

RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL



Ribble Valley
Borough Council

www.ribblevalley.gov.uk

COMMENTS ON APPELLANT'S STATEMENT

TOWN & COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

Planning Inspectorate Reference:	APP/T2350/W/23/3322801
LPA Application Reference:	3/2022/1180

Appeal by Alan & Anne Davies Settlement 2014 Trust
Against the refusal by
Ribble Valley Borough Council to grant planning permission for:

Demolition of an agricultural building (with Class Q consent for residential) and erection of a new dwelling.

Pinfold Farm, Preston Road, Ribchester, Preston PR3 3YD

**WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS SUBMITTED ON BEHALF OF
THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY**

Comments on Appellants Statement of Case

- 1.1 The Appellant's Statement of Case is largely based on the fall-back position of the consented Class Q development (allowed at appeal – see Appendix 1), which the LPA did have regard to in its assessment of the planning application. However, there is disagreement between the two parties in terms of how much weight should be given to the fall-back position and the benefits and dis-benefits of each scheme.
- 1.2 The Council has had regard to the *Mansell v Tonbridge* case referred to by the Appellant, but also to an appeal decision where a similar development with a Class Q fall-back position was dismissed at a neighbouring authority, Craven District Council (Appendix 2). The Council maintains its position that the fall-back scheme is a material consideration that can be given some weight, but that the extant prior approval does not carry sufficient weight to outweigh the spatial strategy of the Local Plan (as was found by the Inspector in the appeal decision at Appendix 2).
- 1.3 Additionally, the Council's case is that the Inspector of the Class Q prior approval development on this appeal site (Appendix 1) judged that the conversion of the existing building would utilise timber walls and metal sheeting roofs 'both of which would reflect materials commonly found on modern agricultural buildings and which [the Inspector] observed on other barns in the locality. As such the use of these materials would be sympathetic to the agricultural character of the building'. The Inspector went on to consider why the use of glazing at each ends of the building would not appear out of character (with an agricultural barn)'.
- 1.4 It is clear that the Inspector, in allowing the appeal, was satisfied that the resultant development would be in keeping with the design and character of the existing agricultural barn, and therefore appear harmonious in its rural setting.
- 1.5 Contrary to the above, the proposal represents a new building in its entirety, of a different massing and roof formation to the existing barn, and with a design and external appearance that bears no resemblance to its agricultural origins which it is seeking to replace. The Delegated Report (Appendix 3) expands on the concerns regarding design and visual harm, noting that the proposal would result in an incongruous form of development with a more prominent orientation and associated domesticated appearance resulting in harm to the character, appearance and visual amenities of the area.

1.6 The Council has had regard to the improvements put forward by the appellant and offers the following comments:-

- The slight reduction in overall area to be developed of 29 sq.m. including the slight reduction in the floor areas and volumes overall would be discernible from the public perception. Therefore the Council does not consider that this would be a benefit or reduce the impact of the development compared to the fall-back scheme.
- The Appellant states that the proposed scheme would result in a reduction in the hardstanding, however, it would appear from the submitted site plan 009 that this hardstanding would likely become residential curtilage immediately to the east of the property, and therefore be subject to domestic paraphernalia which would have an urbanising impact on the countryside. Therefore the Council does not consider that this would be a benefit.
- Whilst it is agreed that the introduction of the solar roof system, ground source heat pump and mechanical ventilation system would improve the energy efficiency of the proposed build, the converted barn could also be subject to the same energy efficiencies. Therefore the council considers that this benefit carries only limited weight which does not override the harm of a new build property in the open countryside (NB Additionally it should be noted that the proposed new ground source heating pipes are not within the application site boundary).

1.7 An updated bat survey was undertaken by a licenced ecologist on the 22nd March, 2023. It is noted that the survey concludes that this is a high-risk location for recording bats and there are a few minor potential roosting places that exist. The report goes on to conclude that none of the potential roosting places identified seem to have a high likelihood of being used by bats with roosting potential low at most. No further bat surveys are required however, contractors should be mindful of bats and provision of integrated bat boxes would be a pro-active measure.

1.8 Therefore, in terms of the third reason for refusal this can be satisfactorily addressed by means of an appropriate condition requiring the mitigation recommendations of the report to be fully implemented.



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 August 2021

by **Alison Partington BA (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25th August 2021

Appeal Ref: **APP/T2350/W/21/3274371**

Pinfold Farm, Preston Road, Ribchester, PR3 3YD

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant approval required under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 3, Class Q of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by Mr A Davies against the decision of Ribble Valley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 3/2021/0096, dated 26 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 23 February 2021.
 - The development proposed is the change of use from agricultural building to one dwelling and associated operational development.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and prior approval is granted under the provisions of Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 3, Class Q(a) and (b), of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) for the change of use from agricultural building to one dwelling and associated operational development at Pinfold Farm, Preston Road, Ribchester, PR3 3YD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 3/2021/0096, dated 26 January 2021, and the details submitted with it, subject to the following conditions.
 - 1) Prior to the first occupation of the dwelling hereby permitted details of the boundary treatment of the residential curtilage shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the LPA. The boundary treatment shall be erected or planted prior to occupation and retained thereafter.
 - 2) Prior to the first occupation of the dwelling hereby permitted the two adjacent agricultural buildings shall be removed as shown on the Proposed Site Plan Reference 002.

Background and Main Issue

2. The appeal relates to an application for the change of use of an agricultural building and associated operations under Paragraphs Q (a) and Q (b) of the *Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended)* (GPDO).
3. There is no dispute between the parties with regard to the compliance of the scheme with all the criteria in paragraph Q.1 and with paragraph Q.2 (a) to (e) and (g). Based on the evidence before me and the observations I made at my site visit, I have no reason to take a different view in terms of the scheme's compliance with these particular paragraphs. Therefore, the focus of my

determination of the appeal has been the area of difference between the parties which relates to paragraph Q.2 (f).

4. In the light of this the main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposal on the design and external appearance of the building.

Reasons

5. The agricultural building that is the subject of the appeal is a relatively modern fully enclosed portal frame structure. The base of the walls are constructed from concrete blocks with the top part being clad with Yorkshire boarding. The roof consists of corrugated cement roof sheets. The front elevation has a large sliding door, but otherwise there are no other openings on the barn.
6. The proposal would convert the barn to a dwelling whose external walls would be clad in timber and whose roof would be constructed from powder coated metal sheeting. Both these would reflect materials commonly found on modern agricultural buildings and which I observed on other barns in the locality. As such, the use of these materials would be sympathetic to the agricultural character of the building.
7. It is proposed to replace the existing door on the front elevation with full height glazing which would incorporate a door into the property. Whilst a greater height than the existing sliding door, the scale and proportions of this would reflect the large agricultural opening.
8. A similar sized opening is proposed on the rear elevation. Although this would not replace an existing opening it is not unusual for barns to have large openings at either end and so it would not appear out of character.
9. Other than this, both the number of openings added to the building and the size of them, have been kept to the minimum necessary to ensure light is provided to habitable rooms. The irregular shape and size of the windows and the high solid to void ratio they would maintain would ensure that the building retains its agricultural character. Moreover, the use of louvred timber cladding would reduce the visibility of the windows, and would match the timber cladding on the walls.
10. The existing barn has a number of clear panels in the roof allowing light in. Given this the proposed rooflights, which are small in size, would not be out of character.
11. As such, I am satisfied that the proposal would not unacceptably harm the design or the external appearance of the building. Accordingly, I consider it would not conflict with the requirements of paragraph Q.2(f) of the GPDO.

Conditions

12. The GPDO attaches various standard conditions to this type of development, including that development must be completed within a period of 3 years (paragraph Q.2.(3)), and be in accordance with the approved details (paragraph W(12)(a)).
13. The GPDO also indicates that conditions reasonably related to the subject matter of the prior approval can be imposed (paragraph W(13)). I have assessed the Council's suggested condition on this basis and the tests for conditions set out in the Framework.

14. In order to protect character and appearance of the area a condition to ensure adequate boundary treatment is provided around the curtilage of the dwellings is necessary. To ensure adequate light is provided to rooms on the eastern elevation, a condition is necessary to ensure the adjacent agricultural buildings are removed as shown on the drawings accompanying the application. As matters of design and external appearance, and the provision of adequate natural light are both assessment issues, I consider these conditions are reasonably related to the prior approval.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above, I conclude the appeal should be allowed and prior approval should be granted.

Alison Partington

INSPECTOR



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 December 2020

by **S Dean MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/C2708/W/20/3253457

Agricultural building, Lane End Farm, Cam Lane, Thornton in Craven, Skipton BD23 3SX

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs J Adamson against the decision of Craven District Council.
 - The application Ref 2020/21481/FUL, dated 2 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 28 May 2020.
 - The development proposed is demolition of agricultural building and replacement with 1 No. dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are whether the appeal site is suitable for the development proposed, having regard to the growth strategy for the area, and whether the appeal proposal would provide biodiversity net gain.

Reasons

Suitability of the site

3. The appeal site, an agricultural building adjacent to a recently constructed dwelling, has an extant prior approval under Class Q for conversion to a dwellinghouse, and the appellant states there is a very real prospect of that conversion taking place. As such, I give the fallback position some weight in the determination of this appeal.
4. I have had regard to both the *Mansell v Tonbridge* case and the 2018 appeal decision quoted by the appellant. Class Q is intended to allow the conversion of existing agricultural buildings and does so largely irrespective of their location or the spatial strategy of the area in which they are located. However, section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that proposals be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Policy SP4 of the Craven Local Plan 2012 to 2032, adopted November 2019 (the Local Plan) sets a spatial strategy for housing growth, which seeks to limit residential development in the countryside to a specific and limited number of criteria which the appeal proposal does not meet.

5. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy SP4 of the Local Plan as well as the guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) on sustainable patterns and locations of growth.
6. I acknowledge that the extant Class Q prior approval could lead to the provision of a dwelling on this site, and the similarities with the appeal proposal in terms of scale and overall size. I also acknowledge that in this case, on this site, the implications of the permitted development regime and the development plan pull in different directions. However, I do not consider that extant prior approval, either alone, or in combination with the other evidence, is a material consideration of such weight to outweigh the spatial strategy expressed in Policy SP4 of the relatively recent Local Plan, and indicate that a decision be taken other than in accordance with the development plan. This is particularly important in light of the Framework imperative for the planning system to be genuinely plan-led.

Biodiversity

7. Policy ENV4 of the Local Plan seeks to ensure that development should deliver a net gain to biodiversity wherever possible. There are no details in the application itself as to how this might be achieved, but a landscaping condition as suggested by the appellant could meet this aim. I am satisfied that a condition to ensure this could meet the tests in the Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance (the PPG), and that it could therefore assist in delivering the biodiversity net gain which the development plan policy seeks. As a result, I consider that the proposal could provide a biodiversity net gain in accordance with Policy ENV4 of the Local Plan.

Conclusion


8. I have found that the extant Class Q prior approval is a material consideration of some weight. I have also found that the proposal could comply with the requirements of Policy ENV4. However, these do not outweigh the significant conflict I have found between the proposal and the spatial strategy of the plan set out in Policy SP4 of the Local Plan. Coupled with the aims of the Framework to deliver a genuinely plan-led system, I do not find that there are material considerations of such weight to indicate that a decision in this case be taken other than in accordance with the development plan.
9. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

S Dean

INSPECTOR

Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.

Signed:	Officer:	KH	Date:	08/03/23	Manager:	LH	Date:	13/3/23
----------------	-----------------	-----------	--------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------	--------------	----------------

Application Ref:	3/2022/1180	 Ribble Valley Borough Council www.ribblevalley.gov.uk
Date Inspected:	26/01/23	
Officer:	KH	
DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:		Refusal

Development Description:	Demolition of an agricultural building (with Class Q consent for residential) and erection of a new dwelling.
Site Address/Location:	Pinfold Farm Preston Road Ribchester PR3 3YD

CONSULTATIONS:	Parish/Town Council
No objections in result of the proposal.	

CONSULTATIONS:	Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies
LCC Highways:	

No objections subject to the imposition of conditions.

CONSULTATIONS:	Additional Representations.
UU – Developers must contact the Developer Services team prior to commencing any works on site. The drainage plans should be in accordance with the drainage hierarchy outline in the NPPF/NPPG.	

RELEVANT POLICIES AND SITE PLANNING HISTORY:

Ribble Valley Core Strategy:

Key Statement DS1 – Development Strategy
Key Statement DS2 – Sustainable Development
Key Statement EN4 – Biodiversity and Geodiversity
Key Statement DMI2 – Transport Considerations

Policy DMG1 – General Considerations
Policy DMG2 – Strategic Considerations
Policy DMG3 – Transport and Mobility
Policy DME3 – Site and Species Protection and Conservation
Policy DMH3 – Dwellings in the Open Countryside

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Relevant Planning History:

3/2021/1271: Proposed demolition of agricultural buildings, erection of a detached dwelling and garage. Refused.

3/2021/0096: Prior Notification: Proposed change of use from agricultural building to one dwelling and associated operational development. Refused. Appeal Allowed - APP/T2350/W/21/3274371.

3/2021/0083: Proposed demolition of concrete block and timber agricultural building under a box profile roof. Approved.

3/2020/0855: Proposed change of use from agricultural building to one dwelling and associated operational development. Refused.

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:

Site Description and Surrounding Area:

The application relates to three agricultural buildings located off and to the north-east of Preston Road, Ribchester. The application site is located outside of any defined settlement boundaries sited on land designated as open countryside.

The area is largely agricultural in character, being of a relatively open aspect save that for sporadic cluster of built-form, the majority of which is residential in nature.

Proposed Development for which consent is sought:

This proposal seeks consent for the demolition of an existing agricultural building (with class Q consent for residential) measuring 18.180m x 9.030m with a maximum height of 5.205.5m to ridge (3.9m to eaves) and the erection of a two-storey four-bedroomed detached dwelling measuring 15.157m x 8.950.1m with a maximum height of 7.893m top of chimney (6.508m to ridge (3.707m to eaves).

It is proposed to re-orientate the building from east/west gable facing to north/south front facing.

It is proposed that the dwelling will be faced in timber cladding and random stone, with the roof area being faced in natural blue-slate apart from the proposed south west facing roof which would have a GB SOL Seamless Infinity Solar Roof System. The architectural language of the proposal is that of a modern dwelling, with large, glazed elements on the south and east elevations with taller, narrower glazed features to all elevations, the two on the west-facing elevation are proposed to have two vertical timber louvres.

The overall fenestration is quite regular in order and hierarchy including the insertion of vertical windows, French doors/Juliet balcony and large glazed doors to the north including a wraparound window at first floor to the north/east. Vehicular and pedestrian access is provided via an existing shared access that is accessed via Ribchester Road to the south.

Principle of Development:

The larger primary building to which the application relates benefits from an extant consent for conversion to a residential dwelling, with prior approval having been granted under the provisions of Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 3, Class Q(a) and (b), of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) by way of appeal decision ref: APP/T2350/W/21/3274371.

As such, the granting of the prior approval, under the provisions of Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 3, Class Q(a) and (b), of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended), has established a consent for the creation of a residential planning unit on-site, albeit through conversion of an existing building. As such, this matter forms a material consideration in the determination of the current application.

It is accepted that there is significant discord between the provisions of article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 3, Class Q(a) and (b), of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) and that of the overall spatial aspirations for housing growth within the borough as embodied within Policies DMG2 and DMH3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.

Even so, the fall-back position offers a sustainability benefit of re-use of an existing building, which does not apply to this proposal. Furthermore a different policy test in the development plan applies to conversions to dwellings in rural areas, with the policy being generally supportive of them in principle subject to meeting relevant criteria.

Notwithstanding the 'fall-back' position, the starting position for any assessment of a planning application is against the development plan.

The proposal seeks consent for the erection of a new residential planning unit within the defined open countryside through demolition of an existing agricultural building and the erection of a new dwelling. In this respect both Policies DMG2 and DMH3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy are engaged for the purposes of assessing the application.

Policy DMG2 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy seeks to restrict residential development within the open countryside and Tier 2 Village settlements to that which meets a number of explicit criteria, with Key Statement DS1 also reaffirming these criteria and setting out the overall spatial aspirations for development within the Borough.

Policy DMG2 is two-fold in its approach to guiding development. The primary part of the policy DMG2(1) is engaged where development proposals are located 'in' principal and tier 1 settlements with the second part of the policy DMG2(2) being engaged when a proposed development is located outside of defined settlement areas or within tier 2 villages, with each part of the policy therefore being engaged in isolation and independent of the other dependant on the locational aspects of a proposal.

The mechanics and engagement of the policy are clear in this respect insofar that it contains explicit triggers as to when the former or latter criterion are applied and the triggers are purely locational and clearly based on a proposals relationship to defined settlement boundaries and whether, in this case, such a proposal is in or outside a defined settlement.

The proposal is located outside of any defined settlement limits, in this respect when assessing the locational aspects of development, it is the latter part of Policy DMG2 (Policy DMG2(2)) which remains engaged which states that:

Within the tier 2 villages and outside the defined settlement areas development must meet at least one of the following considerations:

- 1. The development should be essential to the local economy or social wellbeing of the area.*
- 2. The development is needed for the purposes of forestry or agriculture.*
- 3. The development is for local needs housing which meets an identified need and is secured as such.*
- 4. The development is for small scale tourism or recreational developments appropriate to a rural area.*
- 5. The development is for small-scale uses appropriate to a rural area where a local need or benefit can be demonstrated.*

In respect of the matter of local need, need is defined within the Adopted Core Strategy as '*Local needs housing is the housing developed to meet the needs of existing and concealed households living within the parish and surrounding parishes which is evidenced by the Housing Needs Survey for the parish, the Housing Waiting List and the Strategic Housing Market Assessment*'.

No such information has been provided that would suggest the proposal is that for local needs housing that would meet the above definition, nor can it be argued that the development is needed for the '*purposes of forestry or agriculture*'. As such it cannot be considered that the proposal aligns with the requirements of Policy DMG2 in these respects.

Policy DMH3 relates to the creation of new residential planning units within areas of designated open countryside and sets out a number of explicit criteria which must also be met, in this respect Policy DMH3 reads:

Within areas defined as open countryside or AONB on the proposals map, residential development will be limited to:

1. *Development essential for the purposes of agriculture or residential development which meets an identified local need. In assessing any proposal for an agricultural, forestry or other essential workers dwellings a functional and financial test will be applied.*
2. *The appropriate conversion of buildings to dwellings providing they are suitably located and their form and general design are in keeping with their surroundings. buildings must be structurally sound and capable of conversion without the need for complete or substantial reconstruction.*
3. *The rebuilding or replacement of existing dwellings subject to the following criteria:*
 - *The residential use of the property should not have been abandoned.*
 - *There being no adverse impact on the landscape in relation to the new dwelling.*
 - *The need to extend an existing curtilage.*

The creation of a permanent dwelling by the removal of any condition that restricts the occupation of dwellings to tourism/visitor use or for holiday use will be refused on the basis of unsustainability.

Taking account of the above criterion, as previously identified, it cannot be argued that the proposal is '*residential development which meets an identified local need*', as such the proposal must be considered to also be in direct conflict with Policy DMH3.

As such, and taking account of the above matters, it can only be concluded that the proposal is considered contrary to Policies DMG2 and DMH3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy in that approval would lead to the creation of a new residential dwelling in the defined open countryside, located outside of a defined settlement boundary, without sufficient justification insofar that it has not been adequately demonstrated that the proposal is for that of local needs housing that meets a current identified and evidenced outstanding need.

Taking account of the location of the proposal and its relative isolation from any defined settlement, it is considered that the development would perpetuate an already unsustainable pattern of development, without sufficient or adequate justification, insofar that occupants of the residential dwelling would fail to benefit from adequate walkable access to local services or facilities – notwithstanding the bus stop which serves Pinfold Cottages this provides a limited school/college bus service with two regular services along Preston Road between Clitheroe and Chipping and Blackburn and Preston, this would still place further reliance on the private motor-vehicle contrary to the aims and objectives of Key Statement DMI2 and Policy DMG3 of the adopted Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework presumption in favour of sustainable development and weighs against the development proposal.

In summary the principle of development of development is contrary to the development plan however it is acknowledged that the fallback represents a material consideration which carries weight. The following sections will consider the impact of the development proposal and, where appropriate, a comparison against the fallback scheme will be made to help inform the overall assessment.

Impact Upon Residential Amenity:

The proposed dwelling would be sited approximately 40m from the nearest dwelling Pinfold Farm Bungalow to the south east, 65m from Pinfold Farm to the south west and around 70m from 1 and 2 Pinfold Farm Barn sited to the south east.

Taking account of the orientation and arrangement of the proposed dwelling and its relative distance from nearby residential dwellings, it is not considered that the proposal will result in any undue impact upon nearby existing or future residential amenities.

Visual Amenity/External Appearance:

As established within the 'principle of development' section of this report, the extant prior approval granted at appeal, not only remains a material consideration in respect of matters of principle, but also in relation to matters of visual impact.

In this respect, consideration must be given as to whether the submitted proposal would result in any additional adverse visual impact over and above those that may be resultant if the Class Q prior approval, allowed at appeal, were to be implemented.

In the original Class Q application (3/2021/0096) the authority determined that the proposal would result in harm to the character and visual amenities of the area, with the proposal having been refused for the following reasons:

'The external appearance of building, having particular regard to overall design, external materials and fenestrational arrangement would result in the introduction of a proposal of an overtly suburban character which would be read as an anomalous, incongruous and discordant introduction which would be visually incompatible with and unsympathetic to its rural surroundings in conflict with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework and Q.2(f) of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015.'

However the Inspector, in determining the appeal, did not consider such harm was evident. Given the extant permission on site, a comparative viewpoint must be established as to whether the submitted proposal would result in additional or lesser visual harm.

Whilst the proposed dwelling would occupy a slightly smaller footprint than that of the existing building, it would, however, be re-orientated so that the larger front elevation faces south west rather than east and would be sited closer to the entrance into the site and extending right up to the site boundaries creating a more prominent visual impact.

The architectural language of the proposal is that of a modern dwelling, with large, glazed elements on the south and east elevations with taller, narrower glazed features to all elevations, the two on the west-facing elevation are proposed to have two vertical timber louvres.

The overall fenestration is quite regular in order and hierarchy including the insertion of vertical windows, French doors/Juliet balcony and large glazed doors to the north including a wraparound window at first floor to the north/east.

The roof would be asymmetrical and the material would involve use of both random stone and timber cladding. The collective design is overly fussy and out of keeping with the simple design that many rural buildings depict.

Taking account of the appearance of the proposed dwelling, it is therefore considered that the proposed dwelling would result in a visually suburbanising effect upon the landscape over and above that which would be resultant from the Class Q prior approval consent.

Furthermore, taking into account the proximity of the proposal to adjacent residential built-form, the cumulative effect of further overtly residential development in the area would undermine the character and visual amenities of the area being of detriment to the character of the defined open countryside in this location.

Landscape/Ecology:

The application has been accompanied by a Bat Survey which is, however, out of date and therefore fails to consider the potential impact of the development on protected species contrary to Key Statement EN5 and Policy DME3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.

Observations/Consideration of Matters Raised/Conclusion:

The proposed new build dwelling in open countryside is contrary to the development plan, would be dependent on a private motor vehicle, would result in visual harm, and insufficient evidence has been submitted to demonstrate no resultant harm to protected species.

Whilst a fall-back position exists, this relates to a conversion of an existing building and is considered to result in less harm than the development proposal.

It is for the above reasons and having regard to all material considerations and matters raised that the application is recommended for refusal.

RECOMMENDATION: That planning consent be refused for the following reasons:

01

The proposal would lead to the creation of a new residential dwelling in the defined open countryside, located outside of a defined settlement, without sufficient justification insofar that it has not been adequately demonstrated that the proposal is for that of local needs housing that meets a current identified and evidenced outstanding need nor does the proposed dwelling benefit from adequate walkable access to local services or facilities thus placing reliance upon the private motor vehicles contrary to Key Statements DS1, DS2, DMI2 and Policies DMG2, DMG3 and DMH3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy 2008 – 2028. Whilst a fall-back position is acknowledged, which is a material consideration, this fall-back relates to a conversion with different policy considerations and so carries very limited weight in the overall planning balance.

02

The proposal, by virtue of the external appearance of the dwelling, the horizontal repositioning of the proposed residential unit, driveway/parking area and the likely visual impact of associated domestic paraphernalia such as sheds, washing lines, children's play equipment and fence lines would result in the introduction of an incongruous form of residential development which is overtly domestic and would result in a cumulative visually suburbanising effect of the landscape being of significant detriment of the character, appearance and visual amenities of the area contrary to Policies DMG1 and DMG2 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy. Whilst a fall-back position is acknowledged, which is a material consideration, this fall-back is considered to result in less visual harm in comparison to the development proposal and so carries very limited weight in the overall planning balance.

03

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 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 therefore fails to accord with Key Statement EN4 and Policy DME3 relating to Site species protection and conservation of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy 2008 – 2028.