|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Signed:** | | **Officer:** | **SK** | | | | **Date:** | **27.04.22** | **Manager:** | | **NH** | **Date:** | **27.04.22** |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Application Ref:** | | | | 3/2022/0231 | | | | | |  | | | |
| **Date Inspected:** | | | | 21/04/22 | | | | | |
| **Officer:** | | | | SK | | | | | |
| **DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:** | | | | | | | | | | **REFUSAL** | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Development Description:** | | | | | | Conversion of part of the existing building into two additional residential letting rooms. | | | | | | | |
| **Site Address/Location:** | | | | | | Shireburn House, Shireburn Caravan Park, Edisford Road, Waddington BB7 3LB | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | | | **Parish/Town Council** | | | | | | | |
| No representations have been received in respect of the proposed development. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | | | **Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies** | | | | | | | |
| **LCC Highways:** | | | | | |  | | | | | | | |
| No objections subject to the imposition of conditions. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | | | **Additional Representations.** | | | | | | | |
| No representations have been received in respect of the proposed development. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **RELEVANT POLICIES AND SITE PLANNING HISTORY:** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ribble Valley Core Strategy:**  Key Statement DS1 – Development Strategy  Key Statement DS2 – Sustainable Development  Key Statement DMI2 – Transport Considerations  Policy DMG1 – General Considerations  Policy DMG2 – Strategic Considerations  Policy DMG3 – Transport & Mobility  Policy DMH3 – Dwellings in the Open Countryside  National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Relevant Planning History:**  **3/2022/0026:**  Three new residential caravan pitches with associated landscaping, access and servicing. (Undetermined)  **3/2022/0218:**  Variation of condition 5 (closure of existing access to all traffic except emergency vehicles) of planning permission 3/2004/0806 to provide free site access to the caravan park via the southern road. (Undetermined)  **3/2012/0455:**  Proposed amendment to the Section 106 dated 13th November 2006 in relation to Application No. 3/2004/0806/P to allow occupancy of holiday caravans for 12 months. (Approved) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Site Description and Surrounding Area:**  The application relates to an existing building located within Shireburn Caravan park, Edisford Road, Waddington. The existing building currently accommodates 5 residential dwellings and a bar area associated with the existing caravan park. The application solely relates to an area of the existing building that is currently being used as residential storage.  The site is located outside of any defined settlement limits being within land that benefits from an open countryside designation. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Proposed Development for which consent is sought:**  The proposal seeks consent for the conversion of the area which is currently used as ‘domestic storage;’ to that of two independent residential planning units.  It is proposed that the units will be one-bedroomed in nature, being of an open-plan ‘studio arrangement’. ‘Studio Unit 1’ will accommodate living/cooking and sleeping accommodation within the same room-area, with ‘Studio Unit 2’ accommodating living/sleeping accommodation with the same room-area but benefitting from a separate kitchen/dining area. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Principle of Development:**  The application site lies within the defined open countryside being located outside of the defined settlement of Clitheroe, as such and given the application seeks consent for the creation of new residential planning units, both Policies DMH3 and DMG2 are fully engaged. Both policies seek to restrict development within the open countryside and AONB to that which meets a number of explicit criteria, with Key Statement DS1 setting out the overall spatial aspirations for all development within the Borough.  Given the proposal site is location outside of any defined settlement boundary, Policy DMG2 remains fully engaged. 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’ 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 boundary, 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.*   Policy DMH3 is also applicable and is engaged in parallel with Policy DMG2 given the sites location within the defined open countryside, with the policy providing further context stating that:  *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.*   It is clear from the submitted details that the proposal could not be argued as being ‘essential to the local economy or social wellbeing of the area’ nor could it be considered that the proposal ‘is needed for the purposes of forestry or agriculture’.  In respect of the matter of ‘local need’, no evidence has been provided to suggest that the proposal would align with the definition of ‘local needs housing’ as defined within the Adopted Core Strategy which states that *‘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’*.  In light of the above matters, and in the absence of any other evidence to suggest otherwise, it cannot be considered that the proposal meets any of the exception criterion contained within Policies DMG2 nor DMH3 in relation to new dwellings within the defined open countryside.  As such, the clear and direct conflict with both Policies DMG2 and DMH3 would preclude the ability for the principle of the development to be supported in this location. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Impact Upon Residential Amenity:**  Given the proposal seek consent for the creation of two residential planning units, consideration must not only be given for the potential for the proposal to undermine existing residential amenity but also that of the level of residential amenity and standards of accommodation that will be afforded to potential occupiers of the residential planning units to be created.  In this respect the proposed residential units fail to meet the minimum gross internal floorspace areas as defined within the ‘technical housing Standards – Nationally Described Space Standards’, with Studio Unit 1 being 21m² and Studio Unit 2 being 32m² falling significantly short of the required 37m².  Notwithstanding the above national standards, taking account of the internal configuration of the units it is considered that occupiers of the dwellings would be afforded a sub-standard level of living accommodation by virtue of a poor standard of residential amenity due to the limited size and configuration of the units being contrary to Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Visual Amenity/External Appearance:**  Given the proposal does not seek consent for any exterior alterations to the existing building it is not considered that the proposal will result in any additional or measurable detrimental impact upon the character or visual amenities of the area. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Landscape/Ecology:**  The application has been accompanied by a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and bat Risk Assessment. The report concludes that the proposed development will have no measurable impact upon protected species or species of conservation concerns.  Recommendations are made in respect of vegetation removal in that it should be carried out outside the bird nesting/breeding season. Recommendations are also made, should consent be granted, that the incorporation of provisions for building dependent species may result in overall biodiversity gain. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Other Matters:**  Taking account of the location of the proposal and its relative remoteness in respect of services/facilities, in concert with the lack of any dedicated footway provision for the majority of the extents of Edisford Road, it is considered that the proposed development would perpetuate an already unsustainable pattern of development, without sufficient or adequate justification, insofar that occupants of the proposed residential dwellings would fail to benefit from adequate walkable access to local services or facilities - placing 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. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Observations/Consideration of Matters Raised/Conclusion:**  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 outline planning consent be refused for the following reason(s) | | | | | | | | |
| **01** | The proposal is considered contrary to Key Statements DS1, DS2, and Policies DMG2 and DMH3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy insofar that approval would lead to the creation of new residential dwellings 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. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **02** | The proposed residential units, by virtue of their internal configuration and proposed internal floorpace areas, would afford residents a poor standard of internal residential amenity and a poor standardsof living accommodation, being contrary to the aims and objectives of Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **03** | The proposal would lead to an unsustainable pattern of development, without sufficient or adequate justification, insofar that occupants of the residential dwellings would fail to benefit from adequate walkable access to a wide range of local services or facilities - placing 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. | | | | | | | | | | | | |