

Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.

Signed:	Officer:	BT	Date:	23/7/26	Manager:	LH	Date:	24/7/26
----------------	-----------------	----	--------------	---------	-----------------	----	--------------	---------

Application Ref:	3/2026/0485	 Ribble Valley Borough Council www.ribblevalley.gov.uk
Date Inspected:	18/4/24	
Officer:	BT	
DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:		REFUSAL

Application Description:	Non material amendment to application 3/2024/0530 involving elevation changes to windows, doors and the main entrance roof and the main entrance lobby re-positioned.
Site Address/Location:	Barn at Cockshotts Farm, Stubbins Lane, Sabden, BB7 9EH.

CONSULTATIONS:	Parish/Town Council
N/A	

CONSULTATIONS:	Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies
N/A	

CONSULTATIONS:	Additional Representations.
N/A	

RELEVANT POLICIES:
National Planning Practice Guidance: Flexible options for planning permissions

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:
Nature of Non-Material Amendment: Consent is sought for a non-material amendment to application 3/2024/0530 which granted consent for the conversion of a barn building to three dwellings with associated landscaping, outbuildings and parking. The purpose of the application is to seek the Council's opinion as to whether the changes to the previously approved development are sufficiently material in their nature and in the context of the approved development so as to require a new planning permission. Non-material amendment applications are not an application for planning permission. They do not result in the issuing of a new planning permission and relate only to the amendments sought. In this instance, the proposal concerns numerous amendments to the configuration of fenestration within the barn building approved for residential conversion. These amendments include changes to the proportions of first floor window openings within the North-eastern elevation of the barn building whereby these windows would take on a rectangular emphasis as opposed to the approved square opening design, with the same alterations also being proposed to two first floor window openings within the South-eastern gable end of the barn building, a first floor window opening within the Barn's North-western gable end and a ground floor window opening within the South-western elevation of the barn building. A double width glazed door opening would also be incorporated into the barn's South-western elevation in place of a previously approved single width glazed door opening. In this case, the existing barn building comprises a mixture of square and rectangular openings which were predominantly utilised in the approved scheme of

fenestration pertaining to application 3/2024/0530 resulting in the barn’s randomised sequence of openings and agricultural character being retained. The existing first floor windows are predominantly square and the approved scheme reflected that. In contrast, the proposed amendments to the approved scheme of fenestration would involve the introduction of numerous window openings with a rectangular emphasis as outlined above which, when read in conjunction with the barn’s rectangular openings at ground floor, would subsequently disrupt the building’s randomised sequence of openings through introducing additional glazing and a noticeably regimented pattern of fenestration and solid to void ratio which in turn would give the barn building an overtly domestic appearance (particularly on the North-eastern elevation of the barn building). In addition, the patio doors proposed for the South-western elevation of the barn building would be more prominent than the approved single door opening with respect to their width to the extent that these would compete with the barn’s South-western cart entry feature. Furthermore, the introduction of a roof feature over the barn’s North-eastern cart entry walls would result in a noticeable visual change to the barn’s existing (and as approved) North-eastern cart entry and roof profile, with no justification having been provided for the introduction of this feature.

Taking account of the above, it is considered that the cumulative visual impacts of the amendments sought would result in a fundamental change to the design and external appearance of the development originally approved, with the amendments proposed amounting to a development that would be materially different in terms of design and external appearance to that of the original consent.

In view of the above, it is therefore considered that the proposed amendments would in this case exceed the threshold of a non-material alteration to the original planning permission for the purposes of Section 96A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

Observations/Assessment/Conclusion:

The non-material amendment should be refused.

RECOMMENDATION:

Refuse non-material amendment.