|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Signed:** | | **Officer:** | BT | | | | **Date:** | 13/9/22 | **Manager:** | | **SK** | **Date:** | **13/9/22** |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Application Ref:** | | | | | 3/2022/0535 | | | | |  | | | |
| **Date Inspected:** | | | | | 3/8/22 | | | | |
| **Officer:** | | | | | BT | | | | |
| **DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:** | | | | | | | | | | **REFUSAL** | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Development Description:** | | | | | | Outline application for the erection of 1 detached dwelling with all matters reserved save for access. | | | | | | | |
| **Site Address/Location:** | | | | | | Land Adjacent to Woodacre Cottage, Fleet Street Lane, Ribchester. PR3 3ZA | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | | | **Parish/Town Council** | | | | | | | |
| Ribchester Parish Council have no objections. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | | | **Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies** | | | | | | | |
| **LCC Highways:** | | | | | | Request made for further information with regards to visibility splays. | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **RVBC Environmental Health:** | | | | | | No objections subject to conditions. | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **RVBC Countryside:** | | | | | | No objections subject to conditions. | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **United Utilities:** | | | | | | No objections subject to conditions. | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | | | **Additional Representations.** | | | | | | | |
| No objections received; one representation received in support of the application. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **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 And Mobility  Policy DMH3: Dwellings In The Open Countryside And AONB  Policy DME1: Protecting Trees And Woodlands  **NPPF** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Relevant Planning History:**  **3/2012/0591:**  Proposed single storey rear extension following demolition of existing conservatory extension and proposed first floor side extension (Approved)  **3/2001/0772:**  New vehicular access to existing dwelling and erection of double detached garage (Approved)  **3/2001/0328:**  Change of use of land to form extended curtilage to facilitate access improvements to existing dwelling (Withdrawn)  **3/1995/0580:**  Single storey rear extension (Approved) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Site Description and Surrounding Area:**  The application relates to an agricultural land parcel on the outskirts of Ribchester. The proposed residential dwelling would be situated on the land parcel which lies approximately 50 metres away to the South-east of Woodacre Cottage. The proposal site is situated amongst a small cluster of dwellings approximately 2 kilometres to the North-west of Ribchester’s defined settlement area. The surrounding area is semi-rural and largely comprises open countryside. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Proposed Development for which consent is sought:**  Outline consent is sought for the construction of one detached dwelling with all matters reserved save for access. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Principle of Development:**  Key statement DS1 sets out the spatial vision for the Borough and states:  The majority of new housing development will be:   * concentrated within an identified strategic site located to the South of Clitheroe towards the A59; and * the principle settlements of:   + Clitheroe;   + Longridge; and   + Whalley   Policy DMG2 of the Ribble Valley Borough Council Core strategy also states:  *Development should be in accordance with the core strategy development strategy and should support the spatial vision…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 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.*  Moreover, with regards to the development of dwellings in the open countryside and AONB, Policy DMH3 seeks to restrict residential development to development essential for the purposes of agriculture or residential development which meets an identified local need. The same policy also allows for the conversion of buildings to dwellings and for the rebuilding and replacement of dwellings under certain circumstances.  In this instance, the proposal would involve the creation of a new detached dwelling on a land parcel which lies within the open countryside outside of any defined settlement area. The detached dwelling would not be used in relation to agriculture, nor in this case would the proposal constitute development that meets an identified local need. The proposed dwelling would be a new build property and would not involve the re-use, conversion or replacement of any other building or dwelling.  As such, the proposal fails to meet the criteria within Key Statement DS1 and Policies DMG2 and DMH3 of the Ribble Valley Borough Council Core Strategy in as much that the proposal would lead to the creation of a new residential dwelling located outside of a defined settlement boundary, without sufficient justification.  Additionally, Policy DMG3 states:  *‘In making decisions on development proposals the local planning authority will attach considerable weight to proposals which promote development within existing developed areas or extensions to them at locations which are highly accessible by means other than the private car.’*  In this instance, the proposed dwelling would be situated approximately 1.5 miles away from the nearest settlement with services which in this case is Ribchester village. As such, taking account of the location of the proposal and its relative remoteness from any nearby service and facilities, 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 residential dwelling would fail to benefit from adequate walkable access to local services or facilities which in turn would result in further reliance on the private motor-vehicle.  Accordingly, the proposal is also considered 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.  Taking all of the above into account, the proposal is therefore considered to be unacceptable in principle. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Impact Upon Residential Amenity:**  As the application is made in outline with all matters reserved except for access, a definitive assessment of the impact upon neighbouring residential amenity cannot be considered at this stage. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Visual Amenity:**  The application does not seek consent for the design / external appearance or scale of the proposed dwelling therefore the visual aspect of the proposed development cannot be considered at this stage. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ecology:**  Two mature Oak trees and a grouping of smaller trees were identified during a tree survey carried out at the application site on 11/7/22. The findings from the tree survey show that the proposed access and driveway to serve the proposed residential dwelling would involve construction within the Root Protection Areas of the two aforementioned Oak trees. As such, an additional planning condition would need to be added to any future planning consent in order to ensure adequate protection to the identified trees on site. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Highways:**  Lancashire County Council Highways have reviewed the proposal and have requested that further information be provided with regards to visibility splays from the proposed access. No issues were raised by the LHA with regards to the width of the proposed access. Accordingly, further information with regards to visibility splays from the proposed access would need to be submitted as part of any future proposal. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Observations/Consideration of Matters Raised/Conclusion:**  The proposal would involve the construction of a new residential dwelling within an area of open countryside and fails to meet any of the relevant criteria outlined within Key Statements DS1, DS2 and DMI2 and Policies DMG2, DMG3 and DMH3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy. Accordingly, the principle of residential development on this site is considered to be unacceptable.  It is for the above reasons and having regard to all material considerations and matters raised that outline planning permission be refused. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **RECOMMENDATION**: | | | | To refuse outline planning permission for the following reason: | | | | | | | | | |
| **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 a new residential dwelling, 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 proposal would lead to an 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 a wide range local services or facilities resulting in 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. | | | | | | | | | | | | |