|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Signed:** | **Officer:** | **WH** | | | | **Date:** | | **08-12-23** | | **Manager:** | | **LH** | **Date:** | **15/12/23** |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Application Ref:** | | | | 2023/0285 | | | | | | |  | | | |
| **Date Inspected:** | | | | 07-06-23 | | | **Site Notice:** | | 07-06-23 | |
| **Officer:** | | | | Will Hopcroft | | | | | | |
| **DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:** | | | | | | | | | | | **APPROVAL** | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Development Description:** | | | | | Proposed conversion of existing barn to a dwelling house. Together with rear extensions following demolition of flat roof. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Site Address/Location:** | | | | | Barn to the south of Grove House Malt Kiln Brow Chipping PR3 2GP | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | | **Parish/Town Council** | | | | | | | | | |
| No response. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | | **Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies** | | | | | | | | | |
| **LCC Highways:** | | | | | Concerns around the provision of the access from the north-side of the Malt Kiln Brow. However, on review it is possible for construction vehicles to access utilising southern access which is considered acceptable. | | | | | | | | | |
| **United Utilities:** | | | | | No response. | | | | | | | | | |
| **LCC Archaeology:** | | | | | No objection subject to the imposition of conditions relating to the submission of a programme of building recording and analysis. | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **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  Key Statement EN4: Biodiversity and Geodiversity  Key Statement EN5: Heritage Assets  Policy DMG1: General Considerations  Policy DMG3: Transport & Mobility  Policy DME2: Landscape & Townscape Protection  Policy DME3: Site and Species Protection and Conservation  Policy DME4: Protecting Heritage Assets  Policy DME6: Water Management  Policy DMH3: Dwellings in the Open Countryside and AONB  Policy DMH4: The Conversion of barns and other Buildings to Dwellings  Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act  National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Relevant Planning History:**  The red-line is included within the Kirk Mills Development, which is subject to a number of applications outlined below:  **2014/0183:**  Hybrid planning application seeking both full and outline planning permission as follows: Full planning permission for works and a change of use to the Grade II listed Kirk Mill to create a hotel (18 bed, use class C1) and bar restaurant (Use class A3), works to the barn building to create seven holiday cottages (use class C1), construction of a notel and spa (20 bed use class C1), wedding venue (use class D1), kids club (Use class D1) and trailhead centre (Use class D1 and A3), change of use of Malt Kiln House from residential to use class C1, construction of a new cricket pavilion (Sui Generis), demolition of the group of derelict factory buildings. Outline planning permission for 60 residential dwellings, split over two sites, with a maximum of 56 and 4 units on each with all matters reserved except for means of access – Refused, Appeal Allowed  **2014/0226:**  Works and a change of use to the Grade 11 Listed Kirk Mill to create a hotel (18 Bed) and bar/restaurant. Works comprising partial demolition and extension of Kirk Mill including demolition of the later addition to the east of the Mill and erection of a new extension built on the same footprint in traditional stone to match the existing mill; and removal of further modern alterations to the facade to restore the historic character of the building – Refused, Appeal Allowed  **2015/0766:**  Hybrid planning application seeking both full and outline planning permission as follows: Full planning permission for works and a change of use to the grade II listed Kirk Mill to create a hotel (18 bed) (Use Class C1) and bar restaurant (Use Class A3); works to the barn building to create 7 holiday cottages (Use Class C1); construction of an hotel and spa (20 bed) (Use Class C1), wedding venue (Use Class D1) and kids club (Use Class D1); change of use of Malt Kiln House from residential use to Use Class C1; construction of a new cricket pavilion and cricket pitch (Sui Generis); demolition of the group of derelict factory buildings. Outline Planning Permission for up to 46 residential dwellings (Use Class C3) – Withdrawn  **2015/0767:**  Hybrid planning application seeking both full and outline planning permission as follows: Full planning permission for works and a change of use to the grade II listed Kirk Mill to create a hotel (18 bed) (Use Class C1) and bar restaurant (Use Class A3); works to the barn building to create 7 holiday cottages (Use Class C1); construction of an hotel and spa (20 bed) (Use Class C1), wedding venue (Use Class D1) and kids club (Use Class D1); change of use of Malt Kiln House from residential use to Use Class C1; construction of a new cricket pavilion and cricket pitch (Sui Generis); demolition of the group of derelict factory buildings. Outline Planning Permission for up to 46 residential dwellings (Use Class C3) – Withdrawn | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Site Description and Surrounding Area:**  The site is comprised of The Old Barn and associated curtilage – the building being at least 120+ years old and incorporating a pitched roof with traditional sliding doors and 2no. pedestrian doors to the front elevation. The gable-ends are fairly simple in nature and incorporate 1no. ground floor square window, with modern flat-roof extensions erected to the rear. The barn is currently in a relative state of disrepair.  It is noted that there a number of listed properties in the immediate vicinity – most notably, Grove House (GII Listed) sits approximately 30m north of the site. Kirk House and Kirk Mill (both GII) also sit within 100m of the site, sited north-west of the red-line.  The site lies outside the settlement boundary of Chipping but is generally read within the context of the surrounding residential buildings. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Proposed Development for which consent is sought:**  The proposal seeks conversion of the existing barn to a dwelling-house following demolition of rear flat-roof extension, as well as associated external works to the front to create a new curtilage and access.  To the front (east) elevation, the changes are limited – the existing sliding door cart entry is to be converted into a glazed feature, with the 2no. existing door openings undertaking window conversions inclusive of a timber stable-door feature. In addition, 8no. arrow-slit windows are proposed to the 1st floor – 4 either side of the cart entry, serving upstairs bedrooms.  To the north (gable-end) elevation, 1no. new window opening is proposed serving the upstairs bedroom. This is the same arrangement on the opposite south (gable-end) elevation.  The bulk of the changes affect the rear elevation, where the existing modern flat-roof extension is to be removed and replaced by 2no. rear single-storey projecting features, forming a garden room and kitchen, and creating a central ‘walled-garden’. The single-storey features also form good sized balconies for the rear facing upstairs bedrooms, abutted by stone wall and glass balustrade. The rear roof-plane also incorporates 3no. roof-lights, as well as 2 rear doors to the 1st floor to allow balcony access to the bedrooms, as well as a single central window overlooking a void into the central area of the barn.  The materials used are to match those on the existing barn building as closely as possible, with a modest amount of landscaping and an external bicycle store proposed in the front area of curtilage. This front area of curtilage would also provide off-street parking for 3no. vehicles, with access gained directly off Malt Kiln Brow. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Principle of Development:**  The principle of development is required to be secured against CS Policies DMH3 and DMH4 where they relate to the provision of a barn conversion within the AONB.  DMH3 states that *within areas defined as the AONB, residential development will be limited to the appropriate conversion of buildings to dwellings provided 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.*  DMH4 expands upon this further, stating that *planning permission will be granted for the conversion of buildings to dwellings where:*   * *The building is not isolated in the landscape, and is within a defined settlement or forms part of an already defined group of buildings, and* * *There need be no unnecessary expenditure by public authorities and utilities on the provision of infrastructure, and* * *There would be no materially damaging effect on the landscape qualities of the area or harm to nature conservations interests, and* * *There would be no detrimental effect on the rural economy, and* * *The proposals are consistent with the natural beauty of the area.* * *That any existing nature conservation aspects of the existing structure are properly surveyed and where judged to be significant preserved or, fi this is not possible, then any loss adequately mitigated.*   *The building to be converted must:*   * *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, the Council will require a structural survey to be submitted with all planning applications of this nature. This should include plans of any rebuilding that is proposed;* * *Be of sufficient size to provide necessary living accommodation without the need for further extensions which would harm the character or appearance of the buildings, and* * *The character of the building and its materials are appropriate to its surroundings and the building, and its materials are worthy of retention because of its intrinsic interest or potential or its contribution to its setting, and* * *The building has a genuine history of use for agriculture or another rural enterprise.*   --  In respect of the above, Officers consider that:   * The building is suitably located and well-related to other existing buildings – notably, the grouping of residential dwellings immediately to the north of the application site. * 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. * Impacts upon landscape and natural beauty will be assessed within the Visual Amenity/External Appearance section. * Officers do not consider that there would be any detrimental effect on the rural economy particularly given the derelict and unusable nature of the current barn building. * Impacts upon the conservation of the natural beaty of the area will be assessed within the Visual Amenity/External Appearance section. * There have been no identified nature conversation aspects that require significant preservation or adequate mitigation. A Bat Survey has been submitted with the application, to which it is concluded that the proposed changes to the barn and its extension can commence with minimal risk to roosting bats or nesting birds, if a number of mitigative measures are adhered to.   A structural report has been submitted with the application, to which it is concluded that the barn is in a good structural condition, with no walls requiring re-building and only minor maintenance work required. Following assessment, Officers are considered to be in agreement with this report. Given the above the principle of development is secured against DMH3 and DMH4. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Design and Visual Amenity and Impact upon the Historic Environment:**  It is noted the site lies within the Kirk Mill Conservation Area, as well as within close proximity to a number of Listed Buildings as outlined earlier in the report. As such it is necessary to consider the application against CS Policy DME4, DMG1 and the policies found within the NPPF.  DME4 states – with regard to Conservation Areas - that *proposals within or closely related to Conservation Areas should not harm the area. This should include considerations as to whether it respects and safeguards the architectural and historic character of the area as set out in the relevant Conservation Area Appraisal. Development in these areas will be strictly controlled to ensure that it respects the character of the area in terms of its location, scale, size, design and materials and existing buildings, structures, trees and open spaces. In the Conservation Areas there will be a presumption in favour of the preservation of elements that make a positive contribution to the character of appearance of the Conservation Area.*  With regard to sites within the settings of Listed Buildings, DME4 goes on to state that *development proposals on sites within the setting of Listed Buildings which cause visual harm to the setting of the building, will be resisted.*  DMG1 states that *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.*  Finally, NPPF Paragraph 202 states 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 including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.*  --  It is important to note the proposals are only likely to impact upon the setting of Grove House (GII Listed) which sits immediately north of the proposal site. The listing of Grove House includes the reasons for designation, outlined as follows:  Grove House of late-C18 date and extended in the mid- to late C19, is listed at Grade II for the following principal reasons:  *Architectural interest:*   * a largely intact late-C18 dwelling which falls within the 1700-1850 time-frame when there is a presumption in favour of listing; * the articulation of the principal elevation and the good use of materials, combine to produce an attractive composition; * it retains a largely intact plan-form and a suite of original late-C18 features including a staircase, doors and fitted cupboards, unified by the incorporation of a reeded decoration; * it illustrates the conventions of a higher status dwelling modified by a vernacular approach within a strong local context.   *Historic interest:*   * constructed by the owners of one of the earliest cotton spinning mills in England, which included the pioneering designer of textile machinery Peter Atherton.   *Group value:*   * it benefits from a spatial, historic and functional group value with the Grade II-listed Kirk Mill and Kirk House.   The relationship between the two dwellings is fairly direct – the north-western gable-end of the Old Barn is immediately visible from the curtilage of Grove House and as such is likely to have the most significant impact on the setting of the Listed Building. It is however noted that the existing rear extension is only partially visible from Grove House and is presently obscured by built form and landscaping.  The gable-end elevation, as noted above, is undertaking minimal alterations – most notably the addition of 1no. stone surround matching timber frame window. The alterations to the rear elevation (extension, walled garden etc) are not likely to be visible from Grove House and will not be read within the same context, ensuring that the impact is minimal. Furthermore, it is considered that the works undertaken to the rear elevation will significantly improve the visual amenity afforded to the property, given it seeks to remove the presently dilapidated and run-down, modern rear extension and replace it utilising traditional materials. As such, with regard to the test outlined in Paragraph 202 the development proposal is likely to lead to a negligible level of harm to the Listed Building and as such the benefits of the proposal (i.e. the provision of 1no. additional dwelling, securing the optimum viable use of a currently vacant barn building) are considered to outweigh this negligible harm, and is considered acceptable at least in the context of the adjacent Listed Building, ensuring compliance with Paragraph 202 and CS Policy DME4.  With regard to the Conservation Area, it is noted that no Conservation Area Appraisal exists at present. Officers consider that considerable historic value amenity is afforded to the grouping of Listed Buildings surrounding Kirk Mill. Where the application site sits, is formerly home to a large group of factory and industrial buildings that were demolished after 2015 in association with the Kirk Mills consent noted above. As such the wider site is almost entirely vacant, largely covered with hardstanding as well as numerous pieces of rubble and debris from the demolition. As such, at present contributes very little to the visual and historic amenity of the Conservation Area and the wider site (not including the grouping of Listed Buildings surrounding Kirk Mill, which sits further to the north) never historically contributed to the Conservation Area – following a review of historic maps it is likely they were built after 1965.  Given the above, it is considered that the works to the barn are considerate and reflective of its siting within the Conservation Area and, particularly following the removal of the modern-built rear extension, will more accurately reflect the historic nature of the grouping of buildings to the north and go a small way to improving the visual amenity of the site which at present suffers from the work undertaken in the last number of years. It is noted that the works to the primary facing elevations (front and sides) are minimal and seek to minimise new window openings whilst emphasising the traditional features of the barn building such as the cart entry, and the existing window and door openings to the front and side elevations. The bulk of the alterations made – including to the roof-scape – are made to the rear elevation only which is not read in the context of the Conservation Area and is not largely visible from any part of the public realm, due to its location to the back of the property, levels difference and lack of any public access route to the east of the dwelling. Given the above the proposal is considered compliant with NPPF Paragraph, CS Policies DME4 and DMG1 as well as the relevant parts of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **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 with regard to any impact upon residential amenity. The additional built form would be less dominant and overbearing than the existing arrangement given the existing rear extension sits slightly higher than what would be proposed. This would also not result in any unacceptable impact on amenity or quality of life by way of overshadowing. Whilst there is 1no. window that faces the adjacent dwelling at Grove House, it is noted that this would face the front (primary elevation) which is not private and is visible from the public highway regardless – as such Officers do not consider that the provision of this window would result in any unacceptable intrusion or perception of overlooking. Given the above the proposal is considered acceptable with regard to the impact upon residential amenity. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Highways and Parking:**  Following initial consultation, LCC Highways required further information regarding the provision of a cycle store and assurance that HGV’s would be able to use the appropriate access. This information has since been provided and no further issues have been identified. As such the proposal is considered acceptable with regards to Highways. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ecology:**  A Bat Survey has been submitted with the application, to which it is concluded that the proposed changes to the barn and its extension can commence with minimal risk to roosting bats or nesting birds, if a number of mitigative measures are adhered to. These measures have been conditioned as part of the consent. Subject to compliance with the relevant conditions, the proposal is considered acceptable with regards to its impact on ecology with further details of landscaping conditioned. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Water Management:**  It is noted that the proposal seeks to utilise the existing mains sewer for foul sewage and will discharge surface water into an existing water course. However, no details of surface water drainage have been provided. As such the proposal is considered acceptable in this regard subject to appropriate discharge of the relevant conditions. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **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. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |