

## **LATE ITEMS REPORT**

### **FOR DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE MEETING OF 24 JULY 2007**

#### **B2 - 2007/114 : LAND OFF MICHAEL WIFE LANE, EDENFIELD**

This application, seeking outline permission for an agricultural workers dwelling, has been withdrawn by the applicant.

#### **B5 - 2007/293 : LAND TO REAR OF 183 BURNLEY ROAD, RAWTENSTALL**

The report appearing on the main agenda refers to objections from 3 local residents. Two of these objectors have re-iterated their objections, expressing concern principally about the following matters :

- The adequacy/accuracy of the submitted drawings;
- The substantial increase to the previously permitted dwelling;
- The damage which construction will do to Laund Street/to drainage;
- Adequacy of Laund Street to serve the dwelling /need for it to be adopted by the Council.

It remains my view that this application, to change the house-type permitted by Committee in June 2006, should be approved.

#### **B8 - 2007/381 : LAUND BANK, RAWTENSTALL**

Two objections have been received from residents of properties at the bottom of the access road leading up to Laund Bank, where it passes through a very narrow gap between buildings. They do not object to the proposed extension as such, but to the harm to the access road/neighbouring properties which may arise from the traffic which construction/use of the extension will generate.

Having regard to the restricted width/condition of the access road as it passes between buildings at the bottom of the hill I can appreciate the objectors' concerns about its use by construction traffic. However, I do not consider this, or the additional traffic generated by the dwelling if extended, to provide grounds to refuse the application.

The application is recommended for refusal based on the size/impact of the extension proposed for a dwelling located within the countryside. The existing house has a floor-area over 2 floors of some 180 square metres (including the kitchen to be demolished). The proposal would add approximately 155 square metres, an increase in floor-area of around 86%. The existing house has a volume of approx 575 sq m, and the proposed extension will add to this by approx 390 sq m, amounting to an increase in volume of approx 68%.

Accordingly, the proposed extension is considered to be of a scale which is out of proportion to the existing building, and the design solution proposed does not pay sufficient attention to the form of the existing building.

NEIL BIRTLES  
Senior Planning Officer  
Development Control  
20/7/07