



Suite 9  
Grindleton Business Centre  
The Spinney  
Grindleton  
Clitheroe  
Lancashire  
BB7 4DH

Tel: 01200 449700  
www.ghaonline.co.uk  
email: info@ghaonline.co.uk

## **PLANNING STATEMENT**

**IN RESPECT OF A FULL PLANNING  
APPLICATION FOR THE DEMOLITION OF THE  
EXISTING BUNGALOW AND THE ERECTION OF  
A REPLACEMENT TWO STOREY DWELLING**

**AT**

**SHENSTONE, LONGSIGHT ROAD, CLAYTON-LE-  
DALE, BB1 9EX**

**Prepared by: Colin Sharpe**  
**Our Client: Mrs. Philippa Bailey-Reed**  
**Our Ref: Reed/181/2868/CS**  
**Date: October 2020**



Chartered Surveyors ■■■ Planning & Development ■■■ Land Agents  
Valuers ■■■ Property Agency ■■■ Property Management





## **CONTENTS**

<b>1.</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>Page 3</b>
<b>2.</b>	<b>THE APPLICATION SITE AND SURROUNDINGS</b>	<b>Page 3</b>
<b>3.</b>	<b>PLANNING HISTORY</b>	<b>Page 4</b>
<b>4.</b>	<b>THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT</b>	<b>Page 4</b>
<b>5.</b>	<b>PLANNING POLICY CONSIDERATIONS</b>	<b>Page 4</b>
<b>6.</b>	<b>SIMILAR DEVELOPMENTS IN RIBBLE VALLEY</b>	<b>Page 9</b>
<b>7.</b>	<b>SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS</b>	<b>Page 13</b>

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 Gary Hoerty Associates has been instructed by Mrs Philippa Bailey-Reed to submit a planning application on her behalf for the demolition of the existing bungalow and the erection of a replacement two storey dwelling at Shenstone, Longsight Road, Clayton-Le-Dale, BB1 9EX.
- 1.2 In this Planning Statement we will describe the proposed development and will review the relevant policies and guidance and set out why we believe that the application complies with national planning guidance and local planning policies and why the application should therefore be looked upon favourably by the Local Planning Authority. Whilst appreciating that all planning applications are determined on their own merits, we will also refer to a number of planning permissions granted relatively recently by the Council for the demolition and replacement of existing dwellings in open countryside and Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) locations. We will explain why we consider that the approval of this application would represent a consistency of approach by the Council, and a consistent interpretation of the relevant planning policies and guidance, when compared to the previous approvals to which we will refer.
- 1.3 As the proposal involves the demolition of the existing bungalow, we are aware that the Council will require the submission of a report containing the findings of a Bat, Barn Owl and Nesting Bird Survey of the bungalow. Such a report will be submitted separately.

## **2. THE APPLICATION SITE AND SURROUNDINGS**

- 2.1 The application site, as outlined in red on the submitted plans, has an area of approximately 1750sq.m comprising the curtilage of the existing bungalow. The applicant also owns 1.7ha of land to the north and west of the application site as outlined in blue on the plans.
- 2.2 The site is located on the north side of Longsight Road (A59) and is adjoined to the west by a two-storey dwelling (a replacement for a bungalow that previously occupied the plot) and to the east by a bungalow. To the west and east of this group of three dwellings are areas of open land, and there is also open land to the south on the opposite side of Longsight Road. The general locality of Longsight road comprises open farmland with intermittent dwellings and businesses.
- 2.3 In planning policy terms, the site is within an area of open countryside as defined in the Council's adopted Core Strategy but is not within either the Green Belt or AONB.

### **3. PLANNING HISTORY**

- 3.1 A planning application search on the Council's website for the application site reveals just one application (3/1991/0385) which was an application for extensions to the bungalow that was approved on 09 July 1991. As it was so long ago, and as the current application proposes the demolition of the existing building, this previous permission for extensions is not considered to be of any relevance to the consideration of this application.
- 3.2 We will, however, refer later in this Statement to planning application 3/2005/0666 under which permission was granted on 31 August 2005 for the demolition and replacement of the dwelling, Edenvale, to the west of the application site. This permission has been implemented.

### **4. THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT**

- 4.1 The proposed development involves the demolition of the existing bungalow and the erection of a two-storey house. The front elevation of the replacement house will be in line with the front elevations of the dwellings on either side of the application site. The general design of the house is such that its front and rear elevations are gabled.
- 4.2 The main part of the house has dimensions of 15.5m. by 12.0m. with an eaves height of 5.4m. and a ridge height of 8.6m. Attached to the rear elevation of the main house there is a 3.0m high single storey flat roofed addition with dimensions of 11.0m by 7.0m.
- 4.3 The proposed external materials for the two-storey part of the house comprise grey metal sheets to the ground floor walls, cedar cladding to the upper walls with a grey metal sheet roof. An array of solar panels will cover most of the west facing roofslope. The single storey addition at the rear will have stone panel walls and a living roof containing two large rooflights.
- 4.4 The existing vehicular access from Longsight Road will continue to serve the proposed dwelling. There is a driveway down the side of the existing bungalow leading to a parking and manoeuvring area at the rear. This parking provision arrangement will be replicated to serve the new dwelling.

## **5. PLANNING POLICY CONSIDERATIONS**

### **General**

5.1 Local Planning Authorities are required to determine planning applications in accordance with the Statutory Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In Ribble Valley, if it is to be approved, any development must therefore satisfy, as far as possible, guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework 2019 (NPPF) and the relevant Key Statements and Policies of the Council's Core Strategy 2008-2028 adopted December 2014.

5.2 We set out below extracts from the relevant documents to facilitate the assessment of the application proposal against the principal appropriate policies and guidance.

### **National Planning Policy Framework 2019 (NPPF)**

5.3 The National Planning Policy Framework 2019 is now the main national planning policy guidance influencing planning decision making in England. It sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these should be applied and provides a framework within which locally prepared plans for housing and other development can be produced.

5.4 Paragraphs 11 – 14 of the NPPF highlight the presumption in favour of sustainable development. The presumption in favour of sustainable development does not change the statutory status of the development plan as the starting point for decision making and therefore proposed development that accords with an up to date development plan should be approved, unless other material considerations indicate that the plan should not be followed.

5.5 Importantly, paragraph 11 of the NPPF states that plans and decisions should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development. For plan-making this means that plans should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area and be sufficiently flexible to adapt to rapid change. For decision taking this means approving development proposals that accord with an up to date development plan without delay.

5.6 Paragraph 11 also clearly spells out the Government's presumption in favour of allowing development that accords with an up to date development plan unless any adverse impacts of doing so would demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.

5.7 The application, in simple terms, is for the demolition of an existing bungalow in the centre of a group of three dwellings of different scales, designs and external materials and the erection of a two-storey replacement dwelling. The replacement dwelling will be to modern construction specifications and will be much more

energy efficient than the existing bungalow. It is also proposed that there will be an array of solar panels on the west facing roofslope. In our opinion, it is therefore a relatively straightforward proposal that we consider to constitute sustainable development as defined by the policies in NPPF taken as a whole.

- 5.8 In order for permission to be granted, the proposal must also comply with the Council's adopted Core Strategy. We will now therefore consider the proposed development against what we consider to be the most relevant Key Statements and Policies of the Core Strategy.

### **Ribble Valley Adopted Core Strategy 2008-2028**

#### **Key Statement DS2**

- 5.9 This Policy states that, when considering development proposals, the Council will take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the National Planning Policy Framework; and will work proactively with applicants to find solutions which mean that proposals can be approved wherever possible. It also states that applications that accord with the policies of the Local Plan will be approved without delay unless material considerations indicate otherwise. As stated above, we consider that the proposal represents sustainable development as defined by NPPF, and we will explain below why it fully accords with the relevant policies of the Local Plan such that permission should be granted.

#### **Key Statement EN2**

- 5.10 This Policy relates to landscape considerations with specific relevance to developments that are within the AONB. The Key Statement states that the landscape and character of the AONB will be protected, conserved, and enhanced and that developments will need to contribute to the conservation of the natural beauty of the area. Of relevance to this application that is within the Open Countryside (but outside the AONB) it is stated, additionally, that the Council will expect development to be in keeping with the character of the landscape, reflecting local distinctiveness, vernacular style, scale, style, features and building materials.
- 5.11 The proposal involves the demolition of an existing bungalow and the erection in its place of a two-storey dwelling. As such, the proposal is similar to the development that has taken place at the adjoining property to the west in accordance with planning permission 3/2005/0666. We appreciate that the permission on the adjoining land was granted under the policies of the former Districtwide Local Plan, of which Policy H14 was of most relevance to the consideration of that application. That former Policy was permissive of the rebuilding or replacement of dwellings in the open countryside, but subject to the volume of the replacement dwelling not exceeding 70cu.m. or 15% of the volume

of the existing dwelling (whichever was the greater). In the Delegated Item File Report for that application, the officer stated as follows:

*“Whilst the replacement would occupy broadly the same siting on the plot, it does represent an increase in volume of approximately 65% which is over and above the restrictive guideline figure of a 15% increase in the open countryside (Policy H14). The height of the existing and proposed houses are approximately the same at the pitch but the proposal would appear more substantial due to the level of accommodation provided at first floor level. I do not consider that this increased massing would have a detrimental visual impact. The existing bungalow is run down and of little architectural merit or interest and, given the wide variety of house types to be encountered along this stretch of the A59, I believe that this proposal can be comfortably assimilated into the landscape. The proposed use of brick is again acceptable because of the variety of building materials in evidence along the A59. In terms of residential amenity, the next-door property, Shenstone, is unlikely to be significantly affected as the replacement house would be over 9m away and viewed from the neighbour would appear little more overbearing than the existing property.”*

- 5.12 We will refer back to the Council’s consideration of application 3/2005/0666 below when we examine the current application with respect to Core Strategy Policy DMH3. With respect to Key Statement EN2, the scale, design and external materials of the proposed dwelling all differ from the existing bungalow but, as stated by the planning officer in 2005, there is a wide variety of house types along this stretch of the A59. Since 2005 there have also been other permissions for replacement dwellings on the A59 that have further increased the variety of dwelling types and designs in the locality. There is therefore no particular vernacular of buildings to which the proposed building needs to conform. We therefore contend that the proposed dwelling does not contravene the requirements of Key Statement EN2.

### **Policy DMG2**

- 5.13 This Policy defines the Council’s overall development strategy. As the proposal will simply replace one dwelling with another dwelling it would have no effects upon the approved development strategy and would therefore not contravene Policy DMG2

### **Policy DMG1**

- 5.14 This Policy defines the general criteria that proposals must satisfy in order for planning permission to be granted, in respect of which we will comment below using the headings within the Policy.

- 5.15 **Design.** Although different to the bungalow that is to be replaced, we consider that, within the context of the variety of dwelling types and designs in the locality, the proposed house will appear as an attractive modern dwelling that would not be detrimental to the appearance or character of the locality.
- 5.16 **Access.** The proposed dwelling will be served by the existing access from Longsight Road and will be provided with appropriate parking and manoeuvring areas. As a replacement of one dwelling with another, the proposal will not result in any change in the amount of traffic that will be generated.
- 5.17 **Amenity.** The effects of the proposal on the visual amenities of the locality are discussed above in relation to Key Statement EN2. With regards to the amenities of nearby residents, the proposed dwelling is to be sited between the neighbouring dwellings on each side such that, in our opinion, it will not result in any overshadowing or overbearing effects on either of those properties, nor will their privacy be adversely affected.
- 5.18 **Environment.** The application site is not within an area that is subject to any special environmental protection. The proposed dwelling, although larger than the existing bungalow, will be in a similar location between the two neighbouring properties and within the existing residential curtilage. The proposal does not involve any extension to the existing residential curtilage. As such, we do not consider that the proposed dwelling would have any detrimental effects upon the natural environment.

#### **Policy DME2**

- 5.19 This Policy relates to the protection of the landscape and townscape and states that proposals will be refused if they would significantly harm a number of specified important landscape or landscape features. The only one of the specified features that could be of relevance to this application is “hedgerows and individual trees.” As there are no existing hedgerows or trees that would be affected by the proposed dwelling, we contend that the proposal complies with Policy DME2

#### **Policy DME3**

- 5.20 This Policy relates to the protection and conservation of site and species and will be covered in the separate Bat, Barn Owl and Nesting Bird Survey Report.

#### **Policy DMH3**

- 5.21 This Policy specifies the limited types of residential development that are permissible in the open countryside and AONB, one of which is the rebuilding or replacement of existing dwellings. Even at a time when Such proposals are permissible subject to compliance with the criteria that (1) the residential use of

the property has not been abandoned; (2) there being no adverse impact on the landscape in relation to the new dwelling; and (3) the need to extend an existing curtilage. In this case, the existing bungalow is perfectly habitable, and its residential use has certainly not been abandoned. For reasons given above, we contend that there would be no adverse effects on the landscape and no extension to the existing curtilage is either needed or proposed. Overall, as it is a straightforward replacement of one dwelling with another, we consider the proposal to comply with the intentions of Policy DMH3.

5.22 We would also comment that unlike the previous Policy H14, Policy DMH3 does not seek to impose a limit on the percentage increase in size of the proposed dwelling relative to the existing dwelling. Even at a time when a maximum of 15% increase was applicable under policy H14, the planning officer considered it acceptable to approve application 3/2005/0666 for a replacement dwelling adjoining the application site even though it was 65% larger than the bungalow that it was to replace. We do not, in any way disagree with the approval of that application because the dwelling that now occupies the adjoining plot is, in our opinion, perfectly acceptable for this location with regards to its size, design and external appearance. For reasons similar to those given by the planning officer for approving 3/2005/0666, we consider that the dwelling proposed in this current application is also appropriate and acceptable for this location with respect to its size, design, and appearance. It also falls to be considered under a policy that is far less restrictive than the equivalent policy under which 3/2005/0666 was found to be acceptable.

5.23 For the reasons given above, we consider that we have demonstrated that the proposed development represents sustainable development that is fully compliant with NPPF and the relevant policies of the Council's adopted Core Strategy. However, in further support of our contention that this application should therefore be approved, we examine in the next section of this Statement, a number of permissions for the demolition and replacement of dwellings in the open countryside and AONB that have recently been granted by the Council following their consideration of the respective applications within the same policy context that is applicable to this current application.

## **6. SIMILAR DEVELOPMENTS IN RIBBLE VALLEY**

6.1 Before considering other relevant developments in Ribble Valley, we will reiterate that this is a straightforward application for the demolition of a bungalow and the erection of a two-storey dwelling within the existing residential curtilage. For reasons that we have already stated, we consider the size, design, and external materials to be appropriate for the locality such that the replacement dwelling would not appear as an inappropriate or discordant feature in the landscape. Whilst there will undoubtedly be many more examples of planning permissions

for similar developments in the Ribble Valley, we refer below to five cases that we consider to be relevant to the consideration of this application at Shenstone.

### **Sawley Lodge, Sawley**

- 6.2 3/2013/0853 – Proposed construction of a new gateway and gatehouse lodge, reinstatement of original driveway route and provision of car parking facility for anglers. Approved with conditions on 20 January 2014.

3/2013/0854 – Proposed erection of replacement dwelling. Approved with conditions on 30 January 2014.

- 6.3 With regard to these two applications at Sawley Lodge, we would comment firstly that, not only is the site in the AONB, it is also on raised ground close to the boundaries of the Sawley Conservation Area that contains the remains of Sawley Abbey, a Scheduled Ancient Monument. The Council's planning officers and Members considered the proposed development to be acceptable with regard to its effects upon all these designations, notwithstanding that the proposed dwelling was many times larger than the Victorian Lodge that it was to replace. Additionally, the Victorian Lodge had been reviewed for Listed Building status and must therefore, in our opinion, have had at least some architectural and/or historic importance. However, the Council did not consider it to represent even a non-designated heritage asset, such that its demolition was not even discussed as an issue in the Committee Report for the two applications. There were therefore many considerations to be made in the determination of those applications, including the replacement dwelling being substantially larger than the existing dwelling. We would therefore respectfully suggest that there should be absolutely no objections from the Council's officers or Members with regard to the demolition of the bungalow (that is of no architectural merit) and its replacement with a two-storey house as proposed in this application at Shenstone.

### **The Eaves, Pendleton Road, Wiswell**

- 6.4 3/2014/0053 – Proposed demolition of all buildings on the site (existing house, kennels and various outbuildings) and erection of dwelling house (including bed and breakfast element) reduced footprint scheme of approved application 3/2012/0010. Approved with conditions on 3 April 2014.
- 6.5 The Eaves is on the north side of Pendleton Road just outside the AONB but the land on the south side of the road is within the Forest of Pendle part of the AONB. The site is therefore within the Open Countryside, but it is on raised ground and is clearly visible from the A59 and on lower ground to the north of the site.
- 6.6 Whilst we have not calculated the area/volume of the approved building or the original buildings that have been demolished, we are sure that the Council will not

dispute that the approved development comprises a very significant increase in 'built- form' compared to the site before the application was approved. The scale and design of the dwelling is also considerably different from the original dwelling that was demolished. The replacement dwelling is a prominent feature within the landscape, especially when viewed from the lower ground to the north, from which direction, of course, it is viewed against the backdrop of the higher ground to the south that is within the AONB.

- 6.7 With regards to this approved development at The Eaves, we would contend that the replacement dwelling has a visual impact upon both the open countryside within which it is situated and the immediately adjoining AONB. We would further contend that the increase in scale of the approved development in comparison to the original buildings on the site is considerably in excess of the increase that would result from the approval of the application to which this Statement relates.

#### **Moorhouse Farm, Clitheroe Road, Knowle Green**

- 6.8 3/2015/0757 – Proposed demolition of an existing barn and construction of replacement dwelling and garage, conversion of existing outbuildings to form annex and extension of existing curtilage to provide parking and garaging. Approved with conditions 23 December 2015.
- 6.9 This site is located within the open countryside on the south side of Clitheroe Road, Knowle Green. The land on the north side of the road at this location is within the AONB. The original farmhouse and its attached barn were designated as a Listed Building in November 1983 but were de-listed in November 2012 for the reasons that significant internal alterations had resulted in the loss of a significant amount of original fabric; and alterations to the front, rear and west gable end had further eroded the architectural character of the building. Following a serious fire, the farmhouse part of the building was considered by the Council's Building Inspectors to be unsafe and dangerous. This part of the building was therefore demolished, but the barn part of the building was retained. In view of those specific circumstances, the Council accepted that the demolition of the farmhouse did not amount to the abandonment of residential use at the site.
- 6.10 When application 3/2015/0757 was submitted, only the barn remained on-site, but, due to the specific circumstances described above, the Council considered it on the basis that it was for a replacement dwelling as opposed to a new-build dwelling. The reason why we have referred to this approval is because, again, the replacement dwelling was considerably larger than the combined dwelling/barn that it replaced and of a totally different style/design. One of the design features of the approved replacement dwelling was a predominance of glazing with the south elevation in particular being totally glazed. We contend that the replacement dwelling that is the subject of this current application does not have anywhere near the level of impact on the local landscape than was the case with approved

application 3/2015/0757. We therefore ask that this application is also determined to be in accordance with the applicable planning policies, such that permission is accordingly granted.

**Painley Farm, Knott Lane, Newsholme.**

- 6.11 3/2017/0248 – New dwelling to replace existing farmhouse and two barn conversions approved under planning permission 3/2016/0575. Approved with conditions May 2017.
- 6.12 Painley Farm comprises a group of agricultural buildings and a detached farmhouse in an isolated open countryside (but not AONB) location between Gisburn and Horton. The agricultural buildings were a mixture of traditional stone-built barns and modern portal framed buildings. Permission was granted under application 3/2017/0248 for the erection of a large dwelling following the demolition of the existing farmhouse, one traditional barn and all the modern agricultural buildings. Another traditional barn was to be retained in order to provide garages and additional living accommodation to the replacement dwelling to which it was to be attached by a glazed link.
- 6.13 As this proposal involves the demolition of large agricultural buildings and the existing farmhouse, it does not result in an increase in the volume of built development at the site. The new dwelling, however, is substantially different in scale and design to the original farmhouse. As with the approved development at Knowle Green referred to above, the proposed dwelling contains significantly more glazing than was contained in the original dwelling. It also contains a basement that has one, predominantly glazed, external elevation such that when viewing that elevation (the south) the dwelling appears as a three-storey structure, whilst it is two storeys high when viewing the other elevations.
- 6.14 Due to the large amount of demolition involved, and the scale/design of the proposed dwelling, this approved development will change the appearance of the site from a typical farmstead, including traditional and modern buildings, to a large single dwelling of modern design with an attached annex of traditional design (as it is a converted traditional barn). We are not saying that the Council has erred in granting permission for this significant change in the appearance and character of the site with consequential changes in the local landscape. What we are saying is that the development that is the subject of this Statement has minimal effects upon the local landscape, compared to what we consider to be substantial effects resulting from the approved development at Painley Farm. As that application was considered to be compliant with the relevant Policies, we can see absolutely no reason why the much smaller development at Shenstone should not also be considered acceptable.

### **Lower Read Wood Farm, Old Roman Road, Read**

- 6.15 3/2017/1081 – Demolition of dwelling and outbuilding and the erection of a replacement dwelling with detached garage. Approved with conditions on 9 February 2018.
- 6.16 This application related to a property known as Lower Read Wood Farm, but the property was not in use as a working farm at the time of the application. The main buildings at the property were a traditional two storey farmhouse with an attached barn. The farmhouse was located at the eastern end of an approximately 220m long farm track off the eastern side of Old Roman Road within the Forest of Pendle AONB.
- 6.17 The farmhouse and barn were simple in form, being two storeys high, rectangular in shape and of stone construction under a slate roof. The approved replacement building was two storeys high but with a basement and was of irregular shape and had numerous different eaves and ridge heights. The replacement dwelling was therefore not only larger than the original building, but it was also of a totally different style and design. We are not saying that the Council erred in any way in granting this permission because the approved dwelling is similar in scale and in its general design to numerous other properties in the locality.
- 6.18 The point that we are making is that once again, the replacement dwelling is considerably larger than and of a totally different design to the dwelling that it has replaced, and that the impact of this upon the local landscape (in this case AONB) was considered to accord with the Council's relevant Policies.
- 6.19 The examples that we have given above all relate to relatively recent permissions for developments that are all larger in scale and have a far greater impact on the local landscape than the development to which this Statement relates. In all of the cases, the developments have also been in more prominent and isolated locations than Shenstone and are either within or close to the AONB where it is even more important to protect the landscape from inappropriate development. However, we consider that perhaps the most relevant planning permission to the consideration of this current application is the permission, 3/2005/0666, for the replacement of a bungalow with a larger 2 storey house on the site adjoining the application site. Although that application was approved under different policies we would contend that they were more restrictive than the current policies, and, for reasons that we have already given, we consider that, as that permission was granted in 2005, there should be no reasons for this current application to be refused.

## **7. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS**

- 7.1 We consider that we have demonstrated in this Planning Statement that the proposal represents sustainable development that complies with NPPF and the

relevant Policies of the Council's adopted Core Strategy. We also consider that, in Section 6 of this Statement, we have demonstrated that, in its determination of numerous applications, the Council has accepted that a development in the open countryside (including the AONB) can be different in scale and appearance to the existing situation whilst still complying with the requirements of the relevant policies. We also contend that the proposal under consideration in this application will result in considerably less of an impact on the local landscape than those examples to which we have referred above.

- 7.2 Therefore, overall, we consider the proposed development to be in accordance with the Development Plan. In order to comply with paragraph 11 of NPPF and Core Strategy Key Statement DS2 we accordingly consider that permission should be granted without delay subject to any reasonable conditions that the Council considers to be necessary.
  
- 7.3 If, however, the Council requires any amendments to the proposal, and/or the submission of any additional information in order for permission to be granted, we would ask that you give us the opportunity to address the same (in accordance with NPPF paragraph 38) prior to the determination of the application.

Signed.....*PP. Paul Sharpe*.....Date.....*09/10/2020*.....  
**Colin Sharpe DipTP MRTPI**  
**For and on behalf of Gary Hoerty Associates**

