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| **Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.** |
|  |
| **Application Ref:** | 3/2022/0530 |  |
| **Date Inspected:** | 30/06/22 |
| **Officer:** | KH |
| **DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:**  | **APPROVAL** |
|  |
| **Development Description:** | Variation of condition 2 (approved plans) and removal of condition 9 (off site highway works) from planning permission 3/2021/0595 to allow the addition of a loading area to the east of the main building and change of cladding to timber boarding (resubmission of 3/2022/0271. |
| **Site Address/Location:** | Land at Preston Road Ribchester PR3 3XL |
|  |
| **CONSULTATIONS:**  | **Parish Council** |
| Ribchester Parish Council is responding to this protracted exercise of raising objections to the proposed, changed and re-submitted plans. The Council and a number of residents objected to the initial proposal and there is noting that has or ever will convince the village that its first response was ill judged or incorrect.The developers have responded to the objections but has done nothing to persuade the Council or residents that this is an appropriate development for the village. It should have been positioned on a brownfield site.Recent planning applications in the area of Ribchester have been refused for the following reasons:* Prominent and incongruous development in the open countryside with insufficient justification to the detriment of visual amenity
* By virtue of the external appearance ….. would result in the introduction of incongruous form of residential development which is overtly domestic etc

What has been proposed and included in the written submissions is just the beginning if this is not curtailed by RVBC including increasing the number of lodges, installation of playground, charity containers, tea room, tourism unit, grazing of animals, etc.RVBC may, quite properly, point out that none of these items is in the current Planning Application before it. This is correct but the basis of the following objections is that they represent the next stage of the much bigger development which is being planned.At the start it was assumed that the first application was just the thin end of a much larger wedge.The council has some concerns as to the use of goosewing grey as this would have the appearance of a large grey industrial unit therefore objections to this proposal.The council also objects to the installation of a large-size roller shutter on the building. This itself is incongruous but also suggestive of large vehicles requiring access and egress onto Preston Road. There was no indication of this size of vehicle or related traffic movements in the initial proposal. Ribchester Parish Council accepts that the development is underway. Further, it realises it is here to stay, and there is nothing to be done but learn to tolerate it within its current parameters. However, it urges the Planning Department to take every action allowable to curtail any further expansion of the site, to take steps to contain its expansion and to do everything possible to reign in the vainglorious proposals for a cross between an industrial unit and a Snail Theme Park before this land becomes the eyesore of the Ribble Valley. |
|  |
| **CONSULTATIONS:**  | **Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies** |
| **LCC Highways:** | No objection to the removal of condition 9 (off-site highway works). |
|  |
| **CONSULTATIONS:**  | **Additional Representations.** |
| 4 letters of representation have been received raising the following objections:* The proposed changes to the external materials would be incongruous and not in keeping;
* The doors, windows and shutters add to the industrial appearance;
* I would question the need for 3m high roller shutter door;
* The drawings are not to scale and the height of the building is not accurately reflected;
* The internal and external elevations are confusing and do not correspond with the elevation for the roller shutter indicating windows when no windows are shown on the internal plan;
* There are two run down, tatty, portacabins placed on the bases on the site – these are not in keeping;
* This is the sixth application in 24 months;
* There are existing industrial units lying unused;
* The entrance to the site isn’t very safe as traffic goes quickly down the hill to a National Speed limit area;
* It is on the National Cycleway and large wagons would present a greater risk;
* One of the three trees at the entrance has been removed and two others severely cut back;
* They should stick to green cladding for the building as grey is industrial and would not blend in, the wooden cladding would be an improvement;
* Stock proof fencing should be introduced to limit the movements of holiday makers and causing noise nuisance behind residents properties;
* Impact on wildlife – owls roost and nest in this area as well as kingfisher and deer;
* Trees have been removed and landscaping work carried out to the detriment of wildlife and ecology;
* Containers brought onto the site are proposed to be refurbished as holiday cabins but these are the wrong shape;
* Work has been ongoing past 8pm at night;
* The concrete base for lodge 6 is already in position as per the refused drawing;
* The main building already looks like a factory and is an eyesore; and
* The access road plan states tarmac and broken stone nor resin bound gravel as approved?
 |
|  |
| **PLANNING HISTORY:**3/2020/0513 - Change of use of land and erection of building for heliciculture (snail breeding) together with six log cabins to be used as holiday lets. Resubmission of 3/2020/0513 – Withdrawn.3/2020/0940 – Change of use of land and erection of building for heliciculture (snail breeding) together with six log cabins to be used as holiday lets. Resubmission of 3/2020/0513 – Refused 14/04/21.3/2021/0595 - Change of use of land and erection of building for heliciculture (snail breeding) together with six log cabins to be used as holiday lets following planning application refusal 3/2020/0940 – Approved with conditions 24/09/21.3/2022/0315 – Discharge of conditions 4 (Drainage) and 14 (Construction Management) from planning permission 3/2021/0595 – Discharged 06/05/22.3/2022/0271 – Variation of Conditions 2 (Plans) and Removal of Condition 9 (Off Site Works) of planning application 3/2021/0595 – Refused 04/05/22. |
| **RELEVANT POLICIES:** |
| **Ribble Valley Core Strategy:*** Key Statement DS1 – Development Strategy
* Key Statement DS2 – Sustainable Development
* Key Statement DMI2 – Transport Considerations
* Key Statement EC1 – Business and Employment Development
* Key Statement EC3 – Visitor Economy
* Policy DMG1 – General Considerations
* Policy DMG2 – Strategic Considerations
* Policy DMG3 – Transport & Mobility
* Policy DMH3 -Dwellings in the Open Countryside and AONB.
* Policy EN2 – Landscape
* Policy DME2 – Landscape & Townscape Protection
* Policy DMB3 – Recreation and Tourism Development.
* Policy DMB1 – Supporting Business Growth and Local Economy
* Policy DME6 – Water Management

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) |
| **Description of Proposal**The development proposes changes to the approved use of land for heliciculture and involved the erection of a two-storey building providing a hibernation unit as well as space for demonstrations and office/storage space. In conjunction with the snail farm the development also proposes the erection of six holiday cabins. |
| **Site Location/Address:**The proposed development site relates to land off Preston Road, Ribchester. The site is access off Preston Road between New House Farm and land to the East of Pendle View. The development site has a site area of 6630 sq.m. The application site falls within Flood Zones 2 and 3 and the north of the site borders Boyces Brook. Public Footpath 49 lies adjacent to the site to the north and east. |
| The submitted application seeks to vary condition 2 (Plans) and seeks removal of condition 9 (Off Site Works) of planning consent 3/2021/0595. The proposed variations are summarised below:Condition 2:The submitted details propose the following: * Alterations to the main ‘heliciculture’ building to include the introduction of loading bay door to the south east elevation;
* Change in facing materials on the main building from that of juniper green profiled steel cladding, natural stone plinth and vertical chestnut cladding to that of goosewing grey steel cladding with timber cladding;
* Minor alterations to the internal configuration of the main building including the position of cold room and packaging area, lecture/demonstration area, despatch, stores, test lab and reception areas.
* Alterations to the internal hard-surfacing materials.

Condition 9:Condition 9 reads as follows: *No part of the development hereby approved shall commence until a scheme for the construction of the off-site works of highway improvement (namely an improved metaled and kerbed vehicular drop crossing) has been submitted to, and approved by, the Local Planning Authority. The off-site works shall be implemented in accordance with the approved plans prior to the use of any part of the development hereby approved.*The applicant seeks the removal of this condition in that none of the proposed highway works are considered to be ‘off-site’, in this respect there is no requirement to submit any details and the applicant is therefore released from the requirements of the condition. |
| **Impact Upon Residential Amenity:** The existing entrance falls between two dwellings New House Farm and Pendle View and is outside of the settlement boundary to Ribchester. There is no development to the rear of New House Farm with the nearest holiday lodge sited approximately 15m from the rear boundary of Pendle View and the main building between 26.5m and 46m from the rear gardens of Hillcrest and Culrathain. The previous approved application ascertained that there would be limited impact, due to distances, on the residential amenity of these dwellings. This proposal does not change this.**Landscape/Ecology:**A preliminary ecological appraisal has been submitted that concluded that proposed development has the potential to affect existing habitats on site. The survey has assessed the impacts on other terrestrial mammals and birds. Any site clearance works should be undertaken outside of bird breeding season and a precautionary approach adopted when undertaking these works.This is the same as the previously approved application and therefore is acceptable **Drainage:**Condition 4 has been discharged and therefore the development will be required to be carried out in accordance with the approved details. |
| **Visual Amenity:**The site is located to the rear of residential properties on Preston Road outside the settlement boundary.The site is much lower in level to the rear as it descends towards the brook. The higher part of the building would be visible from the rear of these properties, but it would not be highly visible within the streetscene in this respect.Whilst it is understood that the applicant wants to replicate an agricultural building this proposal is more industrial in its nature and the proposed half-timber logs are not appropriate in this location. As the upper half of the building is more prominent then consideration should be given to soften and reduce the amount of grey cladding by the introduction of flat timber cladding on the frontage and roadside gable (north west) which is most prominent of the rear of residential properties in order to soften that elevation and provide visual interest.The agent has submitted amended plans which show sweet cedar cladding to the front, side (south west) and side (north west) elevations. This is considered to be acceptable  |
| **Highway:**LCC Highways has no objection to the development and has recommended removal of condition 9 relating to off-site highway works.Condition 14 relating to the construction management has been discharged and therefore the development will be required to be carried out in accordance with the approved details. |
| **Observations/Considerations of Matter Raised:**The changes in the colour of materials would be acceptable given its commercial nature and use subject to appropriate timber cladding.The introduction of the roller shutter door to the south east is an acceptable small scale change and would not be unduly visual and create an additional impact above that already approved.The internal changes are acceptable.The materials proposed for the access road are acceptable. |
| **RECOMMENDATION: That planning permission be approved subject to appropriate conditions.** |
|  |