RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL

Development Department

Council Offices, Church Walk, Clitheroe, Lancashire, BB7 2RA

Telephone: 01200 425111

Fax: 01200 414488

Planning Fax: 01200 414487

Town and Country Planning Act 1990

REFUSAL OF PLANNING PERMISSION

APPLICATION NO:

3/2014/0183

DECISION DATE:

23 December 2014

DATE RECEIVED:

07/03/2014

APPLICANT:

Mr Stephen Chicken SCPi Bowland Ltd

C/o Agent

AGENT:

Mr Richard Barton HOW Planning LLP 40 Peter Street

Manchester M2 5GP

DEVELOPMENT PROPOSED:

Hybrid planning application seeking both full and outline planning permission as follows:

Full planning permission for works and a change of use to the Grade II listed Kirk Mill to create a hotel (18 bed, use class C1) and bar restaurant (Use class A3), works to the barn building to create seven holiday cottages (use class C1), construction of a notel and spa (20 bed use class C1), wedding venue (use class D1), kids club (Use class D1) and trailhead centre (Use class D1 and A3), change of use of Malt Kiln House from residential to use class C1, construction of a new cricket pavilion (Sui Generis), demolition of the group of derelict factory buildings.

Outline planning permission for 60 residential dwellings, split over two sites, with a maximum of 56 and 4 units on each with all matters reserved except for means of access.

AT: Land at Malt Kiln Brow Chipping PR3 2GP

Ribble Valley Borough Council hereby give notice in pursuance of the provisions of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 that permission has been refused for the carrying out of the above development for the following reason(s):

The proposal is harmful to the special architectural and historic interest, significance and setting of both Kirk Mill (Grade II listed) and Kirk House (Grade II listed; former mill owner's house; immediately adjacent to Kirk Mill). This is because of the loss and alteration of important historic fabric, plan form and design at Kirk Mill, the addition of poorly designed and inappropriate extensions to Kirk Mill and the intrusion of poorly designed and inappropriate development into the setting of both listed buildings. This is contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, and Policies DME4, DMG1, DMB2 and DMB3 Ribble Valley Core Strategy adopted version.

RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL REFUSAL OF PLANNING PERMISSION CONTINUED

APPLICATION NO: 3/2014/0183 DECISION DATE: 23 December 2014

The proposal is harmful to the character and appearance, significance, setting and views into and out of Kirk Mill Conservation Area and Chipping Conservation Area. This is because of the intrusion upon and coalescence of the conservation areas from poorly designed and inappropriate development. This is contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework and Policies DME4, DMG1, DMB2 and DMB3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy adopted version.

- The proposal would lead to significant development in an unsustainable location contrary to Key Statements DS1, DS2, EC1 and Policies DMG2, DMH3 and DMB1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy adopted version. This harm is not outweighed by the regeneration benefits of the scheme and the housing part of the development does not meet the requirements for affordable housing or community contributions. Approval of the application without sufficient justification would therefore lead to the creation of a range of hotel/leisure uses and up to 60 residential dwellings with associated infrastructure works in the open countryside without sufficient justification which would cause harm to the development strategy for the borough as set out in the Ribble Valley Core Strategy adopted version leading to unsustainable development.
- Given the location, size, intensity, nature and design of the proposed Kirk Mill redevelopment works and associated housing proposals they would be an incongruous feature that would result in the loss of landscape fabric. The proposal would not contribute to, or be in keeping with, the landscape character of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and would cause visual harm, thereby failing to conserve or enhance the natural beauty of the area. No exceptional circumstances have been provided to justify this 'major development' within the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and thus the proposal is considered contrary to Policies G1 and ENV1 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan, Key Statement EN2 and Policies DMG1, DME2, DMB2 and DMB3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy adopted version and the environmental role of the NPPF which seek to ensure that development proposals contribute to, protect and enhance the environment.

Note(s)

For rights of appeal in respect of any reason(s) attached to the decision see the attached notes.

JOHN HEAP

DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY SERVICES