

Barrowford and Western Parishes Committee – Planning Update Report - 4th December 2024

24/0758/HHO 40 Lower Parrock Road Barrowford

Consultee Comments

Parish Council

Objection: the Revised Plans do not address the reason for Refusal: The revised application does not reduce the size and massing of the front first floor dormer in fact it slightly increases the mass. The only discernible variation from the refused application is the raising of the rear of the dormer roof to the height of the main ridge line and sloping the dormer roof from the ridgeline of the house to the front of the dormer without materially diminishing the size and massing of the dormer. When viewed from side elevation 1 a small angle of fall from rear to front elevation is created by raising the starting point to the ridgeline. Giving the impression of a slight reduction on the side elevation to the original flat roof refused in the previous application. The applicant seems to have missed the point that it is the extension of the dormer to close proximity with the ground floor frontage which produces the adverse effect to the streetscape by varying the normal dormer configuration to almost a flat roofed first floor to the front elevation. The proposed extension of the dormer which although may be acceptable to a rear elevation shows poor design and lack of consideration to the overall aesthetics' of the frontage within the wider streetscape through size and massing. The development would represent poor design and would be contrary to paragraph 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework, Policy ENV2 and the Design Principle Supplementary Planning Document. The proposed development would be contrary to paragraph 134 in the National Planning Policy Framework on design, to Policy ENV 2 of the adopted Part 1 Pendle Local Plan - Core Strategy, and to the Design Principle Supplementary Planning Document.

Officer Comments

The issues raised has been addressed in the Officer's report and does not change the recommendation which remains for refusal.

24/0759/HHO 38 Lower Parrock Road, Barrowford

Public Response

The nearest neighbours have been consulted, with one response objecting, relating to:

Our concern is the overall size of the proposed dormer extension. The open view/light from my father's front door/drive will be impacted, no longer open but will be blocked with the proposed extension.

None of the surrounding properties have dormer extensions built to this size/extent out to the front of the property, the proportions of the extension, in our opinion, don't fit with the existing dormer bungalows in the surrounding neighbourhood.

Consultee Response

Parish Council

Objection the Revised Plans do not address the reason for Refusal:

The revised application does not reduce the size and massing of the front first floor dormer in fact it slightly increases the mass. The only discernible variation from the refused application is the raising of the rear of the dormer roof to the height of the main ridge line and sloping the dormer roof from the ridgeline of the house to the front of the dormer without materially diminishing the size and massing of the dormer.

When viewed from side elevation 1 a small angle of fall from rear to front elevation is created by raising the starting point to the ridgeline. Giving the impression of a slight reduction on the side elevation to the original flat roof refused in the previous application.

The applicant seems to have missed the point that it is the extension of the dormer to close proximity with the ground floor frontage which produces the adverse effect to the streetscape by varying the normal dormer configuration to almost a flat roofed first floor to the front elevation.

The proposed extension of the dormer which although may be acceptable to a rear elevation shows poor design and lack of consideration to the overall aesthetics' of the frontage within the wider streetscape through size and massing. The development would represent poor design and would be contrary to paragraph 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework, Policy ENV2 and the Design Principle Supplementary Planning Document. The proposed development would be contrary to paragraph 134 in the National Planning Policy Framework on design, to Policy ENV 2 of the adopted Part 1 Pendle Local Plan - Core Strategy, and to the Design Principle Supplementary Planning Document.

Officer Comments

The issues raised has been addressed in the Officer's report and does not change the recommendation which remains for refusal.