|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Signed:** | **Officer:** | **WH** | | | | **Date:** | | **12/05/23** | | **Manager:** | | **LH** | **Date:** | **15/5/23** |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Application Ref:** | | | | 2023/0228 | | | | | | |  | | | |
| **Date Inspected:** | | | | 03/04/23 | | | **Site Notice:** | | 03/04/23 | |
| **Officer:** | | | | Will Hopcroft | | | | | | |
| **DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:** | | | | | | | | | | | **APPROVAL** | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Development Description:** | | | | | Proposed replacement of an existing greenhouse with a larger greenhouse | | | | | | | | | |
| **Site Address/Location:** | | | | | Higher Chipping House, Cutler Lane PR3 2SY | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | | **Parish/Town Council** | | | | | | | | | |
| No response. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **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  Policy DMG1 – General Considerations  Policy DMG2 – Strategic Considerations  Policy EN2 – Landscape  Policy EN5 – Heritage Assets  Policy DME4 – Protecting Heritage Assets  Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act  National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Relevant Planning History:**  **2023/0146:**  Listed Building Consent for the replacement of an existing greenhouse with a larger greenhouse – Withdrawn  **2022/0187:**  Listed Building Consent for proposed replacement of windows and gutters, internal repair works, conversion of existing outbuilding into home office space and demolition of outbuilding (timber barn) – Approved with Conditions  **2022/0186:**  Proposed replacement of windows and gutters, internal repair works, conversion of existing outbuilding into home office space and demolition of outbuilding (timber barn) – Approved with Conditions  **1991/0217:**  Conversion of shippon to self-contained annex/granny flat (re-submission) – Refused  **1990/0039:**  Replacement of unsafe Nissen hut with new building to be used as garage and store and stable with tack facilities – Approved Unconditionally  **1989/0651:**  Conversion of redundant farm buildings to self-contained cottage annex – Refused | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Site Description and Surrounding Area:**  The site is comprised of a dwelling off Cutler Lane known as Higher Chipping House, as well as associated outbuildings and curtilage. The dwelling at Higher Chipping House is Grade II Listed, with the listing reading as below:  *‘House, late C18th. Coursed watershot sandstone with slate roof. Double- pile plan with end stacks. A symmetrical composition of 2 storeys with attic and 3 bays. Facade has chamfered quoins. Windows sashed with architraves. Door has architrave, fluted Doric pilasters, triglyph frieze and moulded pediment, all badly worn. The rear wall has chamfered mullioned windows of C18th type, flush with the wall and with tooling. The central stair window has a transom only. The rear door has a plain stone surround with furrowed diagonal tooling. Interior. Raised and fielded panelled doors on the ground floor. Right-hand front room has a stone parlour fireplace with moulded surround and cornice hood. The left-hand room has a C19th fireplace said to have come from Wyreside Tower, having an elliptical arch with fluted keystone, fluted pilasters, and cornice.’*  The existing outbuilding was built under application reference 1990/0039 with its conversion into a home office space approved under application reference 2022/0186. The existing timber outbuilding is retained. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Proposed Development for which consent is sought:**  The proposal seeks to remove the existing greenhouse – situated between both existing outbuildings and not visible from the viewpoint or within the same streetscape as the Listed Building – and replace with a larger greenhouse in broadly the same position. The greenhouse would be 4900mm in length, 3700mm in width and incorporate a pitched roof 3340mm tall to the ridge and 2000mm to the eaves. The elevations would be glass, save for approx. 8 courses of brick at the bottom of each elevation, with the door opening at the southern elevation. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Principle of Development:**  The principle of development is supported, given the application seeks to erect an outbuilding ancillary to the use of the dwellinghouse within the curtilage of said dwellinghouse. Whilst this would normally fall within thresholds of Permitted Development (notably Schedule 2 Part 1 Class E), this right does not apply when within the curtilage of a Listed Building. A Listed Building Consent is not necessary as no part of the works touch the fabric of the Listed Building. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Impact upon Listed Building and Setting:**  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 with 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, Policy DME4 states (in regard to Listed Buildings) that *‘alterations or extensions to listed buildings or buildings of local heritage interest, or development proposals on sites within their setting which cause harm to the significance of the heritage asset will not be supported.’*  The NPPF (2021) also states at Paragraph 202 that *‘where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal’.*  In this sense, the proposal is compliant with the above. It is noted that the impact on the significance of the Listed Building is limited, seeing as though there is a significant degree of separation by way of the two existing outbuildings (notably, you would not be able to see the proposed greenhouse and the Listed Building in the same view) with the greenhouse shielded from view by both outbuildings, which are of fairly modern construction in any case.  It is accepted that even in cases such as these, additions or alterations can still impact the setting of the Listed Building. However, in this case, the propose greenhouse is not considered to have a greater impact on the significance of the Listed Building compared to the existing greenhouse it is replacing.  Whilst it is noted the proposed greenhouse is larger in both height and width, and is more fussy in design, its siting and the presence of intervening buildings means its impact on the Listed Building is minimal and does not constitute either harm, or less than substantial harm, in any case. The materials used are reflective of the function of the greenhouse (that being glass and brick) and again do not impact on the significance of the Listed Building or its setting.  Given the above the proposal is deemed compliant with EN5, DME4 and the NPPF (2021). | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **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 application is deemed acceptable. The proposed greenhouse sits well away from adjacent dwellings and common boundaries and as such is not likely to appear dominant or overbearing, nor does it encroach on separation distances. It offers no further opportunity for overlooking and as such will not result in a loss of privacy and will not impinge on the daylight provision of any adjacent neighbours.  Given the above the proposal is deemed 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. In this regard, the proposal is considered to comply with DMG1. The siting of the greenhouse is acceptable, broadly reflective of the existing greenhouse and well screened from view by existing outbuildings. The scale and massing, whilst larger than the existing greenhouse, does not dominate or overpower the existing outbuildings with the ridge and eaves height sitting approximately the same height or lower. The materials used are appropriate and functional for the purposes of the outbuilding. As such the proposal is deemed acceptable with regard to DMG1 (Design).  In addition, EN2 states that the landscape and character of the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding  Natural Beauty will be protected, conserved, and enhanced. It is noted that the site does fall within the AONB – however, in this case the provision of a greenhouse where one already exists and sits within the curtilage of a dwellinghouse utilising functional and appropriate materials screened largely from view by existing outbuildings, has a negligible impact on the AONB and as such is deemed acceptable with regards to 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 approval. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **RECOMMENDATION**: | | |  | | | | | | | | | | | |
| That planning consent be granted subject to the imposition of conditions. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |