
12. FULL APPLICATION – FIRST FLOOR EXTENSION AND GROUND FLOOR KITCHEN EXTENSION AT ROTHERWOOD, WEST LEES ROAD, BAMFORD (NP/HPK/0716/0614, P.1047B, 420864 / 383756, 22/08/2016/AM)

Please note that the application has been brought to the Planning Committee because the applicant is a member of staff.

Applicant: Mr & Mrs Gordon Danks

Site and Surroundings

Rotherwood is located on the northern edge of Bamford on West Lees Road, approximately 80m to the north east of the Anglers' Rest Hotel.

The property is a single storey detached dwelling constructed from a mixture of gritstone and timber cladding under pitched roofs clad with concrete 'Hardrow' slates. Windows and doors are white uPVC.

Access to the property is directly off West Lees Road, the nearest neighbouring properties are the neighbouring single storey dwellings known as Dunvegan to the north and Longridge to the south.

Proposal

This application seeks planning permission for the erection of a first floor extension above part of the existing dwelling and the erection of a single storey rear extension.

The submitted plans show that part of the dwelling would be extended to provide additional accommodation at first floor level, increasing the total number of bedrooms from 2 to 4. To facilitate this increase, the easternmost part of the dwelling would be increased in height to 4.6m at eaves and 6.3m at ridge (compared to the existing height of 3m at eaves and 4.3m at ridge).

A single storey rear extension is also proposed to accommodate a new dining room. The rear extension would extend beyond the existing kitchen wall by 5m and would be inset from the side of the property and the existing bedroom wing which extends further back into the site.

The extensions would be provided with new uPVC window and door frames, the walls and roofs would be clad with stone and slates to match the existing building.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the application be REFUSED for the following reasons;

- 1. The proposed first floor extension would result in a significant loss of daylight and an overbearing impact upon the neighbouring property known as Longridge which would harm the residential amenity of the occupants. The proposed development would therefore detract from the amenity of neighbouring buildings contrary to Core Strategy policy GSP3, Local Plan Policy LC4 and LH4 and the Authority's adopted design guide and Alterations & Extensions Detailed Design Guide.**

Key Issues

- Whether the proposed extensions would conserve the character, appearance and amenity of the existing building, its setting and that of neighbouring properties.

History

None relevant.

Consultations

Highway Authority – No response to date.

Borough Council – No response to date.

Parish Council - The Parish Council has no objection to this proposal for Rotherwood, and it appears to be a well thought out design for the footprint available. Councillors are mindful that several extensions similar in nature to this proposal have already been built onto other similar houses in West Lees Rd, and that those extensions have not proved to be contentious once built.

Representations

No representations have been received to date.

The agent has submitted a letter from the occupants of Longridge. The letter states that they have no objections and that while there will be some impact on the light level into the room facing Rother wood that this is used as a guest bedroom and finally that the development would not have any significant impact upon views over Rotherwood and that Longridge will not be overlooked by the development.

Main Policies

Relevant Core Strategy policies: GSP3 and L1

Relevant Local Plan policies: LC4, LH4, LT11 and LT18

National Planning Policy Framework

Policies in the Development Plan provide a clear starting point consistent with the National Park's statutory purposes for the determination of this application. It is considered that in this case there is no significant conflict between prevailing policies in the Development Plan and more recent policy in the Framework with regard to the issues that are raised because both documents seek to promote a high standard of design which conserves the valued characteristics of the National Park.

Development Plan

GSP3 and LC4 together say that all development must respect, conserve and enhance all valued characteristics of the site and buildings subject to the development proposal. Particular attention will be paid to impact on the character and setting of buildings, scale of development, design in accordance with the design guide and the impact upon living conditions of communities. L1 says that all development must conserve the landscape character of the National Park.

LH4 is directly relevant to the proposals and allows for extensions and alterations to existing dwellings provided that:

- i. detract from the character, appearance or amenity of the original building, its setting or neighboring buildings; or

- ii. dominate the original dwelling where it is of architectural, historic or vernacular merit; or
- iii. amount to the creation of a separate dwelling or an annexe that could be used as a separate dwelling.

The Authority's Design Guide (2007) and Alterations and Extensions Detailed Design Guide (2014) have been formally adopted by the Authority and therefore are relevant material considerations in the determination of this application.

Assessment

The properties along easternmost part of West Lees Road including the application building are relatively modern dwellings of a suburban rather than vernacular appearance. The properties generally have a uniform appearance with single storey form and utilising natural stone and concrete slate. As has been pointed out by the Parish Council, an existing nearby property has been extended to create a first floor in a manner similar to that proposed in the current application.

The proposed first floor extension would utilise the existing plan of the building and extend upwards by raising the eaves and ridge height of part of the building. There are no objections to the proposed materials which would match the existing building or the resultant form or mass of the building which would not harm the character of the existing building or its setting when read as part of the built development along West Lees Road. There are also no objections to the appearance of the proposed rear extension which would be read as a clear sub-ordinate element and reflect the form and massing of the existing building.

Therefore there are no concerns in this case that subject to conditions to ensure appropriate materials and detailing that the extensions would detract from the character or appearance of the existing building or its setting. There are also no concerns that the proposed increase in height would lead to any perceived change to the mass of the building in the wider landscape which would remain read as part of the wider built up area.

There also appears to be ample space on the existing driveway and in the existing garage for three vehicles to park clear of the highway and therefore there are no concerns that the proposed development would result in any highway safety issues or on-street parking which could harm the amenity of the area.

Officers do however have significant concerns in regard to the potential impact of the proposed first floor extension upon the residential amenity of occupants of the neighbouring property, known as Longridge, due to the relationship of the proposed extension and an existing bedroom window located on the gable of Longridge which faces towards the application site.

Rotherwood and Longridge are separated by a distance of approximately 3m and separated by a central close boarded fence. The bedroom window to Longridge is located on the gable facing towards Rotherwood and is the only window providing light and outlook to this habitable room.

The proposed extension would increase the height of the wall facing towards this window from 3m to 4.6m and given the short distance between this wall and the facing bedroom window Officers have significant concerns that the proposed first floor extension would result in a significant loss of daylight and outlook to that bedroom.

The Authority's Alterations and Extensions Detailed Design Guide provides guidance on neighbourliness impacts and outlook in sections 4.2 – 4.5 and says that outlook, amenity, privacy and daylight are fundamental considerations and that all aspects need to be reasonably protected in existing dwellings. Well-designed extensions should ensure that habitable rooms

achieve a satisfactory level of outlook and natural daylight, adequate privacy and outdoor amenity space and no overbearing or harmful overshadowing of neighbouring properties. Section 4.3 says that where an extension would interfere with the outlook from a habitable room in a neighbouring property to the extent that it is unduly intrusive and oppressive then it is reasonable to resist the proposal.

In assessing the potential impact of the extension, Officers have assessed the proposed extension against the 'skylight indicator' advocated by the Building Research Institute (BRE) as an objective test to understand the potential impact of the proposed first floor extension upon daylight to the facing bedroom window. The 'skylight indicator' is a line drawn at 25 degrees above the horizontal taken from facing wall at a point 2m above ground level. If the new build breaches this line then the indicator is that it is likely that windows in the neighbouring house will be overshadowed.

Given the close distance between the facing bedroom window and the proposed extension (a distance of 3m) it is clear that the proposed extension would breach the skylight indicator. Having visited the site to assess the relationship between the two properties and applied the skylight indicator to the proposed drawings Officers conclude that the proposed extension would result in an overbearing impact upon the occupants of Longridge which would have an unacceptable harmful impact upon their residential amenity contrary to Core Strategy policy GSP3, Local Plan policy LC4 and LH4 and the Authority's design guide and detailed design guide.

There are no concerns with regard to the proposed single storey extension which would be no higher than the existing dwelling and therefore would not result in any loss of sunlight or daylight to the neighbouring property on the other side of the dwelling known as Dunvegan. There are also no concerns in regard to loss of privacy from the new ground floor windows and doors due to the intervening existing fences between the properties.

Conclusion

The development would not detract from the character or appearance of the existing building or its setting in the street scene, subject to conditions to secure appropriate materials and design details.

However, given the close distance between Rotherwood and the facing bedroom window to Longridge Officers consider that the proposed first floor extension would result in a significant loss of daylight and an overbearing impact which would harm the residential amenity of occupants of Longridge contrary to policies GSP3, LC4, LH4 and the Authority's design guide.

Officers have discussed this issue with the agent but given the close relationship there do not appear to be any minor amendments which could provide for a first floor extension in a manner which avoids a harmful impact upon the neighbouring property. Therefore the application is recommended for refusal.

Human Rights

Any human rights issues have been considered and addressed in the preparation of this report.

List of Background Papers (not previously published)

Nil