

**Application Recommended for APPROVAL**  
Daneshouse with Stoneyholme Ward

**APP/2017/0461**

Full Planning Application  
Proposed single storey rear kitchen extension  
63 ELM STREET BURNLEY

**Background:**

This is a retrospective application for a single storey rear extension.

**APPLICATION EXTENSION:**



**NEIGHBOURING EXTENSION:**



## OTHER EXTENSIONS ALONG THE STREET:



An objection has been received.

### **Relevant Policies:**

Burnley Local Plan Second Review

GP1 – Development within the Urban Boundary

GP3 – Design & Quality

H13 – Extensions and Conversions of Existing Single Dwellings

Burnley's Local Plan: Proposed Submission Document – March 2017

SP4 – Development Strategy

SP5 – Development Quality and Sustainability

HS5 – House Extensions and Alterations

### **Site History:**

No relevant history

### **Consultation Responses:**

Neighbouring resident objects on the following grounds:

- Proposal blocks sunlight
- Damp concern
- Party Wall issue

*The neighbour has constructed an extension of the same scale and design which requires planning permission. The sunlight issue is no different prior to the construction of this proposal. The neighbour also installed a smaller lounge window and reduced their sunlight.*

### **Planning and Environmental Considerations:**

The main considerations in determining this application relates to the impact that the extension has on the character and appearance of the existing house, surrounding area and the impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties.

Given the location of the mid-terrace property, the extension does not appear overly dominant within the street scene and forms a natural extension to this existing terrace given its design & style. Many other properties have similar and larger extensions to the rear which are acceptable since the precedent has been set many years ago.

The width and depth of the extension is relative to the existing dwelling, and considered appropriate to the existing property which does not result in the extension over dominating the existing property or detracting from the appearance of the rear elevations of the property. It would replicate the extension built to the adjoining property

The use of materials matches the existing property and ensures its compatibility with the existing dwelling.

The extension would not have any direct impact on the neighbouring properties in terms of loss of light or appearing unduly overbearing. The only impact would be to the applicants own windows and this does not result in the application being refused.

The proposal provides an improved kitchen/utility facility which is necessary and will improve the living conditions.

### **Conclusion**

The proposed single-storey extension is not detrimental to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling or the character of the surrounding area. It therefore accords with local plan policies.

### **Recommendation:**

That planning permission be granted.

### **Conditions**

1. The development must be begun by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Act 2004.
2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: ***KH/01 Dwg 02 and 04, received 20 September 2017***

### **Reasons**

1. Required to be imposed by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.
2. To ensure the development is implemented in accordance with the approved plans and to avoid ambiguity.