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| --- |
| **Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.** |
| **Signed:** | **Officer:** | SK | **Date:** | 25.4.23 | **Manager:** | **LH** | **Date:** | **27/4/23** |
|  |
| **Application Ref:** | 2023/0186 |  |
| **Date Inspected:** | Pre-sub | **Site Notice:** | N/A |
| **Officer:** | SK |
| **DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:**  | **APPROVAL** |
|  |
| **Development Description:** | Demolition of equine building and construction of a detached annexe to provide additional accommodation for extended family. Resubmission of 3/2022/0446. |
| **Site Address/Location:** | Marylebone Farm Bowland Gate Lane West Bradford BB7 4TL |
|  |
| **CONSULTATIONS:**  | **Parish/Town Council** |
| West Bradford Parish Council Have offered the following observations:*I write in my capacity as Clerk to West Bradford Parish Council. As a statutory consultee, the Parish Council always seeks to balance the need for any development (whether in a residential, agricultural or employment context) against the wider residential amenity of the village. The above application has been considered in detail at the meeting of the Parish Council held on 29 March 2023, and as a result I have been asked to submit the following observations on members’ behalf.**Members of the Parish Council were reminded that application 3/2023/0186 was a resubmission of application 3/2022/0446, which was rejected by the Local Planning Authority (LPA) on 1 February 2023. This application had been rejected by the LPA on the following grounds:**“…approval would result in the creation of a residential annexe that would provide a level and provision of accommodation which exceeds that which could reasonably be considered as being 'modest'.”**The planning statement in the revised application states that:**“The overall volume and scale of the new building would be significantly smaller than the existing building currently occupying the site and subservient to the main house.”* *However, in members’ opinion, the impact of the proposed new design would not be dissimilar to that put forward in the 2022 application. This is demonstrated by the extracts below, taken from the applicant’s plans, which appear to suggest that changes to the original design are in fact minimal.**If the relevant test is one of “modesty”, members remain unconvinced that the new design will meet this any more than the previous submission. In addition, members wished to restate their concerns previously expressed with regard to the appearance of the proposed design. Members note that the LPA, when considering the Parish Council’s objections to application 3/2022/0446, did not find that there would be:**“…any significant measurable harm upon the character or visual amenities of the area or that of the character or visual amenities of the Forest of Bowland AONB.”* *In contrast, however, members would strongly continue to assert that the presence of a zinc roof and cladding is not in keeping with the traditional design of buildings in the vicinity, nor with the wider appearance of the Forest of Bowland AONB. In line with its previous comments, the design would be viewed more favourably by the Parish Council if the property were to be constructed of random stone and with a slate roof.* |
|  |
| **CONSULTATIONS:**  | **Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies** |
| **LCC Highways:** |  |
| No objections subject to the imposition of condition limiting occupation of the annexe. |
| **CONSULTATIONS:**  | **Additional Representations.** |
| One letter of support has been received in respect of the application. |
|  |
| **RELEVANT POLICIES AND SITE PLANNING HISTORY:** |
| **Ribble Valley Core Strategy:**Key Statement DS1 – Development StrategyKey Statement DS2 – Sustainable DevelopmentKey Statement EN2 - LandscapePolicy DMG1 – General ConsiderationsPolicy DMG2 – Strategic ConsiderationsPolicy DMH5 – Residential and Curtilage ExtensionsPolicy DME1 – Protecting Trees & WoodlandPolicy DME2 – Landscape & Townscape ProtectionNational Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) |
| **Relevant Planning History:****2022/0446:**Demolition of equine building and construction of a detached annex/garage/home office. (Refused)**2022/0011:**Extension of existing building and change to equine use together with a hard standing area for sorting bales of hay. (Approved)**2021/0646:**Addition of four arena mirrors to an existing fence line. To consist of two vertical mirrors 1.2m x 1.8m and two horizontal mirrors 3.6m x 1.2m. (Approved)**2021/0246:**Four proposed arena mirrors along a pre-existing fence line. (Approved) |
|  |
| **ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:** |
| **Site Description and Surrounding Area:**The application relates to an existing equine outbuilding associated with and directly connected to the residential dwelling known as Marylebone Farm. The building is located in a predominantly rural context, also being sited within the designated Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty |
| **Proposed Development for which consent is sought:**The submitted details propose the demolition of an existing equine building and the erection of a single replacement building accommodating a residential annexe with the retention of an existing stone-built ‘store’ building. It is proposed that the annexe will directly interface with the existing store building to be retained, with the store being converted to that of a bedroom with integral en-suite. The annexe will accommodate two bedrooms, utility room and open-plan kitchen, living and dining area. The annexe will also benefit from a direct physical interface with the primary dwelling to the west by way of an existing ‘piggery store’ however there will be no internal connectivity with the primary dwelling.It is proposed that the annexe will be of a lesser footprint than that of the existing equine building (which incorporates the existing store-building) with the apex of the proposed building being lower than that of the existing. It is proposed that the annexe will be faced in natural-stone with intermediate timber panel detailing, with the roof being faced in metal ‘standing-seam’ with hidden gutter detailing, also incorporating PV panelling on the west-facing roof-plane.The annexe is of a contemporary architectural language, largely consisting of a simple ‘utilitarian’ building envelope with feature recessed gable on the south facing elevation. The proposed south facing elevation incorporates full height glazing and vertical intermediate stone ‘planar-wall’ which terminates above the roof apex forming a ‘feature chimney’, with glazed corner on the south-east elevation of the building.The remainder of the elevations are relatively austere with a fenestrational arrangement of a vertical emphasis which visually counters and balances the overall horizontal emphasis of the proposed built form. |
| **Principle of Development:**Given the proposal seeks consent for that of the erection of a residential annexe, Policy DMH5 is primarily engaged for the purposes of assessing the acceptability of the principle of the development**.**In this respect Policy DMH5 reads as follows:*Proposals to extend or alter existing residential properties must accord with Policy DMG1 and any relevant designations within which the site is located. Proposals that are for the extension of properties to provide accommodation for elderly or dependant relatives will also be subject to the following criteria:*1. *The development must be capable of integration into the main dwelling or a use that is ancillary to the use of the main dwelling housing when circumstances change.*
2. *The extension should generally speaking provide only a modest level of accommodation.*

*Any existing nature conservation aspects of the existing structure should be properly surveyed and where judged to be significant preserved or, if this is not possible, then any loss adequately mitigated. Proposals to extend a curtilage in other circumstances will not be approved other than where it will support the health of the local economy or for highway safety reasons.*The submitted details propose that the annexe accommodation will be self-contained, providing two bedrooms, utility room and open-plan kitchen/dining and living room area at ground floor level. Whilst there is no direct internal interconnectivity between the annexe accommodation and that of the primary dwelling, the buildings are physically linked by an existing ‘store’ building, which at a future date, could facilitate the integration of the annexe into the main dwelling as required by criterion 1 of Policy DMH5. Given the proposal possesses the potential to satisfy criterion 1 of the Policy, consideration must also be given in respect of the proposals compatibility with criterion 2 of Policy DMH5. In this respect criterion 2 of Policy DMH5 is explicit in that it requires annexe accommodation *‘provide only a modest level of accommodation’.* The provision accommodation proposed is approximately commensurate with that of the previous refusal, however it is noted that the revised details now omit a large ‘office‘ with associated en-suite which was part of the previous submission. In this respect the level of provision of accommodation, on-balance, could now be considered modest particularly insofar that the proposed annexe also now benefits from a reduced footprint (2m shorter in length) compared to that of the previously refused proposal. |
| **Impact Upon Residential Amenity:**The building to which the application relates is relatively remote from other nearby residential receptor save that for ‘West Heys Farm’ which is located approximately 64 metres to the east and ‘Hollycroft’ which is located approximately 65 metres to the south-west.As such, taking account of the proposals relative remoteness from nearby residential dwellings and taking account of the separation distance outlined above, which are in excess of 60 metres, it is not considered that the proposal will result in any measurable harm upon the residential amenities of occupiers within the immediate vicinity.  |
| **Visual Amenity/External Appearance:**The proposed annexe is of a lesser footprint and scale than that of the existing equine building which it seeks to replace, also being of a lesser footprint of that of the previously refused proposal. In this respect it cannot be considered or argued that the annexe building, by virtue of overall scale or quantum of built-form, will result in additional spatial impacts, over and above that of the existing building which would further compromise the visual openness of the immediate area or that of the Forest of Bowland AONB.The proposed building employs a contemporary elevational language which is largely reminiscent of a utilitarian agricultural building save that for the domestic fenestrational arrangement and south-facing ‘feature-gable’ with the language of the proposed annexe maintaining the general appearance of the previous submission.In this respect, taking account that it was determined that the previous proposal would not result in adverse visual impacts upon the area, whilst taking account of the proposed materials and overall general appearance of the building, it is considered that the proposal accords with the requirements of Key Statement EN2 in that it would be ‘in keeping with the character of the landscape’, ‘reflect local distinctiveness and vernacular style’ (albeit utilitarian), also being in keeping with the landscape designation in terms of scale, style, features and building materials.As such, and taking account of the above matters, it is not considered that the proposal will result in any significant measurable harm upon the character or visual amenities of the area or that of the inherent character or visual amenities of the Forest of Bowland AONB. |
| **Highways and Parking:**Given the proposal seeks consent for that of annexe accommodation and taking account that the dwelling to which the application relates benefits from adequate provision to accommodate additional vehicular parking generated by the proposal, it is not considered that the proposal will result in any adverse highways impacts. |
| **Landscape/Ecology:**The application has been accompanied by the submission of a Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment. The report concludes that there was no evidence found at the time of inspection that would suggest the building is being utilised by roosting bats and further considers that the building is of negligible potential for roosting bats.As such no compensatory mitigation is required to offset the potential impact of the development upon protected species. |
| **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 permission be granted subject to the imposition of conditions. |