|  |
| --- |
| **Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.** |
| **Signed:** | **Officer:** | **WH** | **Date:** | **03-10-23** | **Manager:** | **LH** | **Date:** | **12/10/23** |
|  |
| **Application Ref:** | 2023/0605 |  |
| **Date Inspected:** | 24/03/23 | **Site Notice:** | 04/08/23 |
| **Officer:** | Will Hopcroft |
| **DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:**  | **APPROVAL** |
|  |
| **Development Description:** | Replacement dwelling with detached garage including the demolition of an existing agricultural-style building. Resubmission of 3/2022/1061. |
| **Site Address/Location:** | Mill Race Cottage, White Carr Lane |
|  |
| **CONSULTATIONS:**  | **Parish/Town Council** |
| No objections.  |
|  |
| **CONSULTATIONS:**  | **Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies** |
| **LCC Highways:** | No objections subject to the imposition of conditions relating to a construction traffic management plan, and the implementation of parking and turning facilities.  |
| **United Utilities** | No objection but a reminder to the applicant of their obligations towards UU assets.  |
|  |
| **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 EN4: Biodiversity and GeodiversityPolicy DMG1: General ConsiderationsPolicy DMG2: Strategic ConsiderationsPolicy DMG3: Transport & MobilityPolicy DME2: Landscape & Townscape ProtectionPolicy DME3: Site and Species Protection and ConservationPolicy DMH3: Dwellings in the Open Countryside and AONBNational Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) |
| **Relevant Planning History:****2022/1061:**Replacement dwelling including the demolition of an existing agricultural building – Refused**1995/0148:**Removal of occupancy condition no.2 of 3/85/0201 – Approved Unconditionally |
|  |
| **ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:** |
| **Site Description and Surrounding Area:**The site is comprised of Mill Race Cottage, an existing detached dwelling accessed off Mill House Lane over a small bridge and incorporating a sizeable curtilage, within which a large defunct agricultural building is included. To the north and south, neighbouring dwellings are sited although the site does sit outside of existing settlement boundaries. In terms of the wider context, the site sits centrally in-between Longridge and Ribchester ensuring it has a good level of access to a range of facilities and services. |
| **Proposed Development for which consent is sought:**Following demolition of the existing house and agricultural building, the application seeks consent for a new detached 2-storey dwelling, incorporating a GIA of 390sqm as well as a detached garage of approximately 40sqm within the established curtilage. To the front (north-west) elevation, the roof form is pitched save for a projecting pike incorporating 3no. window openings, random coursed stone and columns to the ground creating an external porch/canopy. The remainder of the elevation incorporates the main entrance centrally, followed by 8no. window openings to ground and 1st floor formed symmetrically and utilising smooth stone heads and cills, random coursed stone to the elevation, as well as quoins to the corners. The roof materials are to be natural slate and 2no. chimney breasts abut either side of the pitched roof. To the side (north-east) elevation, a small number of new window openings are formed as well as a small canopy over a proposed side door entrance and a modest roof-light. However, the features to this elevation are limited. To the side (south-west) elevation, there is a greater number of additional window openings as well as a single-storey canopy, adjoining to a proposed sunroom. Both of these single-storey elements incorporate a pitched roof and offer a larger amount of glazing to allow for greater ingress of natural light. This elevation also incorporates a rooflight adjoining the one on the corresponding roof-plane. To the rear (south-east) elevation, a 2-storey reverse gable is proposed incorporating a bay window to the ground floor, and a larger number of additional features, window openings and glazing including an additional chimney breast.The application also incorporates some external alterations, providing for a good amount of external permeable paving to be utilised within the garden area as well utilisation of the existing site access to provide informal parking arrangements for 6no. vehicles, with the proposed detached garage incorporating a simple pitched roof and garage door, with side access and a new window opening. The garage measures 4579mm in height to the ridge and 2745mm to the eaves, sitting 7100mm in width and 7200mm in length resulting a GIA of approximately 40sqm.  |
| **Principle of Development:**The principle of development is required to be secured against CS Policies DMG2 and DMH3, as the site sits within the Open Countryside. DMG2 states that development outside the defined settlement areas must meet a number of considerations – in this sense, a replacement dwelling is considered acceptable as the net gain of dwellings is effectively zero. In addition, CS Policy DMH3 states that, within areas defined as Open Countryside, residential development will be limited to a number of criteria, the most relevant being as follows:* *The rebuilding or replacement of existing dwellings subject to the following criteria:*
	+ *The residential use of the property should not have been abandoned.*
	+ *There being no adverse impact on the landscape in relation to the new dwelling.*
	+ *The need to extend an existing curtilage.*

In this sense, it is considered that:* The residential use of the property is not abandoned. The applicant and their family is currently occupying the existing dwelling.
* There may be some adverse impact on the landscape in relation to the new dwelling, by virtue of its additional size and massing.
* The existing curtilage is not being extended.

As such in order to ensure the principle of development is secured, it is necessary to establish the level of impact on the landscape in relation to the new dwelling, and whether this is considered *adverse*. Following further Officer review outlined under the *Impact on the landscape and Open Countryside* section, the impact on the landscape is considered to be acceptable and as such the principle of development is secure.  |
| **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 on the amenity of adjacent residents, with the closest adjacent dwelling being White Carr Farm, which sits immediately to the north. The proposal incorporates a significant gap to the common boundary of 7626mm (there is then an additional 9m. approx to the southern elevation of White Carr Farm). This results in a rough 16m gap between the northern elevation of the proposed dwelling and White Carr Farm with the northern elevation of the proposed dwelling not considered a primary elevation. Whilst there is some additional fenestration in the northern elevation, this is only likely to overlook the driveway of White Carr Farm and would not provide intrusive views into any private amenity space. The distance between the two elevations (and bearing in the mind the existing arrangement which, whilst slightly better than proposed with regards to its separation distances, would still have a minor impact on residential amenity) is not considered to result in an unacceptable impact on amenity and quality of life by way of being dominant or overbearing. Any additional overshadowing will be minor in nature and impact only the front driveway of White Carr Farm, and only in the later hours of the winter months. As such this is not considered to be unacceptable. Given the above the proposal is considered acceptable with regards to DMG1 (Amenity).  |
| **Visual Amenity and Impact on the landscape and Open Countryside*****Visual Amenity and Design***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 area by virtue of its size, design, use of material, landscaping and siting.*In this sense the proposal is considered acceptable with regard to visual amenity and design. It is noted that this applications forms a resubmission, with design issues of the original proposal cited as below:* Wide variation in roof forms, and heavy use of fenestration in the roof-planes, resulting in a somewhat cluttered and illegible roofscape compared to the simpler form utilised by the existing dwelling.

By way of resubmission these concerns around the proposed roof-form and fenestration have been sufficiently addressed. The newly proposed form is more simple in nature and is eminently readable, with the fenestration arrangement on all elevations and within the roof-scape reflective of positive design principles, incorporating a good level of symmetry and solid to void ratio. The materials are considered appropriate and broadly reflective of the style and vernacular of the immediate locality, with each elevation incorporating varied but appropriate architectural treatments. As such the proposal is considered compliant with DMG1 (Design) and DMG2. ***Impact on Landscape and Open Countryside***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. It is also necessary to reflect back on the Principle of Development, which (under DMH3) was required to ensure that there would be *no adverse impact on the landscape in relation to the new dwelling.*With regard to the previously refused application, issues surrounding impact on the landscape were identified as below:* Dwelling would be vastly larger than the existing dwelling and nearby built form, incorporating varied and complex roof forms removing the modest aspect of the existing dwelling and introducing an ‘executive dwelling asepct’.
* There are substantial additions in all aspects of the built form and as such the cumulative impact of these additions adversely impacts on the landscape by way of the significant increase in size and massing, and subsequent increase in roofscape, associated fenestration and change in character away from a modest, simple dwelling utilised in association with the existing agricultural building and further towards the ‘executive dwelling’ aspect.

This resubmission covers a significantly smaller footprint than the previously refused submission and incorporates much simpler fenestration arrangements as well as a more legible roof-scape. The simpler nature of the roof-scape is reflective of the existing and adjacent dwellings and whilst the proposed dwelling is evidently larger than the existing, its footprint is not excessive to the point of the development appearing as an ‘executive dwelling’. This proposal is more reflective of the detached dwellings in the immediate locality, with comparable eaves and ridge heights (approx. 80m ASL to the ridge) ensuring that the impact on the landscape and the open countryside will be negligible. As such the proposal is compliant with EN2, DME2 and DMH3.  |
| **Highways and Parking:**Following consultation with Highways, no objection was raised subject to the imposition of conditions relating to the submission of a Construction Traffic Management Plan and implementation of parking and turning facilities. This has been submitted prior to determination and, following consultation with LCC Highways, has been considered acceptable. No further assessment is required. |
| **Landscape/Ecology:**A Bat Survey was submitted as part of the application, concluding that the proposed development does not require an EPS License to proceed lawfully *however* RAMS and reasonable mitigation should be conditioned. This has again been submitted prior to determination – along with an updated emergence survey dated 01.08.2023 – and as such a compliance condition is sought to ensure that appropriate measures are taken to mitigate against any risk towards European Protected Species. In addition, a condition is sought to ensure all trees to be retained are done so in accordance with relevant British Standards, particularly given the presence of mature trees on site. No further assessment is required. |
| **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. |