|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Signed:** | | **Officer:** | **LW** | | | | **Date:** | | **13/03/24** | | **Manager:** | | **LH** | **Date:** | **14/3/24** |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Application Ref:** | | | | | 3/2023/0738 | | | | | | |  | | | |
| **Date Inspected:** | | | | | 26/01/24 | | | **Site Notice:** | | 26/01/24 | |
| **Officer:** | | | | | LW | | | | | | |
| **DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:** | | | | | | | | | | | | **REFUSAL** | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Development Description:** | | | | | | Demolition of existing garage and workshop store and replace with two-storey extension of living accommodation and domestic garage. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Site Address/Location:** | | | | | | 1 Ferry Butts, Garstang Road, Chipping, PR3 2QJ | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | | | **Parish/Town Council** | | | | | | | | | |
| No comments received in respect of the proposed development. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | | | **Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies** | | | | | | | | | |
| **LCC Highways:** | | | | | | No objection subject to the imposition of conditions. | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | | | **Additional Representations.** | | | | | | | | | |
| Four letters of support and one letter of objection have been received in relation to the proposed development. The reasons for support can be summarised as below:   * The design and style of the proposal would be in keeping with the existing nearby buildings; * The visual appearance of the property would be improved.   The concerns outlined within the letter of objection can be summarised as below:   * Lack of parking provision for a 5 bedroom property; * Overflow of additional cars parking, turning, entering, and existing the property on a tight bend. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **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 DMI2: Transport Considerations  Policy DMG1: General Considerations  Policy DMG2: Strategic Considerations  Policy DMG3: Transport & Mobility  Policy DME3: Site and Species Protection and Conservation  Policy DMH5: Residential and Curtilage Extensions  National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Relevant Planning History:**  6/10/1171: Joinery store and reconfiguration of two cottages into one (Approved). | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Site Description and Surrounding Area:**  The application relates to a two-storey end-terrace property at no.1 Ferry Butts, comprising of natural random stone to the external elevations, blue slate roof tiles and timber windows. The property benefits from a sizeable side extension which received planning consent under application 6/10/1171 and currently serves as an existing garage/workshop, consisting of rendered block and a metal profile roof. Having reviewed this planning consent, it does not appear that the extension has been built in complete accordance with the approved plans; however, given consent was granted in 1953, no enforcement action can be taken in this respect.  The site to which the application relates is located within the Open Countryside, approximately 650m west of the defined settlement area of Chipping, as well as the National Landscape (formerly known as the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty). | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Proposed Development for which consent is sought:**  Consent is sought for the demolition of the existing garage and workshop and replacement with a two-storey extension of living accommodation and domestic garage.  The proposed extension would extend a maximum of 12.4m beyond the western facing side elevation of the main dwellinghouse and have a depth of 7.4m. A pitched roof form would be incorporated which would have an eaves and ridge height of 3.3m and 5.4m respectively and include the installation of 6no. roof lights. To the front elevation of the proposed development, a timber garage door and 4no. windows would be featured at ground floor level, whilst to the rear elevation a set of glazed double doors and 2no. windows would be included. The western gable elevation of the extension would also incorporate 1no. personnel door and window at ground floor and 1no. window at first floor level. A single personnel door would also be included to the eastern elevation of the proposal.  In regard to materiality, the proposed extension would be finished in random stone, blue state roof tiles and timber windows to match that of the principal dwellinghouse. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Principle of Development:**  The proposal relates to a replacement extension to an existing residential property and is therefore acceptable in principle subject to an assessment of the material planning considerations.  The site is also located within the National Landscape and therefore consideration will also be given towards the impact of the proposed development upon the visual amenity of the surrounding landscape. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Impact Upon Residential Amenity:**  The proposed openings featured to the front, rear and side elevations of the proposed development would not have a direct interface with any nearby residential properties and as such, no new opportunities for direct overlooking or loss of privacy are anticipated as a result of the works proposed.  The proposed extension would also be sited on the same footprint as the existing garage/workshop and would not be highly visible to the occupiers of no.3 Ferry Butts, being screened from view by the application property itself. In this respect, the proposed development would not result in any measurable undue harm upon the existing amenities of any nearby residents. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Visual Amenity/External Appearance:**  The application site lies within the National Landscape. With regards to development in the NL, Key Statement EN2 of the Ribble Valley Borough Council Core Strategy states that ‘*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 site occupies a prominent position sited adjacent the main highway of Garstang Road, resulting in the development being immediately visible from the public realm. The proposal would be of a considerable size and scale for a domestic side extension, with the footprint of the extension (91 square metres) exceeding that of the principal dwellinghouse (70 square metres) to which it would adjoin.  Whilst it is acknowledged that the property already benefits from an existing side extension, of the same footprint and height of that proposed, this was approved under historic planning application 6/10/1171 as a single storey joinery store/workshop, with the external appearance of the extension reading as such. In this context, the existing structure clearly reads as an incidental, non-domestic addition to the site, by virtue of its external facing materials and overall architectural design.  In contrast, the proposed extension would have a domestic appearance with the external facing materials and fenestration design matching that of the primary dwellinghouse and neighbouring residential properties. In this context, the size and scale of the proposed development would appear more akin to a separate residential unit at the end of the existing row of terraced properties, and not a subservient extension, incidental to the residential use of no.1 Ferry Butts.  In addition to this, there are also concerns in respect of the internal layout of the proposed development. At ground floor, the proposal would include a secondary living room, whilst 2no. additional bedrooms would be provided at first floor which would be accessed solely by a secondary staircase, with there being no physical link between the proposed extension and main dwellinghouse at first floor level. Together with its large scale, this is not considered to be designed as incidental living accommodation to the main dwelling.  In view of the above, it is considered the proposed two-storey extension would result in the introduction of an over dominant, incongruous, and unsympathetic form of development that would not appear subordinate to the principal dwellinghouse or read as a structure incidental to the residential use of the application property. The proposal is therefore in conflict with Policy EN2, DMG1, DMG2, and DMH5 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and Paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Highways and Parking:**  Lancashire County Council Highways have been consulted in relation to the proposed development and raised no objection subject to the imposition of conditions.  As a result of the proposed development, the number of bedrooms at the site would increase from three to five. For the site to comply with the Local Highway Authority’s parking guidance, three car parking spaces need to be provided on site. As part of the parking arrangements, one parking space is proposed to be provided within a garage; however, the internal dimensions of the garage would not comply with the LHAs guidance for a garage when providing a car parking space, with a minimum length of 6m being required.  Notwithstanding the above, the site can provide a minimum of three car parking spaces and a turning area to enable vehicles to exit the site in a forward gear on the existing hardstanding area adjacent to the proposed extension. As such, with the site complying with the parking guidance, the LHA have no objection to the proposal, and it is considered to satisfy Policy DMG1 (Highways and Parking). | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Landscape/Ecology:**  A Bat Survey has been submitted with the application, dated 15th January 2024. The report concludes that the building, when assessed in combination with location and surrounding habitat was observed to have a negligible to low level of bat roost potential. No evidence to suggest use by bats was recorded within the building at a time of year when such physical evidence would be expected. Endoscope inspection of gaps also revealed no evidence to suggest use by bats. As such, the report concludes that the survey effort is considered appropriate to characterise the roost potential of the building and that the presence of a significant conservation value bat roost is unlikely.  However, given some wide gaps are present behind fascia boarding and metal panelling on the gable end of the existing building, reasonable avoidance measures are considered an appropriate approach to development. A Method Statement has been included within the report in order to minimise or remove any potential disturbance to bats. By following the Reasonable Avoidance Measures and Mitigation included within the report, it is concluded that the proposed work could take place whilst ensuring continued ecological functionality of the site. As such, if the application were to be approved, this would be secured by way of an appropriately worded planning condition. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Observations/Consideration of Matters Raised/Conclusion:**  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(s). | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **01:** | The proposed two-storey extension would result in the introduction of an over dominant, incongruous, and unsympathetic form of development that would not appear subordinate to the principal dwellinghouse or read as a structure incidental to the residential use of the application property. The proposal is therefore in conflict with Policy EN2, DMG1, DMG2, and DMH5 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and Paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |