

Item 1 **09/00909/FUL**

Case Officer **Liz Beard**

Ward **Euxton North**

Proposal **Amendments to previously approved planning application ref: 08/01226/FUL to include change to roof pitch over side extension and changes to roof over garage (retrospective application).**

Location **Woodcock Barn Runshaw Lane Euxton ChorleyPR7 6HB**

Applicant **Mr Mike Catterall**

Consultation expiry: 6 January 2010

Application expiry: 7 January 2010

Proposal

1. This application relates to amendments to a previously approved planning application ref: 08/01226/FUL to include change to roof pitch over side extension and changes to roof over garage, which is a retrospective application.

2. The roofs have been built differently to those from the approved plans. The plans were approved in February 2009.

Recommendation

3. It is recommended that this application is refused.

Main Issues

4. The main issues for consideration in respect of this planning application are:

- Design and appearance of the proposal on the existing dwelling.
- Impact on the amenity of the neighbour.

Representations

5. 1 letter of objection has been received from the neighbour, which are as follows:

- The owner has deviated from the original approved plan (08/01226/FUL).
- The roof pitch over the side extension is not as the original approved plans indicate. The new roof line does not incorporate a 'catslide' roof pitch. The reasons the planning officer insisted this could be included in the original plans still apply. The 'break' in the roof angle would clearly separate the garage/house line.
- The flat roof over the garage is substantially larger than indicated in the original approved plans. This has resulted in an extremely large and unsightly visible aspect from my bedroom window. The reasons the planning officer insisted on the original design and scale still apply.
- The garage has been substantially extended further than indicated on the original approved plans.
- The industrial guttering used is oversized aluminium box type which is not only visibly unsightly but extremely noisy as my bedroom window is now only a matter of a few feet away from the guttering.
- The scale, appearance and design of these substantial changes have already been irresponsibly implemented without authority which has now made the building extremely overbearing and intrusive towards my property. Such a large and overpowering building is I feel totally 'out of keeping' set against adjoining bungalows.

6. Euxton Parish Council; have not made any comments.

Consultations

7. Chorley's Conservation Officer states the nearest listed building is Bourne Farm, this development does not impact on the listed building.

Assessment

Design and Appearance of the Proposal on the Existing Dwelling

8. It was established in the report, on the previous application (08/01226/FUL) that due to the number of changes that had been carried out to the dwelling that it no longer had the character of an agricultural dwelling. Therefore it has to be looked at in terms of a more contemporary way.

9. There was some negotiation in the previous scheme to change the massing and bulk of the roof shown, and it was subsequently amended so as to create a 'cat slide roof' over the garage so it looks as if there is some form of separation between the two elements. A window was also added to the front elevation.

10. Since the approval of the scheme (including amended plans) the roof has been built differently to the approved plans. The roof has been built outwards to the side and the length of the garage with a change in the pitch. The main roof, where it links into the garage, has also been built differently to the approved plans in that there is no change in pitch from the main roof and that of the garage, so there is now a vast expanse of roof with the same pitch.

11. Both these elements dominate the building and are not considered subordinate to the dwelling. Therefore the proposal is not in keeping with the existing house. The previous scheme, although still shows a vast expanse of roof, the way that it was designed, by changing the pitch etc, meant that it was not so dominant.

12. The proposal, as previously approved is acceptable, and this proposal is unacceptable as it causes harm to the existing dwelling and therefore detracts from its surroundings. For this reason it is contrary to Saved Policies DC8A and GN5 of the Local Plan Review.

Impact on the Amenity of the Neighbour

13. The extensions to the roof are on the side elevation adjacent to the neighbouring property (Pippins). The neighbouring property has a side window, in the gable elevation, looking out onto the roof and garage extension, and Woodcock Barn is set back further from Pippins therefore enabling the roof to be viewed from the rear garden of Pippins as well.

14. The main roof of Woodcock Barn, as previously described, is a large expanse which dominates the outlook from the garden and rear window of Pippins, and as such is overbearing on the neighbouring property. The garage roof is also dominant when viewed from the side window at Pippins. Although the side window is not a principle window it again is overbearing.

15. Whilst on plan the changes only appear small, it is the design of the roofs that is the key to reaching an acceptable scheme, which was looked at in the previous application, and explicit within the officer's report for application 08/01226/FUL. It is apparent that this was not an acceptable design solution when originally submitted under application 08/01226/FUL, and the applicant was made aware of this. There have been no changes in policy since then to mean that such a scheme would now be considered any differently or favourably.

16. The proposal is considered to be over dominant and overbearing, and will cause harm to the amenity of the neighbour, and as such is contrary to the guidance as set out in the Householder Design Guidance.

Overall Conclusion

17. The proposed amendments to the previously approved scheme are unacceptable. The amendments cause harm to the design and appearance of the existing dwelling and impact on the

amenity of the neighbours at Pippins. The proposal is therefore contrary to Saved Policy DC8A, and the House Extension Guidance and is therefore recommended for refusal.

Planning Policies

National Planning Policies:

PPS2

North West Regional Spatial Strategy

Policies: DP1 & CLCR1

Adopted Chorley Borough Local Plan Review

Policies: DC1, DC8A and GN5

Supplementary Planning Guidance:

- Householder Design Guidance

Chorley's Local Development Framework

- Policy SR1: Incorporating Sustainable Resources into New Development
- Sustainable Resources Development Plan Document
- Sustainable Resources Supplementary Planning Document

Planning History

08/01226/FUL Various extensions, alterations, and re-modelling of property. Approved 6 February 2009.

Recommendation: Refuse Full Planning Permission

Reasons

1. The proposed amendments by reason of their size, siting and design result in an overbearing impact on the neighbouring occupiers at 'Pippins' and cause harm to the design and appearance of the existing dwelling. The proposal is contrary to Saved Policy DC8A of the Chorley Borough Local Plan Review and the guidance as set out in the Householder Design Guidance SPD.
