

Item B. 3 **06/00469/FUL** **Refuse Full Planning Permission**

Case Officer **Miss Lyndsey Cookson**

Ward **Clayton-le-Woods West And Cuerden**

Proposal **Formation of pitched roof over existing flat roof front dormer (retrospective),**

Location **57 Lancaster Lane Clayton-Le-Woods Leyland PR25 5SP**

Applicant **P Beswick & C Kettlewell**

Proposal: This retrospective application proposes the formation of a pitched roof over an existing first floor flat roof dormer. The dormer is centred on the front roof plane, facing onto Lancaster Lane. The roof measures 0.6 metres in height to the pitch, 5.8 metres in width and 3 metres in length from the ridgeline. The roof exceeds the height of the ridgeline by 0.6 metres. It is comprised of timber cladding with a bitumen finish and a felt roof. The cladding will be painted in colours to match the frame and eaves over two front bay windows.

Background: The application property was originally a detached bungalow, which has been extended to incorporate dormer windows on the front and rear, a single storey rear extension and rear conservatory. It is set back from the road by approximately 18 metres.

Policy: Planning Policy Guidance Note 3: Housing
GN1: Settlement Policy – Main Settlements
GN5: Building Design
HS9: Residential Extensions
SPG: House Extension Design Guidelines

Planning History: There have been a number of planning applications at the site:
75/00595/FUL - dormer extension for bedroom and shower room. Permitted
75/00838/FUL - dormer bedroom. Permitted
80/00260/FUL - replacement garage. Permitted
92/00176/FUL - first floor dormer extension. Permitted.
03/00637/FUL - single storey extension to side and dormer to front and rear. Withdrawn.
03/01177/FUL - single storey front extension with dormer to side and single storey side extension. Withdrawn.
05/00769/FUL - single storey rear extension, pitched roof over existing rear extension, conservatory to the rear and erection of 1.7 metre boundary wall. Permitted.

Consultations: None.

Representations: None.

Assessment: The application site lies within a main settlement, in which there is a presumption in favour of appropriate development, subject to normal planning considerations and the other policies and proposals of the plan, as stated by policy GN1.

Design

Policy HS9 states house extensions will be permitted provided that the extension is in keeping with the existing house and the surrounding buildings in terms of scale, size, design and facing materials. The building design must be well related to the surroundings, as stated in policy GN5.

The Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance on House Extension Design Guidelines states that dormer windows and roof extensions have a noticeable effect on the appearance of a house, or the street, because of their prominent position. It will not normally be acceptable for dormers or roof extensions to exceed the height of the roof ridge, as such extensions dominate the house. Dormers should be designed to be subordinate to the original roof of the house.

The dormer window is sited in a prominent position on the dwelling house, on the front roof plane at first floor level. Although the dormer is large in scale, the approved flat roof design did not exceed the roof ridge and was more in keeping with the property. The addition of a pitched roof has increased the bulk, scale and prominence of the dormer.

The bulk and scale of the pitched roof has a harmful effect on the appearance of the dormer, making it an overly large feature which is not subordinate to the dwelling house. The pitched roof exceeds the ridgeline, dominates the front elevation, and has a detrimental effect on the appearance of the dwelling house.

The pitched roof attempts to reflect the design features of the dwelling, by complementing two pitched roofs over the bay windows on the front elevation. However, it contributes to an unnecessarily complex array of roof patterns which clutter the front elevation, and are not in keeping with the simplistic character of the original dwelling.

Impact on street scene

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

The application property is sited within an area of mixed house types, including bungalows and two-storey properties. The application site is to the north of Lancaster Lane, amongst a row of bungalow properties, none of which have incorporated dormer windows on the front roof plane. Facing the application site is a two-storey property with two dormer windows on the front roof plane, and a bungalow with planning permission for a first floor extension, which includes three dormer windows on the front roof plane. These dormers incorporate pitched roofs which are smaller in scale and bulk, and do not exceed the height of the ridgeline over the dwellings, therefore subordinate and in keeping with the respective properties.

Dormer windows with pitched roofs over which are subordinate to the dwelling house and not overly prominent, are evident within

the vicinity. However, the proposed pitched roof is not subordinate or in keeping with the dwelling in terms of scale and siting, and is overly prominent, having an adverse effect on the appearance of the property within the street scene.

Impact on neighbour amenity

The proposal would not have an adverse effect on the amenities of neighbouring residents.

Conclusion:

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.

Policy Guidance Note 3: Housing states that in determining planning applications, local planning authorities should reject poor design particularly where the decisions are supported by clear plan policies and adopted supplementary planning guidance. The proposal is accordingly recommended for refusal.

Recommendation: Refuse Full Planning Permission

Reasons

1. 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.
