|  |
| --- |
| **Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.** |
| **Signed:** | **Officer:** | BT | **Date:** | 6/8/24 | **Manager:** | **LH** | **Date:** | **7/8/24** |
|  |
| **Application Ref:** | 3/2024/0321 |  |
| **Date Inspected:** | 15/7/24 (AM) & 5/8/24 (EVE) |
| **Officer:** | BT |
| **DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:**  | **Decision** | **REFUSAL** |
|  |
| **Development Description:** | Advertisement consent for regularisation of five unauthorised, illuminated steel directional signs with vinyl banners and wooden posts 1m high 1.4m wide x 2.1m long. |
| **Site Address/Location:** | 1) (Grid ref 371114 442087) at Bashall Barn adjacent the car park on Twitter Lane 2) (Grid ref 371119 441845) in the grass verge on the junction of Back Lane and Twitter Lane 3) (Grid ref 370916 441908) in a field at the junction of Twitter Lane and Birdy Brow 4) (Grid ref 370200 441413) in a field at the junction of Clitheroe Lane, Birdy Brow and Chipping Road 5) (Grid ref 370931 440283) on a grass verge at the junction of Clitheroe Lane and New Lane. |
|  |
| **CONSULTATIONS:**  | **Parish/Town Council** |
| Bashall Eaves & Mitton Parish Council: | Consulted 18/6/24 – no response received. |
|  |
| **CONSULTATIONS:**  | **Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies** |
| LCC Highways: | Object to the proposal on the basis of the location of signs 2 – 5. |
|  |
| **CONSULTATIONS:**  | **Additional Representations.** |
| None. |
|  |
| **RELEVANT POLICIES AND SITE PLANNING HISTORY:** |
| **Ribble Valley Core Strategy:**Key Statement DS1: Development StrategyKey statement DS2: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable DevelopmentPolicy DMG1: General ConsiderationsPolicy DMG2: Strategic DevelopmentPolicy DMG3: Transport and Mobility**National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)**Key Statement EN2: LandscapeKey Statement DMI2: Transport ConsiderationsPolicy DMG1: General ConsiderationsPolicy DMG3: Transport & MobilityNational Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)Outdoor advertisements and signs: a guide for advertisers (2007). |
| **Relevant Planning History:****3/2020/0567:**Change of use from A1 Shop and A3 Restaurant/cafe to C1 Hotels to create new overnight accommodation including staff accommodation (Approved)**3/2018/0504:**Proposed conversion of former brewery building to wedding accommodation (2 x bedrooms) including new permanent timber canopy over existing timber decking with new associated access path and timber seating. (Approved)**3/2018/0068:**Proposed conversion of former brewery building to five-bedroom Bed and Breakfast accommodation including replacement and extension of roof including five multi-fuel stove flues. New permanent timber canopy over existing timber decking with new associated access path and timber seating (Withdrawn)**3/2016/0874:**Proposed extension to Bashall Barn farm shop and restaurant to provide a function room and associated external works, including extension of existing car park (Approved) |
|  |
| **ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:** |
| **Site Description and Surrounding Area**The proposal relates to signage situated within the vicinity of a wedding venue in Bashall Eaves. The signage in question is currently in situ in multiple roadside locations on country roads within the nearby vicinity of Bashall Barn. These locations are as follows:* x 1 sign at the junction of Twitter Lane and Bashall Lane at the entrance to Bashall Barn car park
* x 1 sign at the junction of Back Lane and Clitheroe Road
* x 1 sign at the junction of Clitheroe Road and Birdy Brow
* x 1 sign at the junction of Mitton Road and Birdy Brow
* x 1 sign at the junction of New Lane, Clitheroe Road and Clitheroe Lane

The signage subject to this application is sited within an open countryside area comprising a mixture of country roads, agricultural land and woodland. The sign at the junction of Mitton Road and Birdy Brow is sited within the National Landscape (formerly AONB), with the other signs being located immediately adjacent to this designation. |
| **Proposed Development for which consent is sought:**Retrospective Advertisement Consent is sought for the retention of five illuminated directional signs. It is stated that the signage has been erected for the purposes of directing wedding guests from outside of the local area to the wedding venue at Bashall Barn. |
| **Principle of development:**The principle of the commercial advertising is not unacceptable subject to it being appropriate in terms of the material considerations, namely public amenity and highway safety.  |
| **Public Amenity:**National guidance recommends that planning authorities should always consider the local characteristics of the neighbourhood when assessing applications to display adverts and signs. In essence, this involves an evaluation of whether the advertisement or sign is proportionate to and in keeping with an area’s surrounding features. In addition, Paragraph 135 (c) 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’.*In a similar vein, Policy DMG1 of the 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 and style…particular emphasis will be placed on visual appearance and the relationship to surroundings, including impact on landscape character.’*With respect to development within the setting of National Landscapes, Paragraph 182 of the NPPF states:*‘Great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty…development within their setting should be sensitively located and designed to avoid or minimise adverse impacts on the designated areas.’*Key Statement EN2 of the Core Strategy provides similar guidance: *‘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.’*The signs in question are sited within an area of open countryside and also within or immediately adjacent to the National Landscape designation, to the South of Bashall Barn which is predominantly characterised by narrow country roads, hedgerows, woodland and open fields. Signage within this area is largely limited to small scale directional road signage of modest proportions. Small scale brown tourist signage for Bashall Barn is also prevalent within the locality.In contrast, the signage proposed for retention comprises five rectangular steel advertisement boards of significantly larger proportions, with each of the sizeable boards displaying conspicuous etched lettering and a logo associated with the wedding venue. Each of the advertisement boards are mounted within timber frames which stand at heights of 2 – 3 metres above the roadside level, with the lower sections of the timber frames also incorporating multicoloured banner advertisements (save for the sign located at Bashall Barn car park). The existing signs are read in concert against a backdrop of open fields and the wider Forest Of Bowland National Landscape which encompasses the North-eastern and South-eastern extents of the signage (save for the sign located at the car park serving Bashall Barn). As such, the unauthorised signs, by virtue of their width, height, detailing and roadside location, read as conspicuous, over dominant, anomalous and largely unsympathetic additions to the surrounding open countryside which detract from the unspoilt character of the area. It is understood that each of the unauthorised signs comprise static illumination however none of the signs in question were observed as being illuminated during a recent evening site visit. As such, it was not possible to ascertain the full extent of the sign’s illumination intensity however given both the size and quantity of the advertisement boards, and their location within an area of open countryside void of any street lighting, it is considered that retention of the signage would likely introduce an unacceptable level of light pollution to the area.Taking account of all of the above, it is considered that retention of the unauthorised signage would be harmful to the visual amenities of the area and setting of the wider National Landscape. Retention of the unauthorised development would therefore be in conflict the aims and objectives of Paragraph 135 (c) and 182 of the NPPF and Key Statement EN2 and Policy DMG1 of the Core Strategy.  |
| **Highway safety:**Paragraph 115 of the National Planning Policy Framework states:*‘Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety.’*Paragraph 117 (c) of the NPPF further states:*‘Development should create places that are safe, secure and attractive – which minimise the scope for conflicts between pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles, avoid unnecessary street clutter, and respond to local character and design standards.’*In a similar vein, both Policies DMG1 and DMG3 require developments to take account of highway safety implications with respect to access and public safety.In this instance, the unauthorised development has been subject to review from Lancashire County Council Highways who have recommended for the removal of all of the unauthorised signage (save for the sign located at the car park serving Bashall Barn) on the basis of four of the unauthorised signs being sited on the roadside verge (analysis actually shows that only signs 2 and 5 are located on the highway verge) which in turn would carry potential highway safety implications with respect to impacts upon visibility in the event of the signs being retained in their existing location. The LHA have suggested that the applicant could relocate the signage sited on the highway verge into fields adjoining the highway however this is not considered to be an acceptable alternative due to the issues conveyed above with respect to the visual impact of the signage. Nonetheless given the retrospective nature of the application the signs need to be assessed as per their current location.In light of the above highway safety implications, it is considered that retention of the unauthorised signage in their current location would be in conflict with Paragraphs 115 and 117 (c) of the NPPF and Policies DMG1 and DMG3 of the Core Strategy. |
| **Observations/Consideration of Matters Raised/Conclusion:**The unauthorised signs, by virtue of their width, height, detailing, lighting and roadside location, read as conspicuous, over dominant, anomalous and largely unsympathetic additions to the surrounding open countryside and adjoining National Landscape which detract from the unspoilt character of the area therefore their retention is considered to be unacceptable. Moreover, retention of the unauthorised signage carries potential highway safety implications with respect to impacts upon visibility and in turn, public safety.It is for the above reasons and having regard to all material considerations and matters raised that advertisement consent be refused.  |
| **RECOMMENDATION**: | That advertisement consent be refused for the following reasons: |
| **01:** | The unauthorised signs, by virtue of their width, height, detailing, lighting and roadside location, read as conspicuous, over dominant, anomalous and largely unsympathetic additions to the surrounding open countryside which detract from the unspoilt character of the area. Accordingly, retention of the unauthorised signage would be harmful to the visual amenities of the area and setting of the wider National Landscape. Retention of the unauthorised development would therefore be in conflict with the aims and objectives of Paragraph 135 (c) and 182 of the NPPF and Key Statement EN2 and Policy DMG1 of the Core Strategy. |
| **02:** | The location of the unauthorised signage on the highway verge carries highway safety implications with respect to impacts upon visibility and in turn, public safety. Retention of the unauthorised development would therefore be in conflict with the aims and objectives of Paragraphs 115 and 117 (c) of the NPPF and Policies DMG1 and DMG3 of the Core Strategy. |