

# Site Inspection Sub-Committee

**Monday, 17 July 2006**

**Present:** Councillor Harold Heaton (Chair), and Councillors Thomas Bedford and Daniel Gee

**Officers in attendance:** Wendy Gudger (Development Control Manager), Cookson (Planning Assistant) and Dianne Scambler (Democratic Services Officer)

**Also in attendance:** Councillors Michael Muncaster (Ward Representative)

## **06.SI.22 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received by Councillor David Dickinson (Vice-Chair) and Councillor Raph Snape.

## **06.SI.23 DECLARATIONS OF ANY INTERESTS**

No declarations of interest were declared.

## **06.SI.24 MINUTES**

**RESOLVED – That the minutes of the meeting of the Site Inspection Sub-Committee held on 22 May 2006 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.**

## **06.SI.25 PLANNING APPLICATION 06/00469/FUL**

The Sub-Committee visited and inspected the location of the planning application that had been deferred by the Development Control Committee. The retrospective planning application sought permission to retain the formation of a pitched roof over an existing first floor flat roof dormer, at 57, Lancaster Lane, Clayton-Le-Woods.

The dormer is centred on the front roof plane, facing onto Lancaster Lane. The roof exceeds the height of the ridgeline by 0.6 metres and is therefore contrary to the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance on House Extension Design Guidelines.

The property is set back from the highway by approximately 18 metres, and is relatively well screened by vegetation. However due to the bulk of the pitch roof and its siting above the ridgeline of the dwelling house, it is clearly visible within the street scene and Members felt it was an overly prominent and obtrusive feature, out of keeping with the character of the house.

The application was viewed from both the front and side aspects of the development and the views of the Ward Councillors were considered.

Although the Members of the Sub-Committee acknowledged that the owners had tried to make the development look aesthetically pleasing by painting the cladding in a colour to match the frames and eaves over the two front bay windows, it was still against planning policy and if allowed to remain, would set a precedent.

**RESOLVED – That the Development Control Committee refuse the retrospective planning application 06/00469/FUL for the following reason:**

**The proposed extension is contrary to the Council's approved House Extension Design Guidelines and Policy HS9 of the Adopted Chorley Borough Local Plan**

**Review by reason of its design and external appearance, The proposed extension is overly prominent, poorly related visually to the existing dwelling, and detrimental to the street scene and the area as a whole.**

Chair