ATC hut across the street from the application site to its northwest, a window supplier warehouse to the North and the Whitefield Infant School and Nursery to the southwest. The existing dwelling has stone walls to all sides except the elevations to the back street which are finished in render and pebbledash, UPVC doors and windows with stone surrounds and a pitched roof of tiles. The application site is situated within the Whitefield Conservation Area.

The proposed development is the erection of front and rear dormers to accommodate 2 new bedrooms and a bathroom by a loft conversion and a first-floor rear extension. The proposal would increase the total number of bedrooms from two to four.

Relevant Planning History

13/10/0364P Full: Erection of domestic single storey extension to rear. Approved with Conditions

Consultee Response

Highways

Lancashire County Council acting as the Highway Authority does not raise an objection regarding the proposed development and are of the opinion that the proposed development will not have a significant impact on highway safety, capacity or amenity in the immediate vicinity of the site.

Parish/Town Council

No response

Public Response

One neighbour objection has been received raising the following issues:

- impact on the natural light at the rear of the property
- plants growing out of the ledge formed by existing extension
- the application site's rainwater flows into neighbour's rain pipe
-

Relevant Planning Policy

Pendle Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy

Policy SDP1 takes a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the National Planning Policy Framework.

Policy ENV1 seeks to ensure a particularly high design standard that preserves or enhances the character and appearance of the area and its setting. It states that the impact of new developments on the natural environment, including biodiversity, should be kept to a minimum.

Policy ENV2 identifies the need to protect and enhance the heritage and 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 siting and design should be in scale and harmony with its surroundings.

Replacement Pendle Local Plan

Saved Policy 31 sets out the maximum parking standards for development.

National Planning Policy Framework

The Framework states that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. It states that there are three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental. The policies in the

Framework, taken as a whole, constitute the Government's view of what sustainable development in England means in practice for the planning system.

Paragraph 139 states that development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design⁵⁵, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes

Paragraph 208 states that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.

The Design Principles Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) applies to extensions and sets out the aspects required for good design and protecting residential amenity.

The Conservation Area Design and Development Guidance SPD sets out that new development should use good quality and predominantly natural building materials, be well detailed, and respect local architectural detailing and styles. It provides specific guidance on development relating to agricultural building and their sensitive adaptation to other uses.

Officer Comments

The proposed development is in a residential area situated within the settlement boundary of Nelson. There are no underlying policies which would prevent the development in principle. The principal material considerations for the application are as follows:

Design and Materials

The Design Principles SPD advises care should be exercised with the insertions of dormers, to ensure that their design is in keeping with the dwelling and that they do not overlook neighbouring property. Dormers should not be so large as to dominate the roof slope resulting in a property which appears unbalanced.

The proposal seeks to erect full width flat roof dormers to both the front and rear elevations which dominates the entire roof slope of the dwelling and would have a harmful effect upon the character and appearance of the original dwelling. To the front elevation, this also has a wider effect on the street scene in a terrace which has a simple and uninterrupted roof line. The proposed dormers would have grey composite cladding on its front and side walls and membrane on its roof. Whilst to the rear a dormer may be inserted under Permitted Development in some circumstances, one of the conditions within the Permitted Development order is that the materials are similar in appearance to the existing roof materials. The materials for both the dormers differ from the original slate roof of the dwelling. Additionally, the application site being an end terrace dwelling situated at a street corner, its rear elevation is also highly visible on the street scene.

Therefore, the proposed dormers would cause harm to the character and appearance of the original dwelling and have a wider impact upon visual amenity and would be unacceptable in accordance with Policy ENV2 and the Design Principles SPD

The proposal also consists of a first-floor rear extension above an existing ground floor extension. Design principles SPD advises that two storey extensions should normally have a pitched roof and should not breach the 45-degree guidance for neighbouring properties. In addition, where the properties are attached and the neighbouring property has no extension adjacent to the boundary, any first-floor element of an extension should be set in from the party boundary by a minimum of 1m.

The proposal includes a first-floor extension adjoining the party boundary and would be flat roofed. The proposed extension would have stone finish to the elevation facing Clayton Street and render to the side and rear elevations. The application site has a gabled first floor dormer element to the rear, otherwise there is no context of other two-storey rear extensions in the neighbourhood visually connected to the application site. The proposed second storey flat roof extension would be highly visible from public vantage points and would have an unacceptable impact on the character of the street scene.

Overall, the proposed development represents poor design and conflicts with paragraph 139 of the Framework, policies ENV1 and ENV2, the Conservation Area Design and Development Guidance SPD and the Design principles SPD.

Heritage

The application site takes a prominent position within the Conservation Area, given that it is the end terraced property on a row which has a gable onto Clayton Street. The front dormer would interrupt the otherwise continuous and simple roofline of the terrace along Albert Street, and the rear dormer would be highly visible from Clayton Street. The proposed dormers would result in harm to the character and appearance of the Whitefield Conservation Area, which is made up of terraced dwellings without dormers. The harm to the Conservation Area would be “less than substantial” but would not be outweighed by any benefit, in accordance with paragraph 208 of the Framework. As such, the proposed development does not accord with the Framework in relation to heritage assets.

Residential Amenity

The proposed development would have three new windows to the gable elevation facing Clayton Street. These windows would not face any residential properties and would look towards the ATC hut across the street. The proposal would introduce two new dormer windows to the front and rear of the terrace. The front dormer would look towards the Whitefield Infant School and Nursery while the rear dormer would look directly towards a Garage site. The rear dormers would also have views into the rear windows of 69 Stanley Street separated by a distance of circa 13m. However, there is an already existing

relationship between rear windows of both the terraces facing each other and the proposed dormers would not have any greater impact.

The existing rear extension already breaches the 45-degree guidance for the ground floor rear window of adjoining No.62 Albert Street. The proposed first-floor extension would further exacerbate the overbearing impact and would breach the 45-degree guidance for the first-floor window too. The proposed extension would also result in a loss of outlook for the residents and therefore would have an unacceptable impact on the living conditions of No 62.

Therefore, the proposed development would not be acceptable in terms of residential amenity in accordance with ENV1 and ENV2 and the Design principles SPD.

Highways

The development raises no issues of highway safety.

Other Matters

Neighbours have raised objection in relation to an existing issue with rainwater. This is not a material consideration in the determination of this particular application as it relates to an existing issue. Proposed development cannot be expected to resolve existing issues. Similarly, a complaint about plants growing on a ledge overhanging the neighbouring dwelling is a private matter which is not determinative in this case.

RECOMMENDATION: Refuse

For the following reason(s):

1. By virtue of its position upon a prominent roof slope of the dwelling, the proposed dormer would have an unacceptable impact upon the design of the original dwelling and in turn cause harm to the wider character and appearance of the Whitefield Conservation Area. It represents poor design, contrary to paragraph 139 of the Framework and is in conflict with paragraph 208 of the Framework because the harm is not outweighed by any public benefit. The proposal is also contrary to Policies ENV1 & ENV2 of the Local Plan: Part 1 Core Strategy and the Design Principles SPD.
2. The proposed development would have an overbearing impact on the residential amenity of neighbours resulting in an unacceptable impact on the living environment of the occupants of 62 Albert Street and hence would be contrary to policy ENV2 of the Local Plan: Part 1 Core Strategy, and the principles set out in the Adopted Pendle Design Principles Supplementary Planning Document.
- 3.

Application Ref: 24/0267/HHO

Proposal: Full: Erection of a front and rear dormer to facilitate a loft conversion and a first-floor rear extension.

At 119 Clayton Street, Nelson, Lancashire

On behalf of: Ms Shabnam Kanval

REPORT TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE 18th JUNE 2024

Application Ref: 24/0278/HHO

Proposal: Full: Erection of two-storey side and rear extension, 2 no. single storey rear extensions, a side porch and boundary treatment works.

At 129 Marsden Hall Road North, Nelson, Lancashire

On behalf of: Mr Muneeb UI Hassan

Date Registered: 30.04.2024

Expiry Date: 25.06.2024

Case Officer: Athira Pushpagaran

This report has been referred from Nelson, Brierfield & Reedley Committee as a potential issue of maladministration by the Council has been raised.

Site Description and Proposal

The application site is an end-terraced dwelling within the settlement boundary of Nelson at a staggered junction between Marsden Hall Road North, Hollins Road and Merclesden Avenue. The main pedestrian access is from Marsden Hall Road North. The application site is situated within a short, isolated line of terrace houses surrounded by open spaces in a visually prominent position within the neighbourhood. It is clearly visible on approach from Marsden Hall Road North, Hollins Road and Merclesden Avenue.

The proposed development is the erection of a two-storey extension to the side which extends the existing roof line, a rear two-storey pitch roof extension, a single-storey pitched roof rear extension, single-storey infill extension and the creation of a new drive with provision for additional off-street parking. It is noted that the proposed development relating to this application is identical to the scheme which was refused in 24/0117/HHO.

Relevant Planning History

23/0852/HHO Full: Erection of a two-storey side and rear extension, single storey rear extension and boundary treatment works. Refused

24/0117/HHO Full: Erection of a two-storey side extension, single storey rear extension & boundary treatment works. Refused

Consultee Response

Highways

Having reviewed the documents submitted, Lancashire County Council acting as the local highway authority does not raise an objection regarding the proposed development and are of the opinion that the proposed development will not have a significant impact on highway safety, capacity or amenity in the immediate vicinity of the site.

Proposal

The proposal is for the erection of a two-storey side and rear extension, two single storey rear extensions, a side porch and boundary treatment works. This will increase the number of bedrooms from four to five.

Car & cycle parking

The highway authority would usually request three off-road parking spaces for the number of bedrooms proposed, in line with the borough council's Parking Standards. However, as there is no existing parking the provision of two off-road spaces is a betterment and the highway authority considers that the third space can be provided on-road. 2 The hardstanding/driveway must be surfaced in a bound porous material to prevent loose surface material from being carried onto the adjacent public highway network where it could pose a hazard to other highway users. It should also be constructed to prevent surface water flowing from the public highway into the site.

Secure, covered storage for two cycles should also be provided in line with the borough council's Parking Standards.

As off-road parking is to be provided an electric vehicle charging point should also be installed, which will improve the site's sustainability. This shall be fitted in line with the Dept for Transport's guidance regarding Electric Vehicle Charging in Residential and Non-residential Buildings, which states that charge points must have a minimum power rating output of 7kW and be fitted with a universal socket that can charge all types of electric vehicles.

Vehicle crossing

A new dropped vehicle crossing will need to be constructed on Marsden Hall Road North to access the proposed off-road parking. This will need to be carried out under an agreement (Section 171) with Lancashire County Council, as the highway authority. The construction of the vehicle crossing may require the re-location of street lighting column 29, which will be at the applicant's expense. In addition, any works required for the relocation/strengthening of any footway utility box/boxes will be at the applicant's expense.

Construction phase

Due to the site's location within a residential estate, on a bus route and close to Castercliffe Primary Academy on Marsden Hall Road North and on a route to Pendle Vale College on Oxford Road/Hollins Road a condition should be applied restricting the times of deliveries by HGVs to ensure that there is no conflict with traffic, both vehicular and pedestrian, at peak times. The following conditions and informative notes should be applied to any formal planning approval granted.

Parish/Town Council

No response

Public Response

One neighbour objection has been received raising the following issues:

- Worsening the traffic on an already busy and accident-prone junction near a school which is expanding
- Danger to pedestrians and vehicles
- Poor design
- Overlooking neighbour's gardens
- Obstruct views
- Infringe on neighbour's privacy
- Setting a bad precedent
-

Relevant Planning Policy

Pendle Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy

Policy SDP1 takes a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the National Planning Policy Framework.

Policy ENV1 seeks to ensure a particularly high design standard that preserves or enhances the character and appearance of the area and its setting. It states that the impact of new developments on the natural environment, including biodiversity, should be kept to a minimum.

Policy ENV2 identifies the need to protect and enhance the heritage and 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 siting and design should be in scale and harmony with its surroundings.

Replacement Pendle Local Plan

Saved Policy 31 sets out the maximum parking standards for development.

National Planning Policy Framework

The Framework states that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. It states that there are three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental. The policies in the Framework, taken as a whole, constitute the Government's view of what sustainable development in England means in practice for the planning system.

Para 139 of the framework states that development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes.

The Design Principles Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) applies to extensions and sets out the aspects required for good design.

The proposed development is in a residential area situated within the settlement boundary of Nelson. There are no underlying policies which would prevent the development in principle. The principal material considerations for the application are as follows:

Design and Materials

The application site is an end-terraced dwelling situated within a short, isolated line of terrace houses surrounded by open spaces resulting in its visually prominent position within the neighbourhood. The line of terraced dwellings has a continuous sloping roof that end at the application site with a turned gable forming dormers to the front and rear. The exterior of the existing dwelling is finished with pebble dash and has UPVC windows like the other dwellings of the terrace. There is no other context of storey extensions in the area which are visually related to the application site.

The proposed development consists of a pitched roof two-storey extension to the side less than the width of the original dwelling. This in itself would not be unacceptable in principle. However, this would result in a dormer element to the roof mid-terrace which would erode the design quality of the dwelling and its setting. The proposed development consists of a porch of dimensions 2.9m x 1.5m to the side of the proposed two-storey side extension. The design of the porch by itself would not be unacceptable.

The proposed extension to the rear has a two-storey pitched roof element, a single-storey pitched roof element to the back of the two-storey element and an infill single storey sloping roof element near the party boundary. The Design principles SPD advises for pitched roof extensions against flat roof extensions. The SPD also advises extensions to be designed to appear subordinate in scale to the original dwelling. The application site in this case is highly prominent within the street scene with its rear and side elevations visible from two roads. Albeit having a pitched roof design, the overall scale and massing of the proposed extensions would not be sympathetic to the scale of the original dwelling and would not appear subordinate to it would have an adverse impact on the street scene. The various elements of the rear extension would be highly visible from the highway and

would appear disjointed and cluttered especially considering it is a prominent end terrace property. Therefore, the proposed rear and side extensions would be of poor design and have an overbearing impact on the character and scale of the dwelling and its surroundings and would thus be unacceptable and contrary to policies ENV1, ENV2, the Design principles SPD and paragraph 139 of the NPPF.

The proposed development would be finished in white k-render and anthracite grey or black UPVC windows as opposed to the existing pebble dash render and white UPVC windows. The proposed new boundary wall would have smooth render as opposed to the existing and neighbouring wooden picket fence. The difference in proposed materials would further contribute to the detrimental impact of the proposed development on its setting. However, this could be controlled through a condition on materials.

Overall, the proposed development would be of an unsympathetic scale and design in a prominent and exposed location. It would thus be contrary to policies ENV1 and ENV2, para 139 of the National Planning Policy Framework and the guidance set out in the Design principles SPD.

Residential Amenity

The proposed development consists of a two-storey extension to the side and a porch on to this extension. The side extension would have habitable room windows both on the ground and first floor, but they will not be facing any neighbouring properties. This element of the proposed development would thus have no unacceptable impact on residential amenity.

The neighbouring No.131 has a conservatory to the rear adjacent to the party boundary. The proposed development has a single-storey sloping-roofed element adjoining the party boundary between the proposed two-storey rear extension and the neighbour's conservatory. There is an existing shed in its place although not as tall as the proposed extension and therefore the overbearing impact due to this element of the proposal would be marginal. The single storey sloping-roofed extension would extend 4m from the rear elevation of the existing dwelling in accordance with the Design principles SPD.

The proposed development has a two-storey pitched roof extension to the rear, extending 3.2m from the rear elevation of the neighbour's conservatory and set back from the party boundary by 2.3m. This element of the proposed development would not breach the 45° guidance set out by the Design principles SPD in terms of residential amenity of neighbours.

The proposed development has a single-storey extension to the back of the proposed two storey extension that extends 8m from the rear elevation of the existing dwelling and would be set back by 3m from the party boundary. The extension would have a habitable room window each to the rear and to the side towards Hollins Road. These would not overlook any neighbouring windows and thus would not impact on the privacy of neighbours. The proposed single-storey sloping-roofed element adjoining the party

boundary would completely block this element of the proposed development from the neighbouring No. 131 and would thus would not have any unacceptable impact on the privacy and living conditions of the neighbour.

In conclusion, the proposed development would be acceptable in terms of residential amenity in accordance with ENV1 and ENV2 and the Design principles SPD.

Highways

LLC Highways raised no objection to the proposed development subject to their comments being noted, and conditions and informative notes being applied to any formal planning approval granted. The hard standing/driveway must be surfaced in a bound porous material to prevent loose surface material from being carried onto the adjacent public highway network where it could pose a hazard to other highway users. It should also be constructed to prevent surface water flowing from the public highway into the site.

LCC requests a condition regarding controlling any HGV construction traffic movements during construction phase. However, given that the proposed development is of a small-scale development it would not be reasonable to impose such a condition in this particular case.

LCC requests a condition regarding the provision of electric vehicle charging points and covered cycle storage for at least two cycles prior to first occupation. However, given that the proposed development is of a small-scale development it would not be reasonable to impose this condition.

LCC requests a condition that prior to occupation dropped kerbs must be installed at the carriageway edge and a vehicle crossover constructed across the footway and grass verge fronting the site onto Marsden Hall Road North. However, since this would be carried out under Section 171 agreement with Lancashire County Council it would not be reasonable to impose this condition.

RECOMMENDATION: Refuse

For the following reason(s):

1. The proposed development would be prominent in the street scene, and its massing, scale and design would be inappropriate to the original scale and character of the property and its surroundings, and hence would be contrary to policies ENV1 and ENV2 of the Adopted Pendle Local Plan, paragraph 139 of the National Planning Policy Framework and the principles set out in the Adopted Pendle Design Principles Supplementary Planning Document.

Application Ref: 24/0278/HHO

Proposal: Full: Erection of two-storey side and rear extension, 2 no. single storey rear extensions, a side porch and boundary treatment works.

At 129 Marsden Hall Road North, Nelson, Lancashire

On behalf of: Mr Muneeb UI Hassan