|  |
| --- |
| **Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.** |
| **Signed:** | **Officer:** | BT | **Date:** | 2/9/2022 | **Manager:** |  | **Date:** |  |
|  |
| **Application Ref:** | 3/2022/0589 |  |
| **Date Inspected:** | 15/8/22 |
| **Officer:** | BT |
| **DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:**  | **REFUSAL** |
|  |
| **Development Description:** | Proposed double driveway and dropped kerb to the right side of the front of property. |
| **Site Address/Location:** | 1 Ribble Lane, Chatburn. BB7 4AG |
|  |
| **CONSULTATIONS:**  | **Parish/Town Council** |
| Chatburn Parish Council: concerns raised with regards to the impact of the proposal upon highway safety. |
|  |
| **CONSULTATIONS:**  | **Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies** |
| LCC Highways: | No objections subject to conditions. |
|  |
| **CONSULTATIONS:**  | **Additional Representations.** |
| Four objections have been received in relation to the proposal. The objections raised are summarised as:* Impact of the proposal upon highway safety
* Impact of the proposal upon the historic character of the surrounding Conservation Area
 |
|  |
| **RELEVANT POLICIES AND SITE PLANNING HISTORY:** |
| **Ribble Valley Core Strategy:**Key Statement DS1: Development StrategyKey Statement DS2: Sustainable DevelopmentKey Statement EN5: Heritage AssetsKey Statement DMI2: Transport ConsiderationsPolicy DMG1: General ConsiderationsPolicy DMG2: Strategic ConsiderationsPolicy DMG3: Transport & MobilityPolicy DME2: Landscape And Townscape ProtectionPolicy DME4: Protecting Heritage AssetsPolicy DMH5: Residential and Curtilage ExtensionsPlanning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) |
| **Relevant Planning History:**No recent planning history relevant to the determination of the application. |
|  |
| **ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:** |
| **Site Description and Surrounding Area:**The application relates to a detached two storey property in Chatburn. The property is situated on the corner junction between Old Road and Ribble Lane and comprises stone based front and rear garden areas with a detached garage situated directly adjacent to the property’s Northern side elevation. The front Eastern perimeter of the property’s curtilage comprises a 1 metre high stone boundary wall. The surrounding area is residential and is characterised by various two storey properties. |
| **Proposed Development for which consent is sought:**Consent is sought for the conversion of the property’s front garden area to a proposed double driveway. It is also proposed to partially demolish the property’s front Eastern stone boundary wall in order to accommodate a double dropped kerb to provide access to and from the proposed driveway. |
| **Principle of Development:**The proposal is a domestic extension to a dwelling and is acceptable in principle subject to an assessment of the material planning considerations. The proposal site lies within the Chatburn Conservation Area therefore consideration will also be given towards the effect of the proposal upon the historic character of the surrounding area. |
| **Impact Upon Residential Amenity:**The proposed development would not involve the addition of any new structures, nor is it anticipated that the creation of the proposed driveway would result in any significant increase in noise disturbances at the application property. As such, it is not considered that the proposal would be harmful to the amenity of any neighbouring residents. |
| **Visual Amenity / Heritage:**The front elevation of the application property faces into the public realm on Ribble Lane which is a busy thoroughfare within Chatburn. As such, the proposed works to the property’s front garden area and stone boundary wall would have a noticeable impact upon the visual amenities of the immediate area which forms part of the Chatburn Conservation Area.With reference to making decisions on applications for development in a Conservation Area, Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that: *“...special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.”* This guidance is reiterated in Key Statement EN5 of the Ribble Borough Valley Core Strategy which stipulates that all development proposals should respect and safeguard the character, appearance and significance of all Conservation Areas. With specific regard to the application site, the Chatburn Conservation Area Appraisal (2005) identifies the application property as being a Building of Townscape Merit which along with other Buildings of Townscape Merit, is deemed to contribute to the character and appearance of the surrounding Conservation Area by virtue of its largely unaltered historic features. The property’s front stone boundary wall provides a clear example of the property’s historic origins, as is referenced within the above appraisal which identifies historic stone boundary walls as being a ‘*distinctive feature’* of Chatburn’s Conservation Area. In this instance, the proposed development would involve the partial demolition of the property’s front stone boundary wall in order to accommodate access to and from the proposed double driveway. The submitted plans indicate that almost 7 metres of the property’s front stone boundary wall would be removed as part of the proposed works. The proposed plans also indicate that a sizeable area of the property’s stone based front garden area would be replaced with modern block paving. Accordingly, it is considered that the proposed partial demolition of the property’s front stone boundary wall would result in the loss of historic fabric which in turn would disrupt the historic linear pattern of stone boundary walling which runs along the Western side of Ribble Lane from the North of the application property for a distance of approximately 75 metres. Moreover, the addition of modern block paving to the property’s front garden would be visually at odds with the stone based vernacular of front garden surfaces and paths within the immediate area. The Chatburn Conservation Area Management Guidance (2005) states that new development should ‘*maintain the historic pattern of development by respecting the historic grain associated with historic plots and the historic morphology of development in the immediate area’.*Furthermore, the Chatburn Conservation Area Appraisal (2005) identifies a ‘*continuing loss of original architectural details and use of inappropriate modern materials or details’* as being one of the key threats to the historic character of Chatburn’s Conservation Area.Moreover, Policy DME4 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy states that *‘proposals within, or affecting views into and out of, or affecting the setting of a Conservation Area will be required to conserve and where appropriate enhance its character and appearance and those elements which contribute towards its significance’* however given the loss of historic fabric and introduction of inappropriate modern materials that would occur from the proposed works it is considered that the proposal would be an inappropriate form of development that would be harmful to the character and appearance of the Chatburn Conservation Area. As such, the proposal fails to accord with Policy DME4 and is therefore considered to be unacceptable. |
| **Ecology:**No ecological constraints were identified in relation to the proposal. |
| **Highways:**Site visit photo analysis shows on-street parking to be commonplace along the Eastern side of Ribble Lane with sections of the road located immediately to the North of the junction with Old Lane reduced to single lane traffic as a result of the on-street parking. It is also understood that Ribble Lane is utilised by numerous local bus routes. Furthermore, parked cars were observed in front of the access gate belonging to a neighbouring commercial property which is situated directly opposite to the area which would serve as the dropped kerb access to the proposed driveway. With the above in mind, it is considered that the siting of a new driveway and dropped kerb access in an area already constrained in terms of limited manoeuvring space and high volumes of traffic has the potential to pose highway safety issues. Notwithstanding the above concerns, Lancashire County Council Highways have reviewed the proposal and have no issues with the proposed development in terms of parking space dimensions, vehicle access and visibility splays. As such, it is not considered that the proposal would have any undue impact upon surrounding highway safety. |
| **Observations/Consideration of Matters Raised/Conclusion:**The proposed development would result in the loss of historic fabric and introduction of inappropriate modern materials which in turn would result in harm to the historic character of the Chatburn Conservation Area. Notwithstanding this, the proposed works would only affect part of the Conservation Area therefore in this instance it is considered that the harm to the Conservation Area would be less than substantial.Paragraph 202 of the NPPF states:*‘Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use’.*In this instance, the public benefit of potentially alleviating occurrences of on-street parking at and around the application site is not considered to outweigh the harm to the character and appearance of the Chatburn Conservation Area.It is for the above reasons and having regard to all material considerations and matters raised that planning consent be refused. |
| **RECOMMENDATION**: | That planning consent be refused for the following reason: |
| **01:** | The proposed development, by virtue of the loss and alteration of important historic fabric and use of inappropriate modern materials, would detract from the historic character of the surrounding area which in turn would be harmful to the character and appearance of the Chatburn Conservation Area. As such the proposal is considered to be in direct conflict with Key Statement EN5 and Policy DME4 and DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy. |