|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Signed:** | | **Officer:** | **WH** | | | | **Date:** | | **01/06/23** | | **Manager:** | | **LH** | **Date:** | **6/6/23** |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Application Ref:** | | | | | 2022/1061 | | | | | | |  | | | |
| **Date Inspected:** | | | | | 24/03/23 | | | **Site Notice:** | | N/A | |
| **Officer:** | | | | | Will Hopcroft | | | | | | |
| **DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:** | | | | | | | | | | | | **REFUSAL** | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Development Description:** | | | | | | Replacement dwelling including the demolition of an existing agricultural building | | | | | | | | | |
| **Site Address/Location:** | | | | | | Mill Race Cottage, White Carr Lane | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | | | **Parish/Town Council** | | | | | | | | | |
| No response. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | | | **Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies** | | | | | | | | | |
| **LCC Highways:** | | | | | | No objection subject to conditions surrounding:   * The provision of a construction traffic management plan (pre-commencement) * Implementation of parking and turning facilities (pre-occupation) | | | | | | | | | |
| **Countryside:** | | | | | | No objection subject to a condition ensuring the provision of a method statement and RAMS associated with the protected species survey submitted with the application. | | | | | | | | | |
| **United Utilities** | | | | | | No objection subject to the provision of an informative reminding the applicant of their obligations towards ensuring the site is sustainably drained. | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | | | **Additional Representations.** | | | | | | | | | |
| None received. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **RELEVANT POLICIES AND SITE PLANNING HISTORY:** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ribble Valley Core Strategy:**  Key Statement DS1: Development Strategy  Key Statement DS2: Sustainable Development  Key Statement EN2: Landscape  Key Statement EN4: Biodiversity and Geodiversity  Policy DMG1: General Considerations  Policy DMG2: Strategic Considerations  Policy DMG3: Transport & Mobility  Policy DME2: Landscape & Townscape Protection  Policy DME3: Site and Species Protection and Conservation  Policy DMH3: Dwellings in the Open Countryside and AONB  National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Relevant Planning History:**  **1995/0148:**  Removal of occupancy condition no. 2 of 3/85/0201 – Approved Unconditionally | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Site Description and Surrounding Area:**  The site is comprised of Mill Race Cottage, an existing detached dwelling accessed off Mill House Lane over a small bridge and incorporating a sizeable curtilage, within which a large defunct agricultural building is included.  To the north and south, neighbouring dwellings are sited although the site does sit outside of existing settlement boundaries. In terms of the wider context, the site sits centrally in-between Longridge and Ribchester ensuring it has a good level of access to a range of facilities and services. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Proposed Development for which consent is sought:**  Following the demolition of the existing house and agricultural building, the application seeks consent for a new detached 2.5-storey 4-bed dwelling, with a GIA of 468 sqm and integrated garage at 30sqm. The roof form is varied but, broadly speaking, incorporates:   * A number of pitched rooves at split levels * A number of reverse gables coming off the primary pitched rooves * A sun-room incorporating a flat roof with sun-lantern.   A substantial level of fenestration is proposed to all elevations, including rooflights and a Juliet balcony to the south elevation.  The building has been designed with two ‘wings; incorporating a central ‘courtyard’ leading out in the rear garden, over which a glass canopy partly sits. The materials are to be stone mullioned windows, slate roof, composite doors and coursed stone walls. There is a slight levels difference running west-east, where the eastern part of the dwelling sits slightly lower than the western. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Principle of Development:**  The principle of development is required to be secured against CS Policies DMG2 and DMH3, as the site sits within the AONB.  DMG2 states that development outside the defined settlement areas must meet a number of considerations – in this sense, a replacement dwelling is considered acceptable as the net gain of dwellings is effectively zero.  Further commentary around the AONB ensures that *in protecting the designated AONB the Council will have regard to the economic and social well-being of the area. However, the most important consideration in the assessment of any development proposals will be the protection, conservation and enhancement of the landscape and character of the area avoiding where possible habitat fragmentation. Where possible new development should be accommodated through the re-use of existing buildings, which in most cases is more appropriate than new build. Development will be required to be in keeping with the character of the landscape and acknowledge the special qualities of the AONB by virtue of its size, design, use of material, landscaping and siting.*  In addition, CS Policy DMH3 states that, within areas defined as AONB, residential development will be limited to a number of criteria, the most relevant being as follows:   * *The rebuilding or replacement of existing dwellings subject to the following criteria:*    + *The residential use of the property should not have been abandoned.*   + *There being no adverse impact on the landscape in relation to the new dwelling.*   + *The need to extend an existing curtilage.*   In this sense, it is considered that:   * The residential use of the property is not abandoned. The applicant and their family is currently occupying the existing dwelling. * There may be some adverse impact on the landscape in relation to the new dwelling, by virtue of its additional size and massing. * The existing curtilage is not being extended.   As such in order to ensure the principle of development is secured, it is necessary to establish the level of impact on the landscape in relation to the new dwelling, and whether this is considered *adverse*. Following further Officer review outlined under the *Visual Amenity and* *Impact on the landscape and AONB* section, the impact on the landscape is considered to be adverse and as such the principle of development is not secured. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **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 proposed dwelling is considered to have a minor adverse impact on the amenity and quality of life and neighbouring dwellings, by way of the proximity to the garage elevation to White Carr Farm.  The closest adjacent dwelling is that at White Carr Farm immediately north of the proposed dwelling. As such the northern elevation, as the facing elevation, is the elevation that is most likely to contribute to any adverse impact on amenity and quality of life. In this sense, there is minimum upper-level fenestration proposed to this elevation with just 1no. 3-panel windows which would serve an en-suite and site the cills above 1.75m, mitigating any potential impact on overlooking or loss of privacy. The ridge heights to the northern elevation also sit lower than the ridge heights of the rest of the proposed dwelling ensuring that the proposed dwelling does not appear to be dominant or overbearing with respect to its relationship to the dwelling at White Carr Farm.  With regard to separation distances, the relationship (gable end to primary elevation) generally incurs a separation distance of 13.5m although this rule is generally utilised when looking at two-storey blank gable walls. In this sense, the separation distance between the blank gable elevation of the integrated garage and the primary elevation of White Carr Farm is approximately 9m which falls below this distance. However, there is some mitigation present in that the blank gable wall serves the garage and is single storey (although the ridge height is fairly tall at approximately 4.15m). As such whilst there is considered a minor adverse impact, this is not considered unacceptable.  In addition, the proposed dwelling has been assessed with regard to any overshadowing that it may cause to White Carr Farm. It is considered that, given the proposed dwelling would sit immediately south but broadly over the same footprint as the existing, there may be a slight increase in overshadowing and loss of sunlight but this would limited to the winter months and is not likely to impact upon the use of the rear garden at White Carr Farm. As such this is deemed acceptable.  Given the above the proposal is considered acceptable with regard to DMG1 (Amenity). | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Visual Amenity and Impact on the landscape and AONB**  ***Visual Amenity and Design***  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 addition, CS Policy DMG2 states that *development will be required to be in keeping with the character of the landscape and acknowledge the special qualities of the AONB by virtue of its size, design, use of material, landscaping and siting.*  In this sense with specific reference to materiality, the proposal can be given some merit. The materials used are complementary and reflective to that of the surrounding area. However, Officers do have concern surrounding the wide variation in roof forms, in addition to the fairly heavy use of fenestration in the roof-planes, resulting in a somewhat cluttered and illegible roofscape particularly compared to the simpler form utilised by the existing dwelling. Matters of scale and massing are to be discussed below, as they are considered to have an adverse impact on the landscape and AONB.  ***Impact on Landscape and AONB***  In this sense Policy DME2 and Key Statement EN2 are engaged. CS Policy DME2 outlines that development proposal will be refused which significantly harm a number of important landscape or landscape features.  This ties into Key Statement EN2, which states the *landscape and character of the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty will be protected, conserved and enhanced. Any development will need to contribute to the conservation of the natural beauty of the area. The landscape and character of those areas that contribute to the setting and character of the Forest of Bowland Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty will be protected and conserved and wherever possible enhanced. As a principle the Council will expect development to be in keeping with the character of the landscape, reflecting local distinctiveness, vernacular style, scale, style, features and building materials.*  It is also necessary to reflect back on the Principle of Development, which (under DMH3) was required to ensure that there would be *no adverse impact on the landscape in relation to the new dwelling.*  It is important in this aspect to establish the modest and more simple nature of the design and scale of the existing dwelling. Whilst utilising a similar height, the footprint is considerably smaller with the roof form considerably simpler and only utilising a reasonable amount of fenestration. As such the impact of the existing dwelling blends well into the landscape and does not seek to dominate the streetscene by virtue of its design, scale or massing.  The proposed dwelling is vastly larger than this existing dwelling and nearby built form, and incorporates a varied and complex range of roof forms, removing the simple and modest aspect of the existing dwelling and introducing an ‘executive dwelling’ aspect which is not currently present. There are substantial additions in all aspects of the built form and as such the cumulative impact of these additions adversely impacts on the landscape by way of the significant increase in size and massing, and subsequent increase in roofscape, associated fenestration and change in character away from a modest, simple dwelling utilised in association with the existing agricultural building and further towards the ‘executive dwelling’ aspect. The removal of an existing utilitarian agricultural building does not justify allowing a new dwelling of the scale and massing proposed, or mitigate for the visual and landscape harm caused.  Given the above the proposal is not considered to be compliant with CS Policies DME2, DMG1, DMG2 and DMH3, and Key Statement EN2. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Highways and Parking:**  Following consultation with Highways, no objection was raised subject to the imposition of conditions relating to the submission of a Construction Traffic Management Plan and implementation of parking and turning facilities. No further assessment is required. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Landscape/Ecology:**  A Bat Survey was submitted as part of the application, concluding that the proposed development does not require an EPS License to proceed lawfully *however* RAMS and reasonable mitigation should be conditioned. As such in the case of an approval, a condition would be sought to secure this. Upon review, Officers are considered to be in agreement with this report. No further assessment is required. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Other Matters:** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **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. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **01:** | The proposal, by virtue of its design, scale and massing, would result in the provision of an excessively large and over-dominant dwelling that would adversely impact on the existing nature and character of the landscape and AONB and fail to respond positively to or enhance its immediate context. As such the proposal is considered to be in direct conflict with Key Statement EN2, Policies DME2, DMG1, DMG2 and DMH3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy, and Paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |