|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Signed:** | | **Officer:** | **WH** | | | | **Date:** | | **20/04/23** | | **Manager:** | | **LH** | **Date:** | **20/04/23** |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Application Ref:** | | | | | 2023/0162 | | | | | | |  | | | |
| **Date Inspected:** | | | | | 16/03/23 | | | **Site Notice:** | | N/A | |
| **Officer:** | | | | | Will Hopcroft | | | | | | |
| **DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:** | | | | | | | | | | | | **REFUSAL** | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Development Description:** | | | | | | Alterations to approved window and door openings and creation of additional openings on north east and north west elevations including additional rooflights and removal of porch | | | | | | | | | |
| **Site Address/Location:** | | | | | | Hilltop Barn, Clitheroe Road, Knowle Green PR3 2YQ | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | | | **Parish/Town Council** | | | | | | | | | |
| No objections. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | | | **Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies** | | | | | | | | | |
| None required. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **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  Policy DMG1 – General Considerations  Policy DMG2 – Strategic Considerations  Policy DMH5 – Residential and Curtilage Extensions  National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Relevant Planning History:**  **3/2010/0821:**  Proposed Garden Room extension to the garage. (Re-submission of 3/2010/0231P) (Approved with Conditions)  **3/2010/0779:**  Proposed storage building (Approved with Condition)  **3/2010/0231:**  Proposed extension to garage (Refused)  **3/1995/0301:**  Two-story extension to existing dwelling (Refused, appeal dismissed)  **3/1993/0687:**  Detached garage (Approved with Conditions)  **3/1993/0599:**  Conversion of redundant stone barn to dwellinghouse (Reserved Matters) (Approved with Conditions)  **3/1990/0821:**  Conversion of barn to dwelling and improvements to access road (Approved with Conditions) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Site Description and Surrounding Area:**  The site is comprised of a barn conversion, creating a two-storey detached dwelling with a saltbox roof and detached outbuilding in use as ancillary accommodation and a garage. Access is gained off a track down Clitheroe Road. The dwelling is detached, and there is a significant levels difference in relation to the adjacent dwellings to the south (Rose Cottage and Briar Cottage). As a result, the dwelling sits in relative isolation – there is a public footpath running north-south, just to the east of the site but this does not provide a good level of visibility of the site from the public highway. The dwelling also sits within the AONB.  GII Listed Buildings ‘Knoll Hall’, and ‘9 and 10 (West View) and Barn Adjoining to South-West’ sit approximately 180m south-west of the site. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Proposed Development for which consent is sought:**  The development seeks permission for minor alterations to the north-east and north-west elevations, comprising:   * Removal of porch and canopy, installation of double-doors and sliding ‘agricultural type openings’ to the north-west elevation. * Filling in of 2no. windows to the north-west elevation. * Enlargement of 1no. existing window to the north-west elevation * Removal and making good of ‘outrigger’ to the north-east elevation * Installation of double doors and new single door opening (adapted from window opening) to the north-east elevation * Installation of 2no. roof lights on the lower roof slope of the north-east elevation. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Principle of Development:**  The proposal relates to a domestic alteration to an established residential dwelling and as such is acceptable in principle subject to further detailed assessment of the relevant material planning considerations.  Whilst normally these works would not require planning permission by virtue of falling within Schedule 2 of the GPDO, in this case PD rights have been removed under application reference 3/1993/0599. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Impact Upon Residential Amenity:**  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.  Whilst the application does seek to install some new window openings, none of them are considered intrusive or to interfere with the privacy of adjacent dwellings (particularly given the extant levels difference between the application site and the neighbouring dwellings). There is also no increase in footprint proposed. As such it is considered there will be no impact on the residential amenity of adjacent neighbours and as such the proposal is compliant with DMG1 (Amenity). | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Design and Visual Amenity**  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 sense it is necessary to assess whether the altered and new window and door openings as well as removal of porch and outrigger are sympathetic and well designed with regard to the character of the existing dwelling.  In this sense, Officers consider that the remaining agricultural character retained by the barn conversion would be further eroded by the proposals which seek to remove various traditional elements of the original building. In addition, there would be a notable reduction in the void to solid ratio and this would result in significant visual clutter to the side and rear elevations, particularly considering the addition of roof-lights, bi-fold doors and the enlarged first floor window. Whilst it is appreciated that some minor alterations would allow for the retention of features contributing to the agricultural character whilst still being acceptable in principle, in this case the extent of the alterations is considered excessive and detracts from the building’s character.  Given the above, officers consider that the agricultural character of the building would be further eroded and the alterations proposed would contribute further to an increase in visual clutter thus resulting in unsympathetic additions that would be harmful to the character, setting and visual amenities of the immediate surrounding area and fails to respond positively to the or enhance the immediate context. As such the proposals are not considered to be compliant with CS Policies DMG 1 and DMH5 as well as the design objectives found within the NPPF. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Impact on the AONB**  As per CS Key Statement EN2, the landscape and character of the areas that contribute to the setting and character of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty will be protected, conserved and where possible enhanced.  As discussed above, it is considered that the alterations proposed detract from the agricultural setting and character of the dwelling and is not reflective of the dwellings historic use. The alterations are designed in a way that is unsympathetic and contributes to additional visual clutter that would be harmful to the immediate setting. Whilst the dwellings limited contribution to the AONB is considered, the alterations to the dwelling are considered to detract from the setting and character of the AONB and as such the proposal is not compliant with KS EN2. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **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 its design, would result in unsympathetic and incongruous alterations that would be harmful to the character of the building and to the character, setting and visual amenities of the immediate surrounding area. It fails to respond positively to, or enhance, the immediate context or the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. As such the proposal is considered to be in direct conflict with Policies DMG1 and DMH5 and Key Statement EN2 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy, and Paragraph 130 of the NPPF. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |