|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Signed:** | | **Officer:** | **LW** | | | | **Date:** | | **12/07/23** | | **Manager:** | | **KH** | **Date:** | **13/07/23** |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Application Ref:** | | | | | 3/2023/0252 | | | | | | |  | | | |
| **Date Inspected:** | | | | | 15/06/23 | | | **Site Notice:** | | 15/06/23 | |
| **Officer:** | | | | | LW | | | | | | |
| **DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:** | | | | | | | | | | | | **REFUSAL** | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Development Description:** | | | | | | Proposed demolition of existing conservatory and construction of single storey extension to form garden room, utility, WC and link to existing garage. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Site Address/Location:** | | | | | | 1 Kirkbeck Mews, The Oaks, Gisburn Road, Bolton by Bowland, BB7 4NQ | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | | | **Parish/Town Council** | | | | | | | | | |
| No comments received within consultation period. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | | | **Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies** | | | | | | | | | |
| **LCC Highways:** | | | | | | No objection. | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | | | **Additional Representations.** | | | | | | | | | |
| One letter of representation was received in regard to the proposed development. The concerns addressed within the letter can be summarised as below:   * No mention of the overall Kirkbeck Mews development of two houses in the heritage statement which are immediate neighbours and constructed as a single development; * Inaccuracy of the submitted Location Plan; * No details regarding the new or altered vehicle access | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **RELEVANT POLICIES AND SITE PLANNING HISTORY:** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ribble Valley Core Strategy:**  **Ribble Valley Core Strategy:**  Key Statement DS1: Development Strategy  Key Statement DS2: Sustainable Development  Key Statement EN2: Landscape  Key Statement EN5: Heritage Assets  Key Statement DMI2: Transport Considerations  Policy DMG1: General Considerations  Policy DMG2: Strategic Considerations  Policy DMG3: Transport & Mobility  Policy DME4: Protecting Heritage Assets  Bolton by Bowland Conservation Area Appraisal  Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act  National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Relevant Planning History:**  3/2012/0302: Fell one oak tree and deadwood and remove branches from four others (Approved)  3/1996/0179: Erection of new house type (resubmission) (Approved)  3/1996/0053: Extension to existing structure to form new house type (Approved)  3/1988/0731: Removal of existing agricultural buildings and erection of two houses and double garages (Appeal Allowed)  3/1988/0418: Conversion of barn to 2 dwellings, removal of agricultural buildings and construction of 2 houses and 4 double garages (Barn conversion approved, construction of 2 houses refused)  3/1987/0041: Provision of vehicular access, land between the old rectory and public conveniences, Gisburn Road, Bolton by Bowland (Refused) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Site Description and Surrounding Area:**  The application relates to a two-storey detached dwelling known as The Oaks, 1 Kirkbeck Mews. The property comprises of stone, slate roof tiles and timber windows and doors, and benefits from an existing uPVC conservatory to the rear, along with an existing detached garage. The application site is located within the defined Bolton by Bowland Conservation Area and the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Whilst the property itself if not listed, the site is located adjacent The Coach and Horses Public House which is a Grade II Listed Building. The two are separated by Kirk Beck. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Proposed Development for which consent is sought:**  The proposal seeks consent for the proposed demolition of the existing conservatory and construction of a single storey extension to form a garden room, utility, WC, and link to the existing garage.  The proposed extension would be to the side/ rear elevation of the property and would project a maximum of 7.7m from the rear elevation of the dwelling and extend a total width of 6.9m. A flat roof design would be featured which would measure 2.85m in height and include the installation of 1no. roof light. To the northern side elevation of the proposed development, a set of double doors would be featured to serve the proposed garden room, along with 2no. windows which would serve the proposed WC and utility, whilst to the southern facing side elevation a single door and 1no. window would be incorporated. The rear elevation of proposal would also feature a large, glazed section, extending across the full width of the proposed garden room. A set of double doors would also be installed to the rear elevation of the main dwellinghouse.  In regard to materiality, the proposed garden room would be constructed in random coursed stone to match the existing dwellinghouse, with K render being featured to the proposed link to the existing garage. Timber windows and doors would also be incorporated to match the existing fenestration. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Principle of Development:**  The proposal relates to domestic alterations to a dwelling and is therefore acceptable in principle subject to an assessment of the material planning considerations.  The application property is situated within the Bolton by Bowland Conservation Area and sited adjacent a Grade II Listed Building. As such, consideration will be given towards the effect of the proposal on the historic character of the host dwelling and the adjacent Coach and Horses Public House, as well as the surrounding area.  The proposal site is also situated within the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and therefore additional consideration will also be given towards the effect of the proposal on the visual character of the surrounding landscape. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Impact upon Listed Building and Setting:**  The application property is situated adjacent to The Coach and Horses Public House which is Grade II Listed.  The Listing entry for The Coach and Horses reads as follows:  ‘*Public house, late C18th. Squared watershot limestone with hipped slate roof. The main part of the façade is a symmetrical composition of 2 storeys and 3 bays, with chamfered quoins. The windows are sashed with glazing bars in plain stone surrounds. The central door has 6 raised and fielded panels and a plain stone surround with semi-circular head and a fanlight with radiating glazing bars. Set back to the right is a further bay, with similar window details and punched quoins.’*  With regards to proposal for development affecting Listed Buildings, Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that:  “*In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which is possesses.”*  In addition, Paragraph 199 of the National Planning Policy Framework states:  ‘*When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation.’*  Furthermore, Policy DME4 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy States:  ‘*Alterations or extension to listed building 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 eastern (side) boundary of The Coach and Horses public house runs parallel to the western (rear) boundary of the application property, with the two buildings being separated by Kirk Beck. To the eastern side and rear elevation of The Coach and Horses is an existing outdoor seating area, which provides views towards the residential properties of no.1 and no.2 Kirkbeck Mews. The proposed scheme seeks to introduce a relatively modern addition to the rear of the host property which faces towards the adjacent listed building. Despite this, the separation distance, and existing high stone boundary wall to the rear of the application property’s residential curtilage would provide an adequate degree of screening, resulting in the proposed development being largely obscured from sight when viewed from The Coach and Horses. With the above in mind, it is not considered that the proposed development would be of detriment to the significance of The Coaches and Horses public house and as such, the proposal is considered to be acceptable solely in relation to harm to the Listed Building. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Impact upon Character/appearance of Conservations Area:**  The application property is situated within the Bolton by Bowland Conservation Area. With reference to making decisions on applications for development in a Conservation Area, Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that:  “… *special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.”*  Moreover, Key Statement EN5 of the Ribble Valley Borough Core Strategy stipulates that all development proposals should respect and safeguard the character, appearance, and significance of all Conservation Areas.  Furthermore, Policy DME4 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy state that ‘*proposals within, or affecting views into and out of, or affecting the setting of a conservation area will be required to conserve and where appropriate enhance its character and appearance.’*  With specific regard to the application site and its immediate surroundings, the Bolton by Bowland Conservation Area Management Guidance (2005) identifies the ‘*continuing loss of original architectural details and use of inappropriate modern materials or details’* as being the primary threat to the designation and further states that ‘*Alterations or repairs to external elevations should respect historic fabric and match it in materials, texture, quality and colour’* in order to ensure that the merits of the area are preserved.  The application property itself is not considered a historic building, having been constructed in the 1990’s, however the dwellinghouse is largely characteristic of other rural properties situated within the immediate locality and wider conservation area by virtue of its use of traditional materials and unadorned features. The property it also publicly viewable from the main highway of Gisburn Road which runs through the village, with the northern gable elevation of the dwellinghouse facing towards the highway, allowing views of the rear elevation from the public realm.  It is noted that the property features an existing conservatory to its rear elevation, which is partially visible from the public highway and comprises glazing, timber effect uPVC and polycarbonate profiles roof panels. The existing addition to the original dwelling is therefore considered to be of detriment to the historic character of the conservation area and as such, its proposed demolition would arguably result in a positive impact upon the surrounding area.  Notwithstanding this, there does not appear to be any formal planning consent for this existing addition and therefore it is assumed that the structure was built under permitted development. Furthermore, the proposed scheme seeks to introduce a relatively modern addition to the rear of the property which would feature a flat roof design and K render, both of which would fail to respond positively to the traditional built form of the original property and the rural vernacular of the surrounding conservation area. The proposed extension would also incorporate a significant footprint and would therefore introduce a built form which would rear as an incongruous and anomalous addition to the host property by virtue of its design, scale, and massing.  Whilst it is acknowledged that the proposed extension would be set back from the northern side elevation and the distance from the highway and visual break of stone walls would result in the proposal being somewhat screened from view, the proposed addition of a bulky and unsympathetic form of development would detract from the traditional architectural features of the original property. The proposed extension would therefore cause harm to the positive visual amenity associated with the original dwelling and in turn fail to enhance or preserve the historic character of the surrounding area. In view of the above, the proposed development would be in conflict with Key Statement EN5 and Policy DME4 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Impact Upon Residential Amenity:**  The proposed extension would be sited well away from the adjacent dwelling of Beck House at no.2 Kirkbeck Mews and as such, the proposal would not appear dominant or overbearing in relation to this neighbouring property, nor would it encroach on separation distances. The development would also offer no further opportunities for overlooking and therefore would not result in a loss of privacy or impingement upon daylight provision. Given the above, the proposal would not result in any undue impact upon the residential amenity of any neighbouring properties. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Visual Amenity/External Appearance:**  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.’*  Furthermore, Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy states:  ‘*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 material...particular emphasis will be placed on visual appearance and the relationship to surroundings, including impact on landscape character, as well as the effects of development on existing amenities.’*  The application site is also located with the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. With regard to development within the AONB, Key Statement EN2 states:  ‘*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.’*  The original built form of the application property comprises a stone and slate based dwellinghouse with a gabled roof, modestly sized window openings and simple linear elevations. As such, the original property is largely characteristic of other rural properties situated within the immediate locality and wider AONB landscape by virtue of its use of traditional materials and unadorned features.  As mentioned above, it is acknowledged that the property currently benefits from an existing conservatory to its rear elevation which is considered to be of detriment to the aesthetic character of the surrounding landscape. However, the proposed extension would comprise a sizeable footprint, projecting 7.7m from the rear elevation of the original property at its maximum and extending over half the width of the property’s rear elevation. Desktop analysis shows the original dwelling to measure approximately 7.4m in depth and whilst the extension would be staggered in appearance, the proposal – inclusive of the existing detached garage to which it would adjoin – would measure in excess of 9m in depth. The proposed development would therefore more than double the original depth of the property.  Furthermore, whilst the use of natural stone to the proposed garden room and painted timber windows throughout would match the original dwelling, the incorporation of K render would introduce a new material to the property which would appear uncharacteristic and out of keeping when viewed in relation in the host property and the immediate locality. The proposed development would also feature a flat roof design which would appear significantly at odds with the pitched roof form of both the main dwellinghouse and the detached garage to which the extension would form a link to. It is also noted that there is little precedence for this type of roof form in the immediate area and therefore the proposed addition would appear an incongruous and anomalous addition to both the host property and the surrounding AONB landscape.  Accordingly, the proposed development would appear a bulky, incongruous, and largely unsympathetic addition to the host property by virtue of size, scale, and massing. Furthermore, the proposed extension would fail to reflect the rural vernacular of both the host property and the dwellings within the immediate and wider locality by virtue of its flat roof design and incorporation of render and would result in a lack of separation between the original detached garage and the dwellinghouse itself, all of which would result in a form of development that would be largely suburban in appearance. The proposed addition would therefore be of detriment to the traditional built form of the property, causing harm to its character, setting and visual amenities, and failing to respond positively to or enhance its immediate context.  Taking account of the above, the proposed development would be unduly harmful to the visual amenities of the application property and aesthetic of the wider AONB landscape and is therefore contrary to the aims and objectives of Policy DMG1 and Key Statement EN2 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and Paragraph 130 of the NPPF. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Highways and Parking:**  Lancashire County Council Highways were consulted in relation to the application and raised no objections. The proposal is therefore considered to be acceptable in regard to highway safety and parking. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Landscape/Ecology:**  An Arboricultural Constraints Appraisal was submitted as part of the application, dated May 2023. The survey identified 4no. Common Oak trees within the curtilage of the application property, situated to the north of the dwellinghouse. The Root Protection Area of these trees are reduced slightly on the southern side due to the presence of the existing dwelling and associated foundations, which are projected to have restricted significant root growth and development in this direction. Whilst no trees are proposed for removal and this moderately spaced group of Category B trees would not be located within close proximity to the footprint of the proposed development, it is stated that a Construction Exclusion Zone would need to be enclosed by Temporary Protective Fencing and/or where necessary Temporary Ground Protection measures. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Observations/Consideration of Matters Raised/Conclusion:**  The proposed extension would be an unsympathetic and incongruous addition to the host property that would be harmful to the visual amenities of the immediate area and aesthetic of the wider AONB landscape.  In addition, the design and external appearance of the proposed development would be visually at odds with the rural vernacular and traditional built form of the original property and surrounding area, therefore detracting from the historic character of the designated Bolton by Bowland Conservation Area.  As such, for the above reasons and having regard to all material considerations and matters raised, the application is recommended for refusal. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **RECOMMENDATION**: | | | | That planning consent be refused for the following reason: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **01:** | The proposal, by virtue of its design, materials, size and scale, would result in a bulky, incongruous and unsympathetic addition that would fail to reflect the rural vernacular and traditional built form of the application property and surrounding area. The proposed development would therefore fail to respond positively to or enhance the immediate context and would be of detriment to the historic character of the Bolton by Bowland Conservation Area and the aesthetic of the wider AONB landscape. As such, the proposal would be contrary to Key Statements EN2 and EN5 and Policies DMG1 and DME4 of the adopted Ribble Valley Core Strategy 2008 -2028, Paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework and Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |