

<b>REPORT OF:</b>	<b>ASSISTANT DIRECTOR PLANNING, BUILDING CONTROL AND REGULATORY SERVICES</b>
<b>TO:</b>	<b>DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE</b>
<b>DATES:</b>	<b>20TH AUGUST 2024</b>

<b>Contact Details:</b>	<b>Neil Watson</b>
<b>Tel. No:</b>	<b>01282 661706</b>
<b>E-mail:</b>	<b>neil.watson@pendle.gov.uk</b>

## **PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

### **PURPOSE OF REPORT**

To determine the attached planning applications.

## REPORT TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE 20<sup>TH</sup> AUGUST 2024

**Application Ref:** 24/0356/HHO

**Proposal:** Full: Erection of new roof over existing house.

**At:** Monkholme Lodge, Robinson Lane, Brierfield.

**On behalf of:** Mr S. Choudrey.

**Date Registered:** 29/05/2024.

**Expiry Date:** 24/07/2024.

**Case Officer:** Joanne Naylor

This application has been referred to the Development Management Committee as its approval would represent a significant departure from policy.

### **Site Description and Proposal**

The application site is a detached two storey and single storey dwellinghouse located on a generous plot, it has natural stone walls and pitched roof. The site is within the green belt and the open countryside and adjacent to the settlement boundary of Brierfield.

The proposal seeks to erect a new roof over the existing house and the proposed materials would be slate to match the existing.

### **Relevant Planning History**

22/0353/HHO - Full: Erection of first floor and single storey ground floor extensions. Refused 2022

20/0317/HHO - Full: Erection of a first floor extension on the South West side elevation and a first floor balcony on the North West front elevation. Refused 2020

13/10/0449P - Full: Erect single storey domestic side extension. Refused 2010.

13/10/0629P - Full: Erection of single storey domestic side extension to dwelling house (Re-Submission). Approved 2010.

13/13/0472P - Lawful Development Certificate (Proposed use): Use of a detached outbuilding for domestic storage and garaging. Approved 2013.

### **Consultee Response**

#### LCC Highways

Having reviewed the documents submitted, Lancashire County Council acting as the local highway authority does not raise an objection regarding the proposed development

#### Parish/Town Council

No comment.

### **Public Response**

The nearest neighbours have been notified by letter, no responses received.

### **Relevant Planning Policy**

#### Pendle Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy

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.

Saved Policy 31 of the Replacement Pendle Local Plan 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 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) states that poor design should be refused where it fails to reflect local design policies.

Paragraph 152 of the National Planning Framework (2023) states that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.

Paragraph 154 states that the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt, there are exceptions to this which includes:

- (a) buildings for agriculture and forestry;
- (b) the provision of appropriate facilities (in connection with the existing use of land or a change of use) for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation, cemeteries and burial grounds and allotments; as long as the facilities preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it;
- (c) the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building;
- (d) the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces;
- (e) limited infilling in villages;
- (f) limited affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in the development plan (including policies for rural exception sites); and
- (g) limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land, whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would:
  - not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development; or
  - not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt, where the development would re-use previously developed land and contribute to meeting an identified affordable housing need within the area of the local planning authority.

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

Development in the Open Countryside Supplementary Planning Guidance has relevance.

## **Officer Comments**

### **Green Belt**

The site is located within the Green Belt. The exceptions for new buildings that are not inappropriate within the Green Belt include extensions or alterations of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building.

Maps from the 1940s show that a building was in place on the site since the 1940s, however there is not sufficient detail or information to establish the original building and any alterations undertaken since then. A planning application was submitted for an extension, the footprint appears to have remained relatively similar until 2010. Without sufficient information of how the building appeared before 2010, therefore the evidence the Council has from the planning application submitted in 2010 would be taken to show the scale of the original building for the purpose of assessing this application.

The building as it was in 2010 had an external volume of approximately 293m<sup>3</sup>.

In 2013 a large single storey detached garage/storage building was erected, since then an unauthorised side and rear extension was built, and is likely now immune.

Those extensions have increased the total external volume to approximately 737m<sup>3</sup>.

The proposal seeks to erect a new roof to replace the existing roof as the applicant states that the roof is failing and causing damp within the building due to the pitch of the existing roof which is viewed as being inadequate resulting in rainwater ingress and damp due to the existing roof having a pitch of 16 degrees. The existing hipped roof and rear roof would be replaced with a pitched roof with a 30 degree pitch. Although the application site has damp and pests entering the roof space, issues with damp and pests do not constitute very special circumstances.

The existing roof has a volume of approximately 33.47 m<sup>3</sup>, the proposed pitch roof would have a volume of approximately 108.13 m<sup>3</sup>, the proposed pitch roof would result in an additional 74.66m<sup>3</sup> more volume compared to the existing roof. The extensions already in place have increased the total external volume by 444m<sup>3</sup> resulting in an approximate external volume of 737m<sup>3</sup>.

The proposed roof would increase that by approximately 74.66m<sup>3</sup> to 811.66m<sup>3</sup> external volume. That would be a total increase in the external volume of the original building of 177%.

This would represent a significant and disproportionate extension of the original property. There are exceptions to this for extensions and alterations to a building, however it would have to not result in a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original building, in this case the existing extensions and the proposed roof alteration would be disproportionate.

Furthermore, due to the elevated position the proposed roof replacement would be more prominent than the existing roof at 1m high, the proposed roof would be 2.9m high

resulting in an increase of 1.9m over and above the existing roof height. The proposal would be more prominent from public views from Robinson Lane, it would result in unacceptable harm to the openness of the Green Belt and no very special circumstances have been demonstrated to outweigh that harm. The applicant has not provided other options to address the issues of the roof, there are roof systems available which can address water ingress at pitches of 12 degrees for slate tiles.

The proposed roof alteration is contrary to Policy ENV2 and paragraphs 152 – 155 of the Framework.

### **Design and Materials**

The existing dwellinghouse has a hipped roof to the two storey building and a pitched roof to the two storey rear building, the existing roof is 1m high and appears proportionate to the building. The proposed roof would have natural slate tiles, it would increase the height of the roof to 2.9m high, although it would have a pitched roof the proposal would change the design of the dwellinghouse due to the height of the roof, the proposed roof would dominate the dwellinghouse and would be out of character with the dwellinghouse. The proposed development would have a detrimental impact on the appearance of the building due to the proposed roof being 2.9m high, it would be visually prominent from public vantage points and would be out of character to the dwellinghouse, it would result in poor design and would be contrary to paragraph 139 of the Framework, Policies ENV1 and ENV2 of the Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy, the Design Principles SPD.

### **Visual Amenity**

The proposed roof alteration would change the design of the roof from a hipped roof circa 1m high to a pitched roof of circa 2.9m in height, the application site is located on prominent land and the proposed roof would be more prominent due to its greater height compared to the existing, therefore it would cause unacceptable harm to the openness of the Green Belt contrary to Policy ENV2.

### **Impact on Amenity**

The proposed alteration to the roof is sufficient distance from neighbouring properties, it would not result in loss of outlook, loss of privacy nor cause an overbearing impact. Therefore, the proposal would have no unacceptable impact on neighbouring properties and would conform with Policy ENV2 and the Design Principles SPD

### **Highways**

LCC Highways raise no objection to the proposal, therefore it would conform with Policy 31 of the Replacement Local Plan.

## **RECOMMENDATION: Refuse**

For the following reasons:

1. The proposed roof alteration would result in a disproportionate extension of the original building and is therefore inappropriate development in the Green Belt, the extension would cause harm to the openness of the Green Belt and no very special circumstances have been demonstrated that would clearly outweigh that harm, the proposed extension is therefore contrary to policy ENV2 of the Pendle Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy and paragraphs 152-155 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. The proposed development would have a detrimental impact on the appearance of the building, it would be out of scale and character of the building and would be visually prominent from public vantage points. The proposal would result in poor design and would be contrary to paragraph 139 of the Framework, Policies ENV1 and ENV2 of the Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy, and the Design Principles SPD.

Application Ref: 24/0356/HHO

Proposal: Full: Erection of new roof over existing house.

At: Monkholme Lodge, Robinson Lane, Brierfield.

On behalf of: Mr S. Choudrey.