|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Signed:** | **Officer:** | **WH** | | | **Date:** | | **29-11-23** | | **Manager:** | | **LH** | **Date:** | **30/11/23** |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Application Ref:** | | | 2023/0075 | | | | | | |  | | | |
| **Date Inspected:** | | | 21-04-23 | | | **Site Notice:** | | 21-04-23 | |
| **Officer:** | | | Will Hopcroft | | | | | | |
| **DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:** | | | | | | | | | | **APPROVAL** | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Development Description:** | | | | Proposed extensions and remodelling (with associated building works) to the existing two barns, to create two detached dwellings (previously subject to approval 3/2021/0771) together with the erection of two proposed detached garages and external works and change of use of land to residential curtilage. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Site Address/Location:** | | | | Tan Yard Farm, Ribchester Road | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | **Parish/Town Council** | | | | | | | | | |
| No response. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | **Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies** | | | | | | | | | |
| **LCC Highways:** | | | | Initially raised concern around the size of the proposed double garage. On receipt of amended plans their revised response confirms the size of the garage is acceptable. Further information has been requested in relation to boundary treatments, to be addressed through condition. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Archaeology:** | | | | Condition to be imposed relating to photographic record. | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **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 EN5: Heritage Assets  Policy DMG1: General Considerations  Policy DMG2: Strategic Considerations  Policy DME2: Landscape & Townscape Protection  Policy DME3: Site and Species Protection and Conservation  Policy DME4: Protecting Heritage Assets  Policy DMH3: Dwellings in the Open Countryside  Policy DMH4: The Conversion of barns and other Buildings to Dwellings  Policy DMH5: Residential and Curtilage Extensions  Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act  National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Relevant Planning History:**  **2021/0771:**  Prior notification of the proposed change of use of two traditional stone barns to form three new dwelling houses with associated building works including the insertion of new door and window openings to achieve natural light in all habitable rooms – Approved  **2023/0074:**  Proposed front, side and rear two-storey extensions, extension to existing lean-to, creating one garage and extension to domestic curtilage – Pending Determination | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Site Description and Surrounding Area:**  The application site consists of two traditional stone barns located at the end of an access track approx. 175 metres from Ribchester Road. The farm house is directly opposite. To the North East is a sewage works and residential development on Asturian Gate. There is also a short row of semi-detached dwellings on Ribchester Road approx. 125 metres to the North. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Proposed Development for which consent is sought:**  The proposed development seeks to extend and remodel the two existing barns to create 2no. detached dwellings, together with the erection of two proposed detached garages and change of use of land to residential curtilage.  Specifically, with regard to ‘Dwelling 3’ (existing small barn):   * Front-elevation facing north-east; introduction of small porch extension and 1no. door opening, in-fill of void utilising set-back timber cladding and amendment to cart entry (In-set window section with timber clad surround and timber fins in front of fixed pane +500mm roof lift and 2no. proposed roof-lights. * Side-elevation facing south-east; +500mm roof lift to ensure matching roof pitch, utilisation of existing door and window openings. * Rear elevation facing south-west; single-storey rear elevation incorporating 1no. 3-panel window and 1no. set of bi-folding doors as well as provision of 3no. sets of roof-lights, one serving the bedroom and two serving the ground floor. 1 new window opening serving study. * Side elevation facing north-west; 2no. new window openings.   The materials utilised are to be matching stone and timber cladding, mirrored/reflective glazing, timber to the doors and stone to window heads and cills.  With regard to ‘Dwelling 2’ (existing large barn):   * Front-elevation; re-utilisation of existing window and door openings, imposition of 3no. roof-lights. * Side elevation; re-utilisation of 2no. existing window openings, introduction of 1no. door opening and 2no. window openings. * Rear elevation; introduction of 4no. window openings and alteration to/retention of cart entry, incorporating glazed feature. Alteration in siting of roof-lights and reduction from 3 to 2. * Side elevation; re-utilisation of existing window and door openings. Alteration of 1no. door opening to a window opening.   The proposal also introduces 2no. detached garages, 1 of which is a triple garage, and one which is a double garage. These are single-storey, pitched roof buildings incorporating garage door openings and utilising matching materials, with regard to the proposed dwellings. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Principle of Development:**  CS Policy DMH3 supports the appropriate conversion of buildings to dwellings providing they are suitably located and their form and general design are in keeping with their surroundings. Buildings must be structurally sound and capable of conversion without the need for complete or substantial reconstruction.  CS Policy DMH4 states that planning permission will be granted for the conversion of barns and other buildings to dwellings where:   1. The building is not isolated in the landscape, i.e. it is within a defined settlement or forms part of a group of buildings; and 2. There need be no unnecessary expenditure by public authorities and utilities on the provision of infrastructure; and 3. There would be no materially damaging effect on the landscape qualities of the area or harm to nature conservations interests; and 4. There would be no detrimental effect on the rural economy; and 5. The proposals are consistent with the conservation of the natural beauty of the area. 6. That any existing nature conservation aspects of the existing structure are properly surveyed and where judged to be significant preserved or, if this is not possible, then any loss adequately mitigated.   The building to be converted must:   1. Be structurally sound and capable of conversion for the proposed use without the need for extensive building or major alteration, which would adversely affect the character or appearance of the building. 2. Be of a sufficient size to provide necessary living accommodation without the need for further extensions which would harm the character or appearance of the building; and. 3. The building has a genuine history of use for agriculture or another rural enterprise.   In respect of the above, Officers consider that:   1. The buildings are suitably located and well-related to other existing buildings – notably, the adjacent dwelling over the track and the nearby dwellings/building along Ribchester Road. 2. Given the presence of nearby domestic properties it is considered unlikely that there would be any unnecessary expenditure by public authorities/utilities with regard to the provision of infrastructure. 3. Impacts upon landscape and natural beauty will be assessed within the Visual Amenity/External Appearance section. 4. Officers do not consider that there would be any detrimental effect on the rural economy. The buildings already have prior approval consent granted for conversion to residential. 5. Impacts upon the conservation of the natural beaty of the area will be assessed within the Visual Amenity/External Appearance section. 6. There have been no identified nature conversation aspects that require significant preservation or adequate mitigation.   Although no structural report has been submitted it is acknowledged that there is a fall-back position in that the building have prior approval for conversion. In that prior approval application they were considered suitable for conversion. The only difference here is that Barn 3 (smaller barn) is proposed to have a +500mm roof lift together with single storey rear extension and front porch. However these alterations and additions are not considered to amount to extensive building or major alteration which adversely affect the character of the building. In addition, it is evident, following consultation with Archaeology, that the barns have a modest and genuine history in association with the use of agriculture.  Given the above, the proposal is considered compliant with DMH3 and DMH4 subject to consideration against additional material planning considerations. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **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 acceptable particularly in relation to any impact on existing adjacent dwellings. Any dwellings off Ribchester Road are at least 100m away and as such are not considered to be impacted in this regard. With regard to the farmhouse opposite, it is noted that this is an existing relationship between primary elevations that are not sited directly opposite one another (there is a considerable discrepancy with regards to the angle of the relationship) and as such it is not considered either dwelling will impose any unacceptable impact on amenity or quality of life in relation to overlooking or loss of privacy, appearing dominant or overbearing, or resulting in any loss of light.  With regard to the amenity of the existing occupiers, it is noted that the space directly in-between the two buildings would be utilised as parking/hardstanding and not private amenity space, and there would be no unacceptable overlooking or loss of privacy between the two buildings themselves. Given the above the proposal is considered compliant with DMG1 (Amenity). | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Visual Amenity/External Appearance:**  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. Further consideration is given to CS Policy DME2, which states that ‘development proposals will be refused which significantly harm important landscape or landscape features including:   1. *Traditional stone walls* 2. *Ponds* 3. *Characteristic herb rich meadows and pastures* 4. *Woodlands* 5. *Copses* 6. *Hedgerows and individual trees (other than in exceptional circumstances where satisfactory works of mitigation or enhancement would be achieved, including rebuilding, replanting and landscape management)* 7. *Townscape elements such as the scale, form and materials that contribute to the characteristic townscapes of the area*   In this sense, following assessment and subsequent design alterations submitted by the applicant, the proposal is considered acceptable with regard to both DMG1 and DME2. The design features incorporated are subtle and reflect the historic agricultural nature of both buildings. Existing openings have been used to incorporate windows and doors, with additional windows considered to be sympathetic or on less significant elevations. The addition of a modest number of roof-lights is considered acceptable given they are minor in size and do not dominate the roofscape. The materials utilised are to be matching, and where it is considered that a contrasting element would be more appropriate this has been incorporated utilising set-back timber cladding. Where additional built footprint is sought, such as the extension on Dwelling 3, this has been set-back and set-in from the side to ensure it remains sympathetic, and incorporates a matching pitched roof, with appropriate elevational and design treatments. Characteristic agricultural features (such as the catslide roof and cart entry) have been retained and enhanced where possible.  Given the above the proposal is considered acceptable with DMG1 and DME2. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Highways and Parking:**  Following consultation with LCC Highways, further information was requested in relation to the size of the garages and details surrounding boundary treatments. The applicant has subsequently amended the plans to address the concerns, which is considered acceptable with boundary treatments to be secured by condition. No further concerns have been identified and as such the proposal is considered acceptable from a Highways perspective. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Impact on the Historic Environment:**  As per KS EN5, the Council states that there will be a presumption in favour of the conservation and enhancement of the significance of heritage assets and their settings , recognising that the best way of ensuring the long-term protection of heritage assets is to ensure a viable use that optimises opportunities for sustaining and enhancing its significance.  In addition, DME4 states that the Council will make a presumption in favour of the protection and enhancement of the heritage assets and their settings.  The barns themselves are not listed nor do they sit within a Conservation Area but they do hold an element of historical significance given their age and use. As such, following consultation with LCC Archaeology, a condition for historic recording is sought. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Protected Species:**  Following submission of a valid and up-to-date Protected Species Report, the buildings are identified as low risk of supporting protected species and it is not considered that further surveys are required, nor it is it considered that a Natural England EPS License would be required. Survey recommendations in the form of mitigation can be secured by condition. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Impact on Trees:**  The development would involve the loss of a Class B: Sycamore tree and a Class C Willow tree which is necessary to facilitate the site access and garage. It will be necessary to mitigate the impact of their removal with new tree planting to be secured by condition. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Impact on Public Footpath:**  A PROW runs through the site along the track however the development proposal does not propose to block off this route. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **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 approval. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **RECOMMENDATION**: | | |  | | | | | | | | | | |
| That planning consent be granted subject to the imposition of conditions. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |