
Robin Hill,
Talbot
Bridge,
Bashall
Eaves.
BB7 3NA

Replacement
dwelling - revised
design

Planning Statement

February 2016

Judith Douglas

TOWN PLANNING LTD

FULL PLANNING APPLICATION TO RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL

BY MR AND MRS J DIDSBURY FOR

A REPLACEMENT DWELLING (REVISED DESIGN) AT ROBIN HILL, TALBOT BRIDGE, BASHALL EAVES, LANCASHIRE. BB7 3NA

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 This Planning Statement is in support of a full planning application submitted by Mr J and Mrs J Didsbury for planning permission for a revised design for a replacement dwelling at Robin Hill, Talbot Bridge, Bashall Eaves. Planning permission for a replacement dwelling was granted on the 12th November 2015 reference 3/2015/0553.

It should be read in conjunction with a:

- bat survey dated April and June 2015,
- existing site layout 1:500, existing plan/elevations and proposed site layout plan/elevations 209 62A
- site sections showing relative heights to adjacent buildings 209 63
- site location plan ref 209 23 B
- existing site layout TRI 1387 01
- existing site sections TRI 1387 02

2. APPLICATION SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

2.1 The application site includes the whole of the site as approved under 3/2015/0553 together with a right of access to the north of the bungalow which gives vehicle access to the garden area east of the existing bungalow through an existing gateway. The site contains a bungalow and attached garage, dating from the 1970s. It is constructed with a stone front elevation and side elevation facing the road, and roughcast render to the rear elevation and gable facing the garden with a pitched roof of blue slate. The window and doors have artificial stone surrounds. The garden area is mainly down to lawn. The garden area on the eastern side was previously covered with overgrown conifers which have now be taken down. The current driveway to the dwelling

is on the southern side where there is an existing concrete hardstanding off the access from the lane which provides parking in front of the garage. There is a secondary vehicle access to the north of the property which gives access to the eastern side garden. The site boundaries are denoted by hedging, and a post and rail fence. The eastern boundary is the top of the steep banking to Bashall Brook.

- 2.2 The site fronts onto, and takes access from, the Lane which links Bashall to Talbot Bridge. To the south east of the site is a field, to the east the wooded banks of Bashall Brook, to the north west a group of buildings formerly Mardsens Farm which now comprises three dwellings: Mardens, Talbot Fold Barn and Talbot Fold Cottage. Mardens is a substantial two storey Victorian Farmhouse. It has four bedrooms and a large single storey extension to the rear. Its total floor space is 239sqm¹. Talbot Fold Barn is also a substantial two storey four bedroom dwellings. Attached to Talbot Fold Barn is Talbot Fold Cottage also a two storey dwelling which is smaller in comparison to its neighbours.
- 2.3 More generally, the site is set in an area of farmland, which is within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty as defined in the adopted Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan.

3. PLANNING HISTORY

- 3.1 3/2015/0553 Proposed replacement dwelling approved with conditions 12 November 2015.
- 3.2 3/2014/1057 lawful development certificate for existing use of building as a dwelling within the meaning of Class C3. Approved 27 January 2015

¹ Source: sales particulars Rightmove.

- 3.3 3/2014/0809 proposed replacement dwelling refused 31 October 2014.
- 3.4 3/76/0873/PB dated 21st July 1976 Reserved matters application to outline planning permission BO 1968 dated 23 May 1973 Proposed Bungalow, Marsdens Farm, Bashall Eaves approved 14 October 1976.
- 3.5 BO 2016 dated 21st May 1973 to outline application for the erection of an agricultural workers dwellings at Marsdens Farm Bashall Eaves approved with conditions 26th February 1974.
- 3.6 BO 1968 dated 9th March 1973 to form access to O.S Parcel 146 Marsdens Farm, Bashall Eaves approved with conditions 23rd May 1973.

4. THE DEVELOPMENT PLAN

- 4.1 The relevant part of the Development Plan for the purposes of this application is the Core Strategy and the proposals map of the Ribble Valley Local Plan.

Key Statement DS1-Development Strategy

Key Statement DS2 – Sustainable development

Key Statement EN2 – Landscape

Key Statement EN4 – Biodiversity and Geodiversity

Policy DMG1- General Considerations

Policy DMG2- Strategic considerations

Policy DMG3-Transport and mobility

Policy DME2 - Landscape and Townscape protection

Policy DME3 -Site and species protection and conservation

Policy DME4-Protecting heritage assets

Policy DMH3- Dwellings in the Open countryside and AONB

5. THE NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK

5.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published in March 2012. Relevant provisions are identified below.

5.2 The NPPF has as its cornerstone a presumption in favour of sustainable development.

5.3 The main body of the NPPF addresses the components of sustainable development. Those most relevant to the application are:

- ‘delivering a wide choice of high quality homes’ – local planning authorities are expected to boost the supply of housing (paragraph 47). Although paragraph 55 advises against new isolated homes in the countryside, the NPPF is silent on the replacement of dwellings in the countryside;
- ‘requiring good design’ – developments should add to the quality of the area, and reinforce local distinctiveness;
- ‘conserving and enhancing the natural environment’ – in deciding planning applications local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity by applying various principles including resisting development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (paragraph 118).

6. PRE-APPLICATION ADVICE

6.1 We sought pre-application advice from the Council before submitting this revised application. Planning Officer Victoria Walmsley confirmed that the volume and height of the revised plans 9th February 2016 were acceptable in principle however a specific changes to the design of the scheme were suggested. This related to a cat-slide feature on the north elevation and patio doors on the southern elevation. It was suggested that the cat-slide roof be

replaced with a simple lean to roof above the single storey sections and the patio doors be replaced by window openings. These suggestions have been incorporated into the submitted scheme².

- 6.2 We have also contacted the Council's Highways Advisor Mr David Bloomer of Lancashire County Council. In response to the revised drawings he stated by email on the 23rd of February 2016 *"The road is lightly trafficked and the visibility is good. I was going to ask for the verge to be reinstated but you have that covered so I cannot foresee any problems"*.

7. EVALUATION

- 7.1 There have been several applications recently at this property. These have established that the bungalow is dwelling without occupancy restrictions, and importantly, that the replacement of the bungalow with a two storey house is acceptable. The previous application for a replacement dwelling on this site was approved. The Planning Officer states in the Delegated Report that the main matters for consideration were the principle of the development in an AONB, including impacts on visual amenity, the impact on protected species and the impact on the development on highway safety³. The principle of the development has been established. A design for a house has been found acceptable so the main issue now is revised design also acceptable and are the revised vehicle access arrangement appropriate. The impact on protected species is also still relevant. We will consider each in turn.

The principle of the development

- 7.2 The Planning Officer in the previously approved scheme concluded that the proposal complied with Core Strategy Key Statement DS1 and DS2 together with policy DMH3 as the proposal is to replace an existing dwelling. The principle of replacing one dwelling with another has been established as

² Pre-application advice RV/ENQ/2015/00160 see appendix 1

³ Delegated Item File Report 3/2015/0533 see appendix 2

acceptable. As there is no increase in the number of dwellings at the site, the development is not in conflict with Key Statements DS1 and DS2 which seek to restrict additional housing provision to identified settlements. Key Statement DMH3 expands on KS DS1 and DS2 in relation to housing provision of dwellings outside settlements. DMH3 lists exceptions where new housing development will be acceptable in the open countryside and the AONB. This includes “*the rebuilding or replacement of existing dwellings*”

Design and impact on the landscape

- 7.3 Policy DMG1 sets out general planning consideration amongst other matters and this includes the design of the development and the impact on the environment. NPPF (paragraph 115) stresses the importance of appropriate development in the AONB and this should “be afforded the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty”. The site is within the Forest of Bowland AONB, which is a nationally designated landscape and designated heritage asset in NPPF terms.
- 7.4 The Planning Officer in considering the previously approved scheme compared the size of the existing bungalow to the proposed dwelling. She stated “*It is not disputed that the development is larger than the existing bungalow (approximately 4m wider, approximately 1m deeper and approximately 3.5m higher) this is not considered to reason to refuse the application. When considered in the context of the entire site it is clear that the site can accommodate a dwelling of this size and the majority of the development would utilise the footprint of the existing garage.*” It is clear from this statement that an increase in the size and height of the proposed dwelling as compared to the bungalow is acceptable. On this basis, another design for a replacement dwelling larger and higher than the existing bungalow (within reason) should also be acceptable. The way that the mass height and length of the dwelling is expressed in the design of the dwelling and how this relates to the context of the site is of the greatest importance in this sensitive location within the AONB.

- 7.5 In assessing the previously approved scheme the Planning Officer acknowledged that the existing bungalow differs from the dwellings to the north of the site which include a typical Victorian design farmhouse and traditional rural buildings built out of natural stone. She considered that the approved scheme reflected the other buildings in the group by being two storey in height and being constructed out of natural stone. This approach has again been used in the revised scheme. The Officer also noted that the previous scheme was similar in scale and height to the nearby buildings. It is clear that the question now to be considered is whether the revised design of the proposed replacement dwelling has a significantly different and detrimental impact on the landscape than the approved scheme which would warrant refusal of planning permission.
- 7.6 Whilst the revised scheme has a larger footprint than the approved scheme the overall height of the dwelling has been reduced. The impact of the mass and height of the building on the visual appearance of the landscape is similar to the proposed dwelling and will be no more prominent in the landscape than the approved scheme. The dwelling is in a linear form which reflects the form of traditional farm and rural buildings in this area. The orientation of the dwelling is such that the front of the house faces south with the principle rooms on the south side and the ancillary rooms on the north. This is the traditional arrangement for farmhouses in the area where the principle rooms took advantage of the warmer and sunnier southern aspect and kitchens, larders and dairies were on the cooler northern side to keep stored food cool. The ridge line of the proposed dwelling runs approximately east west which reflects the orientation and arrangement of the traditional original farmhouse at Talbot Fold to the north.
- 7.7 The repositioning of the main vehicle access to the north side of the building affords the opportunity to close the existing vehicle access to the site and to reinstate the hedging on the western side of the site. This will improve the screening of the site from public views to the south. As before the dwelling will

be viewed against the backdrop of the existing buildings to the north and being lower in height, it will appear less prominent than the approved scheme.

7.8 This revised application again provides an opportunity to secure a replacement dwelling that would be more appropriate to its context than the existing bungalow. In particular, the form and architectural detailing of the proposal has been designed to reflect vernacular traditions of houses in the area. The replacement dwelling will have external facing materials appropriate to the character and traditions of the area, including stone walls and blue slate roof. The scale of the proposed dwelling, would again reflect other property in the area and local traditions.

7.9 In summary, the proposed replacement dwelling would appear as an appropriate feature in the local landscape, representing a significant visual enhancement compared to the existing dwelling. Key Statements DME2 and DMH3 are satisfied.

Access

7.10 The existing main access to the south of the dwelling would be closed off in favour of using the existing right of access to the north of the dwelling which also serves some of the properties to the north. A new drive and parking area to the east of the dwelling would be created providing parking and turning for at least three cars. The traffic generated by the proposed development would be low, comparable to that of the existing dwelling and have no detrimental impact on the conditions, operation or safety of the local highway network in the vicinity of the site. The access onto the Lane has good visibility and traffic speeds are slow. The Lane has wide verges so that whilst the garden areas of the existing houses are separated from the Lane by hedges these hedges do not compromise visibility for drivers. Mr D Bloomer LCC has confirmed that the use of this alternative access is acceptable.

Protected Species

- 7.11 The site itself is not designated as one having any wildlife / ecological value or significance or subject to any designation, either at the local or national level. The banks of the adjacent Bashall Brook are designated as an ancient woodland. The replacement dwelling is proposed to be built over the footprint of the existing dwelling which is well outside the boundary of the ancient woodland. Policy DME3 is satisfied.
- 7.12 A bat survey was carried out in April and June 2015. A dawn and dusk emergence survey recorded no bats emerging from the building to be demolished. It is concluded that building is not currently being used as a roost by bats and no loss of a roost would occur as a result of the development proposal. No objection to the proposal was raised previously by the Council's Countryside Officer.
- 7.13 There are no heritage designations or features of heritage interest relating to the site or in its vicinity. Accordingly, the proposal would result in no detriment to heritage interests.

8. CONCLUSION

- 8.1 The proposal is for a revised design for a replacement dwelling. Policy in the Core Strategy allows for such development, subject to consideration of various detailed matters. The key matter is design and landscape impact. The proposal would be of a design reflecting local traditions and would appear as a more appropriate feature in the local landscape than the existing development. The scale of the development is appropriate to the site and the setting within the landscape. No harm to the landscape will occur as a result of this development.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1 Pre-application advice



RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL

Description	Revised design for replacement dwelling at Robin Hill, Balshall Eaves			Council Offices Church Walk CLITHEROE Lancashire BB7 2RA T:01200 414501 E:Victoria.walmsley@ribblevalley.gov.uk W: www.ribblevalley.gov.uk
Application Ref:	RV/ENQ/2015/00160	Meeting Date:	21/1/16	
Site Visit:	4/1/16	Case Officer:	VW	
Issue Date:	15/2/16			

Dear Judith,

I write in response to your clients Pre-Application Enquiry regarding a revised design for a replacement dwelling at Robin Hill, Bashall Eaves. A site visit was made on the 4th January 2016 with a meeting with yourself and your client held on the 21st January 2016. I mentioned at the meeting that the original submitted plan for the replacement dwelling as part of this Pre-Application Enquiry was unacceptable due to the fact that the proposal was too large, in comparison to the original approved dwelling but said I would confirm my thoughts at the office, and consult with other officers.

General Observations

I suggested on the 1st February that you discuss with your Architect to arrange submitting some new plans which were of similar volume to the approved scheme (3/2015/0553), in order for me to assess. Just for information, they were received on the 9th February. After assessing the new plans, I am pleased to see that the dwelling is sufficiently reduced in volume and height, and would be acceptable in principle. However, I do have a concern with regards to the Cat-Slide roof located on the rear elevation of the proposed dwelling. After discussing this with several planning officers, we agreed that the roof at the rear should reflect that of the front with a simple lean-to roof above the single storey sections at the rear (I have attached a simple sketch of the recommended roof amendment for information). The other concern I have is with the patio doors serving the lounge and the dining area to be located on the front/south facing elevation. I suggest these be removed from the front elevation and replaced by window openings. I would have no objection to these doors be located on the rear/north facing elevation of the property.

Highway Observations

As you are aware, Lancashire County Council Highways department will no longer be supplying Pre-Application advice at this time and they are currently considering charging for such advice. If you require any additional information with regards to Highway issues, you will be expected to request this information through your own initiative and contact LCC direct for further advice. I note that you are blocking off the original access, creating some screening, and using the access lane that is currently used for Talbot Fold Cottage to the

North of the proposal. I suggest that you submit some Highway Visibility Splays/Sight lines should a formal application come forward.

Conclusions

In conclusion, the new plans dated 09/02/16 are acceptable, subject to some changes I have suggested above.

Please be mindful of the fact that the above advice has been given on the basis of the level of information submitted as part of the pre-planning enquiry. I trust that you find the above observations of use and stress that they represent officer opinion only, at the time of writing, given without prejudice to the final determination of any application submitted.

Kind regards,

Victoria Walmsley

Pre-Application Advice Officer

Appendix 2 Delegate Item file Report 3/2015/0553 (conditions omitted)

This report needs to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.

DATE INSPECTED:

Ribble Valley Borough Council

DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT – APPROVAL

Ref:

Application No:

3/2015/0553

Robin Hill, Talbot Bridge, Bashall Eaves, Clitheroe, Lancashire, BB7 3NA

Development Proposed:

Proposed replacement dwelling

CONSULTATIONS: Parish/Town Council

Mitton and Bashall Eaves Parish Council: No objection in principle to the plans, however, as this is the first new dwelling constructed in the village for some considerable time, we would ask RVBC to give due consideration to the design and construction of the proposed dwelling being commensurate and in keeping with the existing buildings in Bashall Eaves.

CONSULTATIONS: Highway/Water Authority/Other Bodies

Countryside Officer: Sufficient information to assess application. Standard requested species condition required.

Highway Development Control Section: No objections regarding the replacement dwelling and are of the opinion that the proposed development should have a negligible impact on highway safety and highway capacity in the immediate vicinity of the site.

The applicant has indicated sufficient off-road parking, based on the recommendations from the Joint Lancashire Structure Plan. Conditions are recommended for the car parking space to be marked out and for permitted development rights to be removed to prevent the garages being converted into living accommodation.

CONSULTATIONS: No additional representations.

RELEVANT POLICIES:

Ribble Valley Core Strategy (2014)

Key Statement DS1: Development Strategy

Key Statement DS2: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

Key Statement EN2: Landscape

Key Statement DS2: Biodiversity and Geodiversity

Key Statement EN5: Heritage Assets

Policy DMG1: General Considerations

Policy DMG2: Strategic Considerations

Policy DMG3: Transport and Mobility

Policy DME2: Landscape and Townscape Protection

Policy DME3: Site and Species Conservation

Policy DME4: Protecting Heritage Assets

Policy DMH3: Dwellings in the Open Countryside and AONB.

Policy EN4: Biodiversity and Geodiversity

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

COMMENTS/ENVIRONMENTAL/AONB/HUMAN RIGHTS ISSUES/RECOMMENDATION:

The application site comprises of a single storey dwelling in the remote countryside location of Bashall Eaves within the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). The property was constructed as an agricultural worker's dwelling in the late 1970s/early 80s. A recent Lawful Development Certificate for existing use (3/2014/1057) has confirmed that the dwelling has been occupied as a dwelling within the meaning of Class C3 of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended) without restricted occupancy for in excess of four years.

The current application seeks consent for the demolition of the existing single storey dwelling and the erection of a two storey replacement dwelling. This application has been submitted following the refusal of a similar proposal (3/2014/0809).

The previous planning application (3/2014/0809) was refused for the following reasons:

1. The proposal would result in the creation of a new dwelling in a remote countryside location in the Forest of Bowland AONB, which would be isolated from services and facilities and would result in the future occupants relying on the private car to access services. The proposal does not therefore comprise sustainable development and is contrary to Policies ENV1, G5 and H2 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan, Policies DMG1, DMG2, DMH3 and DME4 of the emerging Ribble Valley Core Strategy (including proposed main modifications) and the NPPF.
2. The proposal, be reason of its size, scale, design and massing would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area and fails to conserve or enhance the landscape and scenic beauty of the Forest of Bowland AONB, a designated heritage asset, resulting in significant harm to the character and visual amenities of the Forest of Bowland AONB. The proposal is therefore contrary to the NPPF, Policies G1 and ENV1 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan, the adopted Supplementary Planning Guidelines: Alterations and Extension to Dwellings and Key Statements DS1, DS2, EN2 and EN5 and policies DMG1, DMG2, DMH4 and DMH5 of the emerging Core Strategy (including proposed main modifications).
3. The proposal would have a detrimental impact on bats, a European Protected Species and on the basis of the information submitted, it is unlikely that a European Protected Species licence would be granted. As such, the proposal is therefore contrary to the NPPF, Policies G1 and ENV7 of the Districtwide Local Plan and Policies DMG1, DME3 and Key Statements DS2, EN3 and EN4 of the emerging Core Strategy (including proposed main modifications).

The matters for consideration in the determination of this application involve the principle of the development in an AONB, including impacts on visual amenity, the impact on protected species and the impact of the development on highway safety.

The NPPF states that housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. NPPF (paragraph 55) seeks to avoid the creation of isolated new dwellings in rural areas to ensure the principles of sustainable development are achieved.

Core Strategy Policy DS1 seeks to direct new housing development to identified strategic sites, principle settlements and villages within the borough, however this policy does not preclude new housing development outside defined settlement boundaries. This policy is further expanded by Policy DMG2 which sets out the circumstances when development outside the defined settlements would be appropriate. In respect of housing development, a development should meet a local housing need(s) or an identified need. Development should also be in keeping with the character of the landscape and acknowledge the special qualities of the area by virtue of its size, design, use of materials, landscaping and siting.

Policy DMB3 states "In the AONB it is important that development is not of a large scale. In the AONB and immediately adjacent areas proposals should contribute to the protection, conservation and enhancement of the natural beauty of the landscape. Within the open countryside proposals will be required to be in keeping with the character of the landscape area and should reflect the local vernacular, scale, style, features and building materials."

The previous planning application was refused as the nature of the site was considered to be isolated in terms of accessibility to local services. Consideration was also given to the fact that the existing dwelling was an agricultural worker's bungalow. Since this decision a Lawful Development Certificate has determined that the lawful use of the existing bungalow is residential (Use Class C3). Whilst the site may be isolated in terms of accessibility to local services the replacement of this dwelling would not result in any greater impact than that currently experienced by the previous/current occupants in terms of accessing local services.

Furthermore, the development would not result in an increase in the number of dwellings on the site. Therefore, this would not conflict with Core Strategy Key Statements DS1 and DS2 which seek to restrict additional housing provision to identified settlements. Core Strategy Policy DMH3 lists exceptions where new housing development will be acceptable in the open countryside and the AONB. This includes "the rebuilding or replacement of existing dwellings". Therefore, the principle of replacing the existing dwelling with a new dwelling in this instance is considered acceptable and the first reason for refusal given on 3/2014/0809 is no longer sustainable.

Policy DMG1 sets out general planning considerations, amongst other matters, this includes the design of the development and the impact on the environment. NPPF (paragraph 115) stresses the importance of appropriate development in the AONB and that it should "be afforded the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty". The site is within the Forest of Bowland AONB, which is a nationally designated landscape and designated heritage asset in NPPF terms.

The previously refused application (3/2014/0809) stated "The scale, size, design and massing of the proposal would afford it a level of visual prominence that would be at odds with the pleasant sylvan character of the existing dwelling and those in the vicinity". The applicant has advised in their Planning Statement that this approach contradicts that previously taken by RVBC on similar schemes where a number of planning permissions have been granted for the replacement of poorly designed twentieth century bungalows and dwellings with new high quality two storey dwellings. This includes site within the AONB. The development, subject of this application, has been amended. The development now includes a single storey garage which is clearly subservient to the main dwelling. This is the same design approach as the existing bungalow. The design has been altered and is considered to result in a simpler design approach than the previously refused scheme. The applicant has also altered the footprint of this development, resulting in the depth of the property being reduced. It is not disputed that the development is larger than the existing bungalow (approximately 4m wider, approximately 1m deeper and approximately 3.5m

higher) this is not considered reason to refuse this application. When considered in the context of the entire site it is clear that the site can accommodate a dwelling of this size and the majority of the development would utilise the footprint of the existing garage.

The existing bungalow differs in visual appearance when compared to the residential dwellings located to the north of the site. The existing dwellings to the north of the site comprise of a typical Victorian design farmhouse and traditional rural buildings built out of natural stone. The development reflects the other buildings in this group by being two storeys in height and the use of natural stone with dressed eills. The submitted sections show the relationship of the development with existing buildings. These sections demonstrate that the development will be similar in scale and height to nearby buildings.

The application site slopes down away from the properties to the north. When viewing the development from the south it will be seen against the backdrop of the existing buildings to the north. This is the same situation as the existing bungalow on site. The existing buildings will screen the development when viewed from the north. Furthermore, the existing surrounding vegetation would further assist in reducing the visual impact. The level of hardstand shown to be provided in the site has been reduced since the previously refused application.

Sufficient separation distance would remain between the proposed development and neighbouring plots to maintain the existing character of the area. A condition is recommended to secure the materials and external surfaces.

Whilst the development introduces a two storey dwelling this is not out of keeping with the immediate surrounding dwellings to the north of the site. In terms of the visual impact in this part of the AONB it is not considered that the development would result in significant visual intrusion to such an extent that would sustain a recommendation of refusal. It is therefore considered that the development would comply with Core Strategy Policies DMG1 and DME2 in respect of its design and impact on landscape quality and the visual character of the area. A condition is recommended to remove permitted development rights to ensure RVBC can maintain control over the design, appearance and level of any future development.

The applicant has submitted a Bat Survey. This has been assessed by the Countryside Officer. The dawn and dusk emergence survey recorded no bats emerging from the building to be demolished. The survey concluded that the existing building is not currently being used as a roost by bats and no loss of a roost would occur as a result of the development. Subject to a standard condition no objections have been raised by the Countryside Officer.

Core Strategy DMG1 in respect of 'access' seeks to ensure that the traffic and car parking implications of proposed developments are considered and that safe access can be provided which can accommodate the scale and type of traffic likely to be generated. In addition, Policy DMG3 seeks to ensure adequate car parking and servicing space is provided for new development.

The existing access would be utilised and parking would be provided within the site, including the garage. The local Highways Authority has raised no objection subject to conditions.

In light of the above assessment it is concluded that the development is acceptable and complies with relevant planning policies within the adopted Core Strategy and NPPF. It is therefore recommended that planning permission be granted subject to conditions to control the materials and parking provision.

RECOMMENDATION: That conditional planning permission be granted

CONDITIONS

Prepared by:

Judith Douglas Bsc Hons Dip TP MRTPI

Judith Douglas Town Planning Ltd

90 Pimlico Road
Clitheroe, BB7 2AH
Tel. 01200 425051

Ref. JDTP 005

February 2016