|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Signed:** | | **Officer:** | **WH** | | | | **Date:** | | **17-07-23** | | **Manager:** | | **NH** | **Date:** | **19/07/23** |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Application Ref:** | | | | | 2022/0650 | | | | | | |  | | | |
| **Date Inspected:** | | | | | 24-03-23 | | | **Site Notice:** | | N/A | |
| **Officer:** | | | | | Will Hopcroft | | | | | | |
| **DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:** | | | | | | | | | | | | **REFUSAL** | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Development Description:** | | | | | | Demolition of existing building, removal of steel feed silo, steel portacabin, portaloo and blockwork boundary walls. Proposed erection of stone building with welsh slate roof to provide four-bedroom holiday cottage with paved amenity area, farm office with staff welfare facilities, secure store workshops, covered disabled parking space, new stone boundary walls and paved area. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Site Address/Location:** | | | | | | Mill House, Chipping Road, Chaigley BB7 3LS | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | | | **Parish/Town Council** | | | | | | | | | |
| No response. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | | | **Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies** | | | | | | | | | |
| **LCC Highways:** | | | | | | Further information required to fully assess the Highways impact of the proposed development. On receipt of further information, no objection was raised subject to conditions regarding the below:   * Construction Traffic Management Plans * Visibility splays * No occupation until the parking and turning facilities have been implemented. | | | | | | | | | |
| **United Utilities** | | | | | | No objection, although the applicant’s obligations and responsibility towards sustainable drainage of the site are noted and have been included within an informative. | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | | | **Additional Representations.** | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **RELEVANT POLICIES AND SITE PLANNING HISTORY:** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ribble Valley Core Strategy:**  **Ribble Valley Core Strategy:**  Key Statement DS1: Development Strategy  Key Statement DS2: Sustainable Development  Key Statement EN2: Landscape  Key Statement EC3: Visitor Economy  Policy DMG1: General Considerations  Policy DMG2: Strategic Considerations  Policy DMG3: Transport & Mobility  Policy DME2: Landscape & Townscape Protection  Policy DMB3: Recreation and Tourism Development  National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Relevant Planning History:**  **2021/1063:**  Proposed single-storey, steel framed sheep shed, with secure enclosed store for equipment at end, with cladding for security – Approved with Conditions  **2021/0966:**  Proposed open-sided portal frame building with enclosed machinery store – Permission Required  **2016/0732:**  Discharge of conditions 3 (materials), 4 and 6 (building recording and analysis), 5 (windows and doors), 10 (nesting boxes,) 11 (visibility splay), 12 (maintained hedge), 13 (roof lights), 14 (parking), and 15 (foul drainage) from planning permission 3/2013/0840 – Approved with Conditions  **2016/0047:**  Demolition of single storey side extension and erection of two storey side extension to existing house – Approved with Conditions  **2015/1037:**  Demolition of existing shippon and construction of larger steel framed shippon with associated fences and gates – Approved with Conditions  **2014/0826:**  Change of use from Shippon to 4-bedroom detached house, replacement of concrete block boundary wall with natural dry-stone wall – Refused  **2013/0840:**  Change of use of stone barn to four-bedroom house – Approved with Conditions | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Site Description and Surrounding Area:**  The site is comprised of an existing agricultural building of cement and timber construction sited in an existing agricultural complex. Immediately to the south sits a barn conversion and associated parking, with an additional dwelling further south still.  The site sits fairly isolated, in a broadly rural context – there is a larger agricultural complex directly north of the site, as well as a small cluster of dwellings at Chaigley Court approximately 200m north-east. The Principal Settlement of Clitheroe sits approximately 3.25 miles east of the site providing good access to a wide range of amenities and services. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Proposed Development for which consent is sought:**  The application seeks permission for:   * Demolition of existing agricultural building * Removal of steel feed silo, portacabin, portaloo and blockwork boundary walls * Erection of split level two/one storey building incorporating pitched roof, approx 7259mm in width, 27650mm in length * Single-story element stepped back off the front elevation by approx. 1.2m , with an eaves height of 2849mm and a ridge height of * Building to incorporate holiday accommodation and a farm office in the two-storey western portion. The single-storey eastern portion will accommodate a secure store used in association with the farm office. * 1no. disabled parking space is provided to the east of the building. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Principle of Development:**  The principle of development is required to be secured against Key Statement EC3 and Policy DMG2. EC3 states that *‘proposals that contribute to and strengthen the visitor economy of Ribble Valley will be encouraged, including the creation of new accommodation and tourism facilities through the conversion of existing buildings or associated with existing attractions.’* with DMG2 stating that development outside the defined settlement areas must meet at least one of the following considerations (relevant criteria selected only):   * The development is needed for the purposes of forestry and agriculture. * The development is for small scale tourism or recreational developments appropriate to a rural area.   In this sense, the holiday accommodation element of the proposal is clearly compliant with EC3. The provision of an additional holiday let sited within the AONB will provide further facilities for potential occupiers to contribute to and strengthen the visitor economy of the Ribble Valley. Whilst not a conversion the proposal does comprise of a replacement building. As such this proposal is considered to align with EC3.  CS Policy DMG2 is also engaged given the sites location outside of any defined settlement area. In this sense, it is evident that the development is needed for the purposes of agriculture with regard to the farm office and secure store element of the proposal. The applicant has provided evidence of a significant total holding, with land surrounding Mill House all within the applicants control and used for seasonal grazing for a large number of sheep. The farm office would allow for a dedicated area to complete administrative work associated with the agricultural operation as well as stores and welfare facilities inc. kitchen/dining area, shower and changing room. The secure store will house machinery associated with the agricultural operation.  With further regard to DMG2, as noted above the holiday accommodation element of the proposal can be considered small scale tourism appropriate to a rural area.  In addition, Policy DMB3 states that planning permission will be granted for development proposals that extend the range of tourism and visitor facilities in the borough, so long as they meet a number of criteria. These criteria are further explored within this delegated report.  As such the principle of the development is secured with consideration given to further material planning considerations as outlined below. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Impact Upon Residential Amenity:**  As per Core Strategy Policy DMG1, 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.   In this sense, the proposal is considered compliant with DMG1 (Amenity). It is noted that the closest residential dwelling is that of the applicant, which sits roughly 6.1m off the front elevation of the proposed building. However, this is an improvement on the existing arrangement, where the building sits roughly 2.8m off the same elevation. Whilst the proposal does sit taller than the existing building, this is only by a modest 1.5m at ridge height and 0.9m to the eaves height. In addition, it is also necessary to consider that the existing silo – sitting at approximately 8m tall – is also being removed.  As such Officers consider that the cumulative impact and additional harm by way of being dominant and overbearing in relation to adjacent residential dwellings is mitigated significantly by; the significant improvement in terms of separation distance; the relatively minor increase in height at both ridge and eaves level and; the removal of the existing silo.  The provision of the proposed building has also been considered with regard to overlooking and a loss of privacy in relation to the adjacent dwelling. In this sense it is noted that there are no 1st floor windows and only 1no. ground floor window on the existing dwelling. The proposed building would offer no intrusive ground floor fenestration within the holiday accommodation element of the proposal, with 1no. window serving a downstairs bathroom. At 1st floor, facing the existing dwelling there is 1no. roof light serving the holiday accommodation, and this sits above a void and as such would not provide any opportunities for overlooking or a loss of privacy. The provision of an outdoor seating area at the 1st floor has also been considered – in this sense, the relationship between the proposed building and the existing adjacent dwelling is such that any potential for overlooking will only relate to a very small portion of the paved yard to the rear of the existing dwelling. It does not overlook any dedicated garden area and as such it is considered unlikely that the provision of this balcony would cause an unacceptable adverse impact on the amenity and quality of life of the adjacent dwelling.  In relation to the provision of adequate day lighting to the adjacent dwelling, it is noted the proposed building sits north of the adjacent dwelling and as such there will be no impact on the provision of adequate day lighting throughout effectively all times of the year, save for a small period in the height of summer where the rear yard of the adjacent dwelling may experience a small amount of overshadowing. Officers see this as minor, and do not consider it an unacceptable adverse impact on amenity or quality of life.  Any adverse impact on amenity or quality of life has also been considered in relation to the combination of uses present by way of the provision of the proposed building. In this sense, given the existing residential use already sits adjacent to the agricultural use, there is no additional harm or adverse impact on amenity or quality of life identified by the provision of the proposed building. Whilst the use is intensified somewhat this is not considered unacceptable particularly given the proposed building sits over a smaller footprint than the existing agricultural building.  Given the above the proposal is considered compliant with DMG1 (Amenity). | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Visual Amenity/External Appearance and Impact on the AONB**  As per CS Policy DMG1, all development must be sympathetic to existing and proposed land uses in terms of its size, intensity and nature as well as scale, massing, style, features and building materials. In this regard, the proposal is considered to comply with DMG1. In addition, EN2 states that the landscape and character of the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty will be protected, conserved, and enhanced.  CS Policy DME2 states that development proposals will be refused where they significantly harm a number of important landscape or townscape features.  CS Policy DMB3 also requires a number of design related criteria to be fulfilled – notably:   * The development should not undermine the character, quality or visual amenities of the plan area by virtue of its scale, siting, materials or design; * In the AONB; the proposal should display a high standard of design appropriate to the area.   In this sense, the proposal is not considered compliant with the relevant design policy. The building proposed would clearly be domestic in nature, evident by the use of natural stone materials and clearly domestic features (glazing, appropriate fenestration, Welsh slate roof-tile and numerous roof-lights) as well as the proposed C3 use. Even the agricultural element of the proposal incorporates similar domestic features and is not immediately evident as an agricultural office.  This sits in disparity with the agricultural nature of the complex and immediate surrounds, which contributes significantly to the character and nature of the AONB in which agricultural uses are a common sight and lend clear significance to the AONB. The existing building is also evidently agricultural, with the surrounding land in regular grazing use. As such the proposal cannot be said to be sympathetic to the existing land use, further eroding the nature of the agricultural enterprise and in addition does not protect, conserve or enhance the AONB by the same virtue.  It is therefore considered that the design and external appearance of the proposed building would result in the introduction of an incongruous, anomalous, and discordant from of development by virtue of the further erosion of agricultural character that would significantly visually compromise and undermine the inherent character of the immediate and wider landscape, resulting in a suburbanising visual effect on AONB landscape.  As such and taking account of the above it is considered that the proposal is considered to be in direct conflict with Key Statement EN2 and Policies DMG1 and DMB3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy in that the proposal would result in significant detrimental impacts upon the character and visual amenities of the Forest of Bowland AONB and that of the immediate area. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Highways and Parking:**  Following consultation with LCC Highways, no objection has been raised save for the inclusion of conditions relating to:   * Construction Traffic Management Plans * Visibility splays * No occupation until the parking and turning facilities have been implemented.   The applicant has evidenced that the required visibility splays are provided. 1no. disabled access parking space is provided within the proposal as well, and no other changes to access or levels of parking are proposed or required. As such no further assessment is required. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Landscape/Ecology:**  A Bat Survey was submitted as part of the application, concluding that the no evidence of roosting bats was found and that the building is low risk, although given the high-quality bat-feeding location various mitigation measures have been recommended within the report, both with regard to bats and with regard to house-sparrows, to which evidence of nesting has been identified. These mitigation measures have been conditioned to be provided prior to commencement of any work on-site. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Observations/Consideration of Matters Raised/Conclusion:**  As such, for the above reasons and having regard to all material considerations and matters raised that the application is recommended for refusal. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **RECOMMENDATION**: | | | |  | | | | | | | | | | | |
| That planning consent be refused for the following reason(s). | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **01:** | The proposal, by virtue of the further domestication and increased erosion of existing agricultural character would significantly visually compromise and undermine the inherent character of the immediate and wider landscape, resulting in a suburbanising visual effect on AONB landscape and as such is considered to be in direct conflict with Key Statement EN2 and Policies DMG1 and DMB3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy in that the proposal would result in significant detrimental impacts upon the character and visual amenities of the Forest of Bowland AONB and that of the immediate area. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |