|  |
| --- |
| **Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.** |
| **Signed:** | **Officer:** | **WH** | **Date:** | **06-12-23** | **Manager:** | **LH** | **Date:** | **6/12/23** |
|  |
| **Application Ref:** | 2023/0542 |  |
| **Date Inspected:** | 01-08-23 | **Site Notice:** | 01-08-23 |
| **Officer:** | Will Hopcroft |
| **DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:**  | **REFUSAL** |
|  |
| **Development Description:** | Proposed erection of agricultural workshop and machinery/implement storage building. |
| **Site Address/Location:** | Yew Tree Farm, Chipping Road, Chaigley BB7 3LX |
|  |
| **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 StrategyKey Statement DS2: Sustainable DevelopmentKey Statement EN2: LandscapeKey Statement EC1: Business and Employment DevelopmentPolicy DMG1: General ConsiderationsPolicy DMG2: Strategic ConsiderationsPolicy DME2: Landscape & Townscape ProtectionNational Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) |
| **Relevant Planning History:****2015/0681:**Erection of milking parlour and dairy building – Approved with Conditions**2012/0894:**Phase 2 of the two-phase application for a new covered manure store – Approved with Conditions**2012/0893:**Phase 1 of a two-phase new covered manure store – Approved with Conditions |
|  |
| **ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:** |
| **Site Description and Surrounding Area:**The site is comprised of an agricultural complex at Yew Tree Farm, inclusive of a number of mixed agricultural buildings in addition to an access track off Chipping Road. The applicant has an extensive holding incorporate the surrounding land in addition to significant areas of land within the surrounding area. The site lies in Chaigley, but is evidently rural in nature and fairly isolated, with a handful of farms present within the wider surrounds.  |
| **Proposed Development for which consent is sought:**The proposal seeks permission for the erection of a single-storey agricultural building, utilised as an agricultural workshop and machinery/implement store. The building incorporates a dual-pitched roof, is 42674mm in width and 10668mm in length. To the eaves the height is 4800mm and to the ridge, 7073mm. To the north-westerly elevation, 5no. uPVC windows are proposed with stone-coloured concrete blocks to 2438mm in height. The remainder of the elevation including the roof will be slate blue box profile cladding. To the south-easterly elevation, 3no. uPVC windows are proposed with the cedar wood board introduced to the elevation. The uPVC windows are bisected by a roller shutter door, and the elevation incorporates 2 open fronted bays. To the north-easterly elevation, the concrete blocks measure up to 645mm with the remainder of the elevation blank, incorporating slate blue box profile cladding. To the south-westerly elevation, the arrangement reverts back to a block height of 2438mm with the remainder slate blue box profile cladding.  |
| **Principle of Development:**The principle of development is required to be secured against KS EC1 and CS Policy DMG2. EC1 states that developments that contribute to the strengthening of the wider rural economies will be supported in principle, with DMG2 stating that development outside the defined settlement areas must meet one of a number of considerations; the relevant one in this case being *‘the development is needed for the purposes of forestry or agriculture’.*In this sense, the proposal seeks to strengthen the operation of an existing agricultural enterprise through providing a building to allow both open and enclosed/secure storage for machinery and implements as well as a workshop to aid in the efficient operation of the complex. Furthermore, following assessment of the information submitted it is evident that the applicant operates a significant agricultural enterprise. Given the above the proposal is considered compliant both with EC1 and DMG2, and as such the principle of development is secured subject to detailed assessment against further material planning considerations.  |
| **Impact Upon Residential Amenity:**The proposal relates to the provision of an additional agricultural building amidst a number of existing sizeable agricultural buildings, on an agricultural holding. The nearest dwelling is the associated farmhouse which is occupied by the applicant/farmer – the closest dwelling aside from this is some 400m to the south-east of the application site and as such it is not considered that the proposed development will have any impact on the amenity or quality of life of nearby residents. The proposal is therefore considered compliant with CS Policy DMG1 (Amenity). |
| **Visual Amenity and Impact on the AONB:***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 addition, CS Policy DMG2 states that development will be required to be in keeping with the character of the landscape and acknowledge the special qualities of the AONB by virtue of its size, design, use of material, landscaping and siting.In this sense the proposal is not compliant with the above in that the materials used, as well as the elevational features are not reflective of the agricultural nature of the complex and would out of keeping and incongruous with the surrounding vernacular by virtue of an overly industrial appearance borne largely out of the provision of large metal roller shutter doors and a large number of uPVC windows.Whilst it is noted the applicant has submitted amended plans introducing stone coloured concrete brick and cedar wood boards to parts of the elevation, these alone are not considered sufficient enough to ensure the building does not appear overly industrial, and as such out of keeping and incongruous with the design and visual amenity of the immediate surrounds. *Impact on the AONB*In this sense Policy DME2 and Key Statement EN2 are engaged. CS Policy DME2 outlines that development proposal will be refused which significantly harm a number of important landscape or landscape features. This ties into Key Statement EN2, which states the *landscape and character of the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty will be protected, conserved and enhanced. Any development will need to contribute to the conservation of the natural beauty of the area. The landscape and character of those areas that contribute to the setting and character of the Forest of Bowland Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty will be protected and conserved and wherever possible enhanced. As a principle 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.*In this sense, it is noted that the building, in terms of scale, is substantial. It is 42m long and 10m in width and would be one of the larger agricultural buildings within the complex. As such by definition it is going to have some additional impact on the landscape of the AONB by virtue of the significant provision of additional built form where there was previously none. The height of the building (4.8m to the eaves and 7m to the ridge) is largely comparable to the height of the existing agricultural buildings. However, given the incongruity of the elevational treatments as noted above the impact on the AONB is considered egregious by way of the provision of a building with a largely industrial appearance in a clearly agricultural setting. Given the above, it is considered that the proposal would have a significant impact upon the setting and character of the AONB and landscape and as such is not considered compliant with CS Policy DME2 and Key Statement EN2.  |
| **Highways and Parking:**The proposal does not incorporate any changes to the existing access nor to the level of parking, and it has not been considered necessary to consult with LCC Highways. As such the proposal is considered compliant with regard to any impacts on the local highways network.  |
| **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 reasons: |
| **01:** | The proposal, by virtue of the provision of overtly industrial elevational features into an agricultural setting, would comprise an unacceptable intrusion into the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty that detracts from the visual and landscape character of the area. As such it would fail to comply with Ribble Valley Core Strategy Policies EN2, DME2, and DMG1, together with the National Planning Policy Framework (Paragraph 130). |