

Peter Hitchen Architects

Peter Hitchen Architects Ltd
Marathon House
The Sidings Business Park
Whalley
Lancashire
BB7 9SE
09 August 2022

**PROPOSED CONVERSION OF TWO AGRICULTURAL BUILDINGS INTO
TWO DWELLINGS
LAND OFF WHITTLE HALL FARM, MOOR LANE, LANGHO
ARCHITECTS STATEMENT TO SUPPORT THE PLANNING APPEAL**



View of the agricultural buildings from Moor Lane

This statement is written to support the planning appeal following the refusal of the prior notification application to Ribble Valley Borough Council (ref 3/2022/0436) and with specific reference to the refusal reasons 2 and 3. The planning consultant has prepared a separate statement which addresses the **first reason** for refusal on the basis of the location and this should be read in association with this correspondence.

Reason 2: Insufficient evidence has been submitted to assess the potential impact of the development on protected species including bats. In the absence of such information therefore, the likelihood that the proposed works will cause disturbance to bats [sic] result in the loss of a bat roost or cause injury or death to bats and other wildlife within or adjacent to the site cannot be determined and the proposed works would fail to satisfy the requirements of Para W of Schedule 2 Part 3 of the Town and Country Planning [General permitted Development] [England] Order 2015.

Regular communications were issued to the case officer during the application process enquiring about the status of the application and asking if they required any further information. The submission was validated on the basis of all the documentation issued with the application. The only information which was requested by the authority related to the agricultural holding detail which was quickly concluded by the issue of the relevant map accepted by the case officer.

We have emails which confirm the communications and it is clearly apparent that we could have provided a bat survey for the buildings, however it is worth noting and very relevant to say that they are completely inappropriate structures for any kind roost for habitat but the applicant would be willing to accept a condition on the notice relating to the habitat.. A statement from our ecology consultant would have concluded the matter if the case officer had raised this as an issue.

Reason 3: The proposed developments would result in a poor quality, cramped form of development inappropriate design for residential use contrary to the criteria set out in Schedule 2 Part 3 Class Q 2 [f] of the Town and Country Planning [General [permitted Development] [England] Order 2015

The two agricultural buildings are located adjacent to each other and the proposal has been designed to meet all the requirements as stipulated by the regulations under the order. The footprint of the buildings has not been extended and the layout of the internal spaces has been arranged in order to respect privacy matters and the residential amenity of the dwellings. The plans demonstrate that any principal windows are located in a manner to ensure there is no overlooking.

The buildings are of a low profile and the materiality is entirely appropriate for the conversion under the order. The buildings volumes remain as existing. The curtilage of the development is entirely proportionate for the overall scale of the development. We are confused and perplexed with this reason for refusal on the basis of the site wide conditions and how the design has been produced. The relationship between the two dwellings is comparable to the proliferation of new build housing developments within the borough and the space standards are compatible with the national standards.