

Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.

Signed:	Officer:	MC	Date:	12/10/2026	Manager:	LH	Date:	13/10/26
----------------	-----------------	-----------	--------------	-------------------	-----------------	-----------	--------------	-----------------

Application Ref:	3/2026/0567			 Ribble Valley Borough Council www.ribblevalley.gov.uk
Date Inspected:	22/01/2026 (as part of pre-application enquiry)	Site Notice:	N/A	
Officer:	MC			
DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:				APPROVAL

Development Description:	Conversion of redundant barn to form extension to existing dwelling and granny annexe. Insertion of solar panels to front elevation of dwelling.
Site Address/Location:	Cowley Brook Farm, Higher Road, Longridge, PR3 2YX

CONSULTATIONS:	Parish/Town Council
No response received.	

CONSULTATIONS:	Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies
LCC Highways:	The Local Highway Authority (LHA) notes that the proposal utilises the existing vehicular access and parking arrangements, with no alterations proposed to the access onto the public highway. The submitted plans indicate that four parking spaces are to be retained within the site. No objection subject on highway safety grounds.
RVBC Countryside Officer:	The Countryside Officer recommends that all recommendations outlined within the ecology surveys are adhered to.
CONSULTATIONS:	Additional Representations.
No representations received.	

RELEVANT POLICIES AND SITE PLANNING HISTORY:
Ribble Valley Core Strategy: Key Statement DS1: Development Strategy Key Statement DS2: Sustainable development Key Statement EN2: Landscape Key Statement EN5: Heritage Assets Policy DMG1: General considerations Policy DMG2: Strategic considerations Policy DMH5: Residential and Curtilage Extensions Policy DMG3: Transport and Mobility Policy DME1: Protecting Trees And Woodlands Policy DME2: Landscape And Townscape Protection Policy DME3: Site and Species Protection and Conservation

Policy DME4: Protecting Heritage Assets
Policy DME5: Renewable Energy
Policy DME6: Water Management
Policy DMH4: The Conversion of Barns And Other Buildings To Dwellings

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Relevant Planning History:

3/2016/0958

Alterations to existing dwelling and extension into adjacent attached barn.
Approved with Conditions

3/2016/0959

Conversion and alterations to barn to form one dwelling.
Approved with Conditions

3/2015/0016

Conversion of barn to form two dwellings.
Refused
Appeal Dismissed

3/2014/1112

Single storey side extension, internal alterations and improvements to existing access (Resubmission of application 3/2014/0589).
Approved with Conditions

3/2014/0689

Conversion and extension of derelict house to create 2 holiday cottages, creation of off street parking and siting of septic tank
Refused

3/2014/0588

Change of use of barn to form 2 no. dwellings and erection of garages. Change of use of land to create domestic curtilages and alterations to access
Refused

3/2014/0589

Single storey side extension, internal alterations, erection of garage and improvements to existing access
Refused

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:

Site Description and Surrounding Area:

The site comprises an existing dwelling attached barn at Cowley Brook Farm, Higher Road, Longridge. The application site is located approximately 3km to the east of Longridge in the Forest of Bowland National Landscape and comprises a farmhouse with attached barn. The two-storey barn is located to the east of the farmhouse and faces onto Higher Road. It has a single storey lean-to at the rear, which houses three stables, and a double garage extends from the east elevation. The barn is faced with natural stone, a blue slate roof and timber window frames and doors with stone heads and sills.

Proposed Development for which consent is sought:

The proposal includes the insertion of a row of flush fitted solar panels to the front elevation of the existing dwelling and the conversion of the adjoining barn to a granny annexe and residential accommodation which will be linked to the existing main dwelling.

The proposal includes the insertion of rooflights, new windows and doors.

It should be noted that planning permission was granted in 2016 under planning ref: 3/2016/0958 for the conversion of part of the barn to additional living accommodation. However, this was only for a much smaller section of the barn. Planning permission was also granted to convert the barn to a dwelling, with some of the new external alterations being similar to that as approved under planning ref: 3/2016/0959. Both permissions have not been implemented.

Principle of Development:

The site is not located within a defined settlement and Policy S5 of the NPPF states:

Policy S5 of the NPPF states that:

1. Only certain forms of development should be approved outside settlements, as set out in the following list. These should be approved, unless the benefits of doing so would be substantially outweighed by any adverse effects, when assessed against the national decision-making policies in this Framework:

- a. Development for: agriculture, horticulture and forestry; outdoor sport and recreation; allotments; cemeteries and burial grounds; mineral extraction and processing; engineering operations and infrastructure (including for transport, energy, water and telecommunications); roadside facilities in accordance with policy TR5; national defence and security; or which is solely for nature conservation, restoration and/or enhancement;*
- b. Development for rural businesses and services, including tourism, where a location outside settlements is shown to be necessary;*
- c. The reuse, extension, alteration or replacement of an existing building, provided that the existing building is of permanent and substantial construction, is lawful in planning terms, and any extension or alteration will not result in a disproportionate increase in size compared to the existing building. In the case of proposals for a replacement building, it should be for the same use and not disproportionately larger than the one it replaces;*
- d. The redevelopment of previously developed land (including a material change of use to residential or mixed-use including residential);*
- e. Limited infilling within groups of houses;*
- f. An exception site as provided for in policy HO10, or development brought forward under a Community Right to Build Order or Neighbourhood Development Order;*
- g. Development which would address an evidenced unmet need for gypsy, traveller or 25 The existing building is to be assessed as the property as existing on the date of the publication of this Framework. 25 travelling showpeople accommodation, provided it meets the criteria in policy HO12;*
- h. Residential and mixed-use development which would:*
 - i. Be within reasonable walking distance of a well-connected station (applying the definitions in the glossary at Annex B)*
 - ii. Be physically well-related to the station or the settlement within which the station is located;*
 - iii. Be of a scale which can be accommodated taking into account the existing or proposed availability of infrastructure; and*
 - iv. Not prejudice any proposals for long-term comprehensive development in the same location.*
- i. The development of land allocated for that purpose in the development plan (where this lies outside settlements);*

j. Development which would address an evidenced unmet need (including, but not limited to, development proposals involving the provision of housing where the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites or scores below 75% in the most recent Housing Delivery Test), and where the development would:

- i. Be physically well-related to an existing settlement (unless the nature of the development would make this inappropriate) and be of a scale which can be accommodated taking into account the existing or proposed availability of infrastructure; or*
- ii. Comprise major development for freight and logistics purposes which accords with policy*

2. In applying this policy, the circumstances in which the benefits of approving development proposals are likely to be substantially outweighed by adverse effects include, but are not restricted to, situations where the development proposal would fail to comply with one of the national decision-making policies which state that development proposals should be refused in specific circumstances.

3. Development proposals comprising isolated homes, which are those lying outside settlements or groups of houses, should not be approved other than in accordance with policy HO11.

4. Development proposals which do not fall within one of the categories set out in this policy should only be approved in exceptional circumstances, where the benefits of the proposal would substantially outweigh the adverse effects, including to the character of the countryside and in relation to promoting sustainable patterns of movement.

5. This policy does not apply to development proposals in the Green Belt or on land designated as Local Green Space, which should instead be determined in accordance with policies HC8, GB6, GB7 and/or GB8 (as appropriate). However, where development would not be inappropriate in these locations (through the application of policies HC8 and GB7), proposals should be approved unless the benefits of doing so would be substantially outweighed by any adverse effects, when assessed against the national decision-making policies in this Framework, and applying paragraph 2 of this policy.

The proposal falls to be assessed under criterion 'c' of Policy S5 as it would constitute the re-use of an existing building. Whilst external alterations are proposed to the barn, the proposal does not include any additional extensions and would not therefore result in disproportionate additions. The Council are satisfied that the building is of permanent and substantial construction and is lawful.

Policy DMG2 is also relevant which requires development within the Tier 2 villages and outside the defined settlement areas to meet at least one of six considerations which are listed as below:

- 1. The development should be essential to the local economy or social well-being 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.*
- 6. The development is compatible with the enterprise zone designation.*

Whilst none of the criteria within Policy DMG2 relates to the conversion of an existing barn into additional living accommodation (rather than a new dwelling), Policy DMH4 is also of relevance as the proposal would result in the conversion of an existing agricultural barn to residential accommodation.

Policy DMH4 which is for the conversion of barns and other buildings to dwellings states that:

Planning permission will be granted for the conversion of buildings to dwellings where:

- 1. the building is not isolated in the landscape, i.e. it is within a defined settlement or forms part of an already group of buildings, and*

- 2. there need be no unnecessary expenditure by public authorities and utilities on the provision of infrastructure, and*
- 3. there would be no materially damaging effect on the landscape qualities of the area or harm to nature conservations interests, and*
- 4. there would be no detrimental effect on the rural economy, and*
- 5. the proposals are consistent with the conservation of the natural beauty of the area.*
- 6. that any existing nature conservation aspects of the existing structure are properly surveyed and where judged to be significant preserved or, if this is not possible, then any loss adequately mitigated.*

The building to be converted must:

- 1. be structurally sound and capable of conversion for the proposed use without the need for extensive building or major alternation, which would adversely affect the character or appearance of the building. The council will require a structural survey to be submitted with all planning application of this nature. this should include plans of any rebuilding that is proposed;*
- 2. be of a sufficient size to provide necessary living accommodation without the need for further extensions which would harm the character or appearance of the building, and*
- 3. the character of the building and its materials are appropriate to its surroundings and the building and its materials are worthy of retention because of its intrinsic interest or potential or its contribution to its setting, and*
- 4. the building has a genuine history of use for agriculture or another rural enterprise.*

The Ribble Valley Core Strategy notes that the re-use of existing rural buildings provides an important opportunity to preserve buildings that contribute to the areas character and setting, can usefully provide a housing resource and promote sustainability.

It has been established at a previous appeal that the site is not isolated within the landscape, given that it would adjoin the existing property, in addition to a number of timber sheds associated with the barn and a further dwelling approximately 60 metres to the west. In addition, there would not likely be any unnecessary expenditure by public authorities and utilities on the provision of infrastructure.

The submitted information confirms that the barn is currently vacant and it is not considered that there would be any harm to the rural economy.

Criterion 3, 5 and 6 of Policy DMH3 will be assessed later in this response.

The application has been accompanied by a structural survey which states that the barn is in generally reasonably good condition structurally, with little or no sign of previous movement and no sign of ongoing movement..

The report states that the conversion will require the construction of an insulated inner leaf which may comprise of a cavity with insulation plus a block inner leaf or a backing block to the stone with a cavity and a further block inner leaf.

The report also notes that the rear wall to the main barn acts as a retaining wall and this will need to be assessed for any required tanking detail during detailed design. The existing trusses and purlins appear to be free from signs of rot or infestation but others have definitely suffered damage but should be checked for rot prior to their reuse. Due to the good condition of the barn walls any new openings introduced in the barns should not affect the overall stability of the buildings but they should be assessed by a structural engineer.

As such, the Council are satisfied that the proposal is structurally sound and capable of conversion.

Policy DMH5 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy states that:

"For the extension of properties to provide accommodation for elderly or dependant relatives will also be subject to the following criteria:

- 1. The development must be capable of integration into the main dwelling or a use that is ancillary to the use of the main dwelling housing when circumstances change.*
- 2. The extension should generally speaking provide only a modest level of accommodation."*

The floorplans indicate that the granny annexe would have a separate access from the front, a ground floor room with small kitchen and downstairs w/c and a first-floor bedroom with en-suite. Whilst the proposal would not be connected internally to the main dwelling, the proposal provides a modest level of accommodation which can be secured by way of planning condition as ancillary to the main dwellinghouse.

Impact Upon Residential Amenity:

Ribble Valley Core Strategy Policy DMG1 provides specific guidance in relation to amenity and states that all development must:

- '1. not adversely affect the amenities of the surrounding area.*
- 2. provide adequate day lighting and privacy distances.*
- 3. have regard to public safety and secured by design principles.*
- 4. consider air quality and mitigate adverse impacts where possible'*

Given the separation distances between the proposed converted barn and surrounding residential dwellings within the vicinity, as well as the orientation of the proposed windows serving primary living accommodation, it is not considered that the proposed conversion would result in any adverse impact upon the amenity of existing or future residents.

As such, the proposal is considered to accord with Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.

Visual Amenity/External Appearance and Heritage:

Key Statement EN2 relates to the Forest of Bowland National Landscape and states:

The landscape and character of the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty will be protected, conserved and enhanced. Any development will need to contribute to the conservation of the natural beauty of the area. The landscape and character of those areas that contribute to the setting and character of the Forest of Bowland Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty will be protected and conserved and wherever possible enhanced. As a principle 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.

Policy N4 of the NPPF states:

1. Development proposals within Protected Landscapes should be limited in scale and extent and sensitively located and designed to avoid harm to the statutory purposes and special qualities of the Protected Landscape. Substantial weight should be placed on the importance of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of these areas, and to conserving and enhancing wildlife and cultural heritage in National Parks and the Broads.

Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy states that:

"Development must 'not adversely affect the amenities of the surrounding area' and 'consider the density, layout and relationship between buildings, which is of major importance".

In addition, Policy DMG2 also states that

'In protecting the designated Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty the council will have regard to the economic and social well being of the area. However the most important consideration in the assessment of any development proposals will be the protection, conservation and enhancement of the landscape and character

of the area avoiding where possible habitat fragmentation. where possible new development should be accommodated through the re-use of existing buildings, which in most cases is more appropriate than new build. development will be required to be in keeping with the character of the landscape and acknowledge the special qualities of the AONB by virtue of its size, design, use of material, landscaping and siting. the AONB management plan should be considered and will be used by the council in determining planning applications.'

Policy DMH4 also requires development to be consistent with the conservation of the natural beauty of the area.

Policy DMH5 also states:

'Proposals to extend or alter existing residential properties must accord with policy DMG1 and any relevant designations within which the site is located.'

Cowley Brook is also considered to be a Non-Designated Heritage Asset.

Key Statement EN5 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy states that:

'There will be a presumption in favour of the conservation and enhancement of the significance of heritage assets and their settings. The Historic Environment and its Heritage Assets and their settings will be conserved and enhanced in a manner appropriate to their significance for their heritage value; their important contribution to local character, distinctiveness and sense of place; and to wider social, cultural and environmental benefits.'

In addition, Policy DME4 states that:

'Alterations or extensions to listed buildings or buildings of local heritage interest, or development proposals on sites within their setting which cause harm to the significance of the heritage asset will not be supported.'

Policy HE4 of the NPPF states that:

'1. Heritage assets, as an irreplaceable resource, should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance. To achieve this, development proposals which would affect the significance of heritage assets, including any contribution made by their setting should:

a) Maintain or secure a use consistent with their conservation, taking into account the importance of maintaining the assets, the positive contribution they can make to sustainable communities including local economies, and the positive contribution they can make to local character and distinctiveness; and
b) Avoid (or if that is not possible, minimise) harm to the significance of heritage assets, and instead conserve this significance.

2. Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (including from development within its setting) should have a clear and convincing justification in accordance with the policies in this chapter.

3. Where there is evidence of deliberate neglect of, or damage to, a heritage asset, the deteriorated state of the asset should not be taken into account in any decision relating to the asset.

4. Proposals for enabling development, which would otherwise conflict with other policies in this Framework and/or those in the development plan, but which would secure the future conservation of a heritage asset, should be considered on the basis of whether the conservation benefits outweigh the disbenefits of departing from the policies concerned.'

Policy HE5 also states:

'1. Development proposals affecting heritage assets should be accompanied by an assessment of the significance of the assets affected (including any contribution made by their setting) and of the potential effect of the proposal on their significance. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is necessary to understand the potential effect of the proposal on their significance. The relevant

historic environment record should be referred to in making this assessment, and appropriate expertise employed where necessary.

2. Assessments of the potential effects of development proposals on the significance of heritage assets (including through effects on their setting) should identify whether proposals would be likely to:

- a) Have a positive effect, which is where the significance of a heritage asset would be enhanced, or better revealed; or
- b) Have no effect on the significance of a heritage asset; or
- c) Result in harm to the significance of a heritage asset, either from work affecting the asset itself or from development within its setting. The degree of harm should be identified: substantial harm would occur where the development proposal would seriously affect a key element of the asset's significance; or
- d) Cause the total loss of the significance of a heritage asset.

3. In making this assessment it is the effect on a heritage asset's significance rather than the scale of the development which should be considered.

4. Decision-makers should be satisfied that assessments accurately reflect the effects on heritage assets caused by development proposals.

5. Where a development proposal involves, or has the potential to involve, a heritage asset with archaeological interest, an appropriate desk-based assessment should be undertaken and, where necessary, a field evaluation. These should be used to help understand the asset's significance and the potential effect of the proposal on this, which should inform the design, mitigation and implementation of the development.'

In addition, Policy HE7 of the NPPF states that:

'1. Development proposals which would have a positive effect on a non-designated heritage asset should be supported.

2. Where a development proposal would harm the significance of a non-designated heritage asset, this should be weighed against the benefits of the proposal and a balanced judgement made, having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the non-designated heritage asset.

3. Where a development proposal would cause substantial harm to, or the total loss of, the significance of a non-designated heritage asset, it should only be supported where the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefits of the proposal, having regard to the scale of the harm or loss and the significance of the non-designated heritage asset.'

The application is supported by a heritage statement which states that the building may be considered a non-designated heritage asset by way of its agricultural function, traditional farm appearance and contribution to the existing historic rural landscape character. Its significance derives from its representation of traditional agricultural practices in Lancashire, the use of local materials such as stone and slate and its form and layout.

Firstly, with regards to the introduction of solar panels on to the front elevation of the existing roof, Policy DME5 states:

Development proposals within or close to the AONB, Sites of Special Scientific Interest, Special Areas of Conservation and Special Protection Areas, notable habitats and species, local nature reserves, biological heritage sites or designated heritage assets and their setting will not be allowed unless:

1. The proposals cannot be located outside such statutory designated areas
2. It can be demonstrated that the objectives of the designation of the area or site will Not be compromised by the development
3. Any adverse environmental impacts as far as practicable have been mitigated

The proposal would introduce solar panels to the front elevation of the main dwelling. The amount and siting of solar panels have been reduced and more centrally located so that the panels appear more centrally within the roof slope. The solar panels would be flush to the roof which would help reduce the panels visual appearance and the extent of panels on the roof slope is considered to be acceptable and they would not dominate the roof. The site is located within the Forest of Bowland National Landscape and thus it would be

reasonable to secure details of the solar panels prior to their installation to ensure they are of an appropriate appearance as to not be visually obtrusive within the landscape.

To the front elevation, the proposal would introduce two new windows to the first floor. One above the existing main cart door opening and one to the side of this opening, adjacent to the main farmhouse. The Council have previously raised concerns at the pre-application stage with regards to the number of openings proposed and this has been reduced from three new first floor openings to two.

The removal of the timber door with glazing has already been established under planning ref: 3/2016/0959 and thus the Council raise no objection to this element.

Prior to the determination of the application, the enlargement of the ground floor window between the main cart lodge opening and the existing dwelling has been reduced in size following concerns raised by the Planning Officer with regards to the number of new openings.

Whilst the amended scheme would introduce some new openings to the front elevation, this is not considered to be excessive and would still retain the historic character of the barn, utilising mostly existing openings. The retention of the smaller ground floor window opening also helps to retain the random sequence of openings commonly found on agricultural buildings which is welcomed.

The windows would have simple casement windows which helps to differentiate between the barn and the main dwellinghouse and are help to reduce any domestication of the appearance of the barn.

Turning to the flank elevation, a new window would be inserted at first floor level. This window would be obscured behind the existing garages and would not be harmful to the character of the barn. The window design would also match the existing windows on this elevation.

To the rear elevation, the proposal re-locates two existing rooflights to the rear roof of the main dwelling which is considered to be acceptable. Two new conservation type rooflights would be introduced to the rear roof of the barn. The introduction of these rooflights is considered acceptable and would not dominate the roof slope. Their positioning within the roof would also not appear overly uniform with one rooflight being set lower towards the eaves.

Turning to new openings to the rear wall, the proposal would utilise the existing rear openings to facilitate an office. Three stable doors would be inserted to include two windows with timber boarding below and one timber stable door. Given that these would utilise existing openings, this is acceptable and the introduction of stable doors would be similar to that already approved under planning ref: 3/2016/0959. The retention of the middle opening as a fully timber door would help reduce uniformity.

The proposal would also introduce new patio doors, a ground floor window and a new first floor window. Whilst these new openings would result in a more domestic appearance to the rear of the barn, the principle of introducing these new openings has already been established under the granting of planning permission ref: 3/2016/0959.

All windows and doors would be timber to match the existing which is considered to be an appropriate material within the Forest of Bowland National Landscape and their details/specification can be secured by way of planning condition.

Overall, the external alterations to the building to facilitate the conversion to residential accommodation are considered to be acceptable. The proposal would result in some loss of historic fabric and therefore would represent a low level of harm to the significance of the building. However, this is balanced against the benefits of bringing the redundant building back into use.

Whilst comments have not been received from the Historic Environment Unit, the previous application under planning ref: 3/2016/0959 included a condition to secure the implementation of a programme of

archaeological building recording. Given that the previous permission was not implemented and this condition had not been discharged, it would be reasonable to include such condition to ensure the recording and inspection of matters of archaeological/historical importance associated with the site.

Overall, the proposal is considered to accord with Key Statement EN2 and EN5 and Policies DMG1, DMG2, DME4 and DME5 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy as well as Policies HE4, HE5 and HE7 of the NPPF.

Highways and Parking:

Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy states that all development must:

- 1. Consider the potential traffic and car parking implications.*
- 2. Ensure safe access can be provided which is suitable to accommodate the scale and type of traffic likely to be generated.*
- 3. Consider the protection and enhancement of public rights of way and access.*

In addition, Policy DMG3 states that:

All development proposals will be required to provide adequate car parking and servicing space in line with currently approved standards.

The Local Highway Authority have provided comments on the scheme and they note that the proposal utilises the existing vehicular access and parking arrangements, with no alterations proposed to the access onto the public highway. The submitted plans indicate that four parking spaces are to be retained within the site. Having considered the submitted information, the Highway Authority has no objections to the proposal and raises no highway concerns.

The double garage would be able to accommodate 2 no. vehicles with an additional parking space on the driveway.

As such, subject to the above suggested conditions, the proposal is considered to comply with Policy DMG1 and DMG3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.

Landscape/Ecology:

Policy DME3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy also states that:

‘Development proposals that are likely to adversely affect the following.... ‘Wildlife species protected by law’ will not be granted planning permission. exceptions will only be made where it can clearly be demonstrated that the benefits of a development at a site outweigh both the local and the wider impacts. Planning conditions or agreements will be used to secure protection or, in the case of any exceptional development as defined above, to mitigate any harm, unless arrangements can be made through planning conditions or agreements to secure their protection’.

The application is supported by a bat and bird ecology survey. The report considers that there is no predicted impact on roosting bats or bat roosts but advised that there are a small number of potential roost features suitable for bats associated with roof coverings, roof edges and wall cavities. A number of recommendations are outlined and the report states that any new lighting should be designed to reduce light spill upwards and that the renovated building should incorporate suitable bat roosting features. It is considered that these can be secured by way of planning condition.

Turning to birds, there are potential impacts to barn owls (disturbance, damage, destruction). Current evidence suggests at least one barn owl has roosted in the buildings prior to the 2026 survey and there is a reasonable likelihood that barn owls could be roosting within the barn building at any time of the year. The

report states that a pre-commencement check should be undertaken by an ecologist prior to works commencing and that an internal barn owl box should be installed on the east gable. This can be secured by way of planning condition.

With regards to nesting birds, there are predicted impacts to nesting swallows and blue tits (disturbance, damage and destruction) and other nesting birds, nests and eggs as a result of the proposed works. Pre-commencement checks should be undertaken prior to the commencement of works and the report recommends that the renovated building should either retain features suitable for use by swallows and blue tit e.g. open and accessible canopy structures for swallows and deep wall cavities for blue tits or the renovated building should incorporate suitable bird nesting features e.g. a minimum of 3 x integral nesting boxes or external bird boxes suitable for use by hole nesting birds and at least 2 swallow cups should be installed under a roof overhang or canopy. Again, this can be secured by way of planning condition.

The development is proposed as being exempt from having to achieve the mandatory Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) requirement the site is less than 0.2 hectares in size. As such, the application is considered to be exempt from mandatory BNG.

Observations/Consideration of Matters Raised/Conclusion:

As such, it is for the above reasons and having regard to all material considerations and matters raised that the application is recommended for approval.

RECOMMENDATION:	That planning consent be granted subject to the imposition of conditions.
------------------------	---