|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Signed:** | | **Officer:** | **EP** | | | | **Date:** | | **06/02/2023** | | **Manager:** | | **SK** | **Date:** | **10.02.23** |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Application Ref:** | | | | | 3/2022/1096 | | | | | | |  | | | |
| **Date Inspected:** | | | | | 30/01/2023 | | | **Site Notice:** | | N/A | |
| **Officer:** | | | | | EP | | | | | | |
| **DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:** | | | | | | | | | | | | **REFUSAL** | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Development Description:** | | | | | | Removal of existing rear structure and erection of a two storey and single storey rear extension and associated alterations. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Site Address/Location:** | | | | | | 3 The Barn Clerk Hill Road Sabden BB7 9FR | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | | | **Parish/Town Council** | | | | | | | | | |
| Sabden Parish have raised no objection but have raised a comment in regards to public rights of way and access for neighbours being maintained. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | | | **Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies** | | | | | | | | | |
| **LCC Highways:** | | | | | | No Objection. | | | | | | | | | |
| RBVC Countryside have raised concerns in regard to the quality of the bat survey provided. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | | | **Additional Representations.** | | | | | | | | | |
| One comment has been received in reference to the extension and how the materials used should reflect the setting within the AONB. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **RELEVANT POLICIES AND SITE PLANNING HISTORY:** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ribble Valley Core Strategy:**  Key Statement DS1 – Development Strategy  Key Statement DS2 – Sustainable Development  Policy DMG1 – General Considerations  Policy DMG2 – Strategic Considerations  Policy EN2 – Landscape Protection  DME3 – Species Protection  DMH5 -- Residential and Curtilage Extensions.  National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Relevant Planning History:**  **1992/0420: Barn converted to 3 dwellings. (approved with conditions, PD rights removed)**  **1991/0671: Barn conversion. (refused)** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Site Description and Surrounding Area:**  The proposal relates to a two-storey mid barn conversion located off Clerk Hill Road, Sabden, within the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The original barn was converted into 3 dwellings in the 1990s and their associated permitted development rights were removed. The existing property consists of natural stonework and a slate roof. The surrounding properties comprise a mixture of both agricultural and residential uses and the majority are consistent in style with the proposal dwelling. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Proposed Development for which consent is sought:**  Consent is sought for the demolition of an existing conservatory at the rear of the dwelling and the erection of a two-storey extension in its place, to provide additional living space to the ground floor and a larger third bedroom with home office to the first floor. The proposed extension is to consist of Natural Stonework and Vertical Cedar Cladding. It would measure a maximum height of 5.235m, 5.535m in width and 2.93m in depth. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **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 also lies within the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty therefore additional consideration will be given towards the effect of the proposal on the visual character of the surrounding landscape. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Impact Upon Residential Amenity:**  The two properties with the potential to be most affected by the proposed extension are the adjoining Wiswell Moor Farm and Wiswell Moor Barn. The South-Eastern elevation would face Wiswell Moor Barn, as the first-floor element of the proposal is set inwards by approximately 1.39m, and the 45-degree angle criteria is met, there would be no significant loss of light from this side.  Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy states that all development must *‘not adversely affect the amenities of the surrounding area’.* Whilst it is noted that the proposal forms a smaller footprint than the existing lean-to extension, the two-storey nature allows for a far more overbearing position within the rear streetscape. The North-Western elevation of the proposal faces Wiswell Moor Farm, which is sited opposite Bramble Cottages and its associated out-buildings. Given that the rear accessway from No.1 The Barn to Wiswell Moor Farm is narrow and that Bramble Cottages is already close in proximity to the host dwelling and adjoining properties, the proposed two-storey extension would result in an unacceptable sense of enclosure for the occupants of Wiswell Moor Farm. As such the proposal is considered to have an adverse impact on residential amenity. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Visual Amenity/External Appearance:**  With regards to development in the AONB, Key Statement EN2 states that: ‘*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’.*  Paragraph 130 of the NPPF states: *‘Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting’.*  The character of the area surrounding the application site is predominantly rural being largely characterised by stone-built dwellings with slate roof profiles. The proposed rear extension is to consist of Natural Stonework and Vertical Cedar Cladding to the exterior. Whilst the natural stonework would be in keeping with the surrounding properties, the proposed cedar cladding would appear out of character and as such unsympathetic in the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The proposal is to project, 2.93m rearwards, will extend a width of 5.53m and will have a maximum height of 5.23m almost matching the hight of the existing roof pitch. As a result, given its scale, the proposed extension would appear over dominant in relation to the host dwelling and the properties in the immediate vicinity. The proposed glazed openings are also disproportionate and not coherent with the existing windows on the host dwelling and neighbouring dwellings. The roof pitch of the proposed extension features a reverse gable which is out of character for the area given that the existing roofscape is uniform, forming conventional roof slopes. It is therefore considered that the proposed extension would fail to reflect the local distinctiveness of the area in terms of its use of materials, scale and design which in turn would be contrary to the aims and objectives of Key Statement EN2. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Highways and Parking:**  LCC Highways have been consulted and raise no objection. However, they have issued an informative note stating that ‘*the grant of planning permission does not entitle a developer to obstruct a right of way and any proposed temporary or permanent stopping-up or diversion of a right of way should be the subject of an Order under the appropriate Act. The applicant should be advised to contact Lancashire County Council's Public Rights of Way section by email on PROW@lancashire.gov.uk, quoting the location, district and planning application number, to discuss their proposal before any development works begin’*. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Landscape/Ecology:**  A scoping survey was conducted on 03/12/2022 at 1pm and concluded that there was *a ‘lack of evidence and potential access points at this property’*. It was suggested that this paired with the fact ‘*recent remedial roof work* failed *to find any evidence of bat presence indicates that the extension will not impact adversely on any local bat population, nor it is likely any bats will be uncovered or disturbed during the tile removal’.* As a result, it was therefore concluded that any further emergence surveys are not considered necessary and there is no need for a mitigation scheme. However, it was suggested that the habitat enhancement outlined in the survey be incorporated to boost roost potential in the locality.  In accordance with policy DME3 development proposals that are likely to adversely affect protected species will not be granted planning permission.  RVBC Countryside were consulted in relation to the bat survey provided and a site visit was conducted on 25/01/2023. At said site visit a few loose and out of place slates adjacent to the rear of the property were noted as potential access points for bats. Following this, a Licensed Council Approved Ecologist was consulted who was in agreement with the findings of the RBVC countryside officer and in addition also observed numerous other potential access points for bats.Taking this into account*,* it has been concluded that, *‘a licensed ecologist would have made reference to these potential access points and potentially recommended further surveys would be required to ascertain the level of bat activity within this area. Taking all of the information into consideration the Councils Countryside Officer feels the submitted Bat Survey is not adequate to make an informed decision on the proposed developments potential impact to the local bat population which are a protected species.’* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Observations/Consideration of Matters Raised/Conclusion:**  In conclusion, the proposal would inflict an unacceptable sense of enclosure on the adjoining property, Wiswell Moor Farm, and as such is considered to have an undue negative impact on residential amenity.  Taking into consideration the materials, scale and design the proposed extension would appear unsympathetic in relation to the host dwelling and properties in the immediate vicinity, as well as the wider AONB, and undermines the character of the streetscape.  The bat survey provided failed to identify clear potential access points and is therefore considered inadequate to assist in the making of an informed decision on the proposed extensions potential adverse impact on the protected local bat population.  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 its scale, proposed materials and elevational language would result in the introduction of an incongruous and anomalous form of development that fails to respond positively to the inherent character of the parent building or that of the character of the immediate and wider Forest of Bowland AONB, being of significant detriment to the character and visual amenities of the area and the character of the property to which the application relates. As such the proposal is in direct conflict with Policy DMG1 and Key Statement EN2 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **02:** | The proposal is in significant direct conflict with Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy insofar that the proposal, by virtue of its overall scale and proximity to nearby/adjacent residential receptors, would result in an overbearing impact and create a detrimental and overt sense of enclosure upon the adjacent residential dwelling to the northwest being of significant detriment to existing residential amenities of neighbouring occupiers. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **03:** | The submitted Bat Survey fails to adequately assess or determine the potential impacts upon European Protected Species or species of conservation concern in that the survey fails to adequately identify potential bat ‘access points’ on the parent building. As such the proposal is considered to be in significant and direct conflict with Policy DME3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |