|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Signed:** | **Officer:** | **MC** | | | | **Date:** | | **23/01/2025** | | **Manager:** | | **LH** | **Date:** | **28/1/25** |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Application Ref:** | | | | 3/2024/0903 | | | | | | |  | | | |
| **Date Inspected:** | | | | 12/12/2024 | | | **Site Notice:** | | 12/12/2024 | |
| **Officer:** | | | | MC | | | | | | |
| **DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:** | | | | | | | | | | | **APPROVAL** | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Development Description:** | | | | | Proposed removal of boundary wall and toilet block. Construction of single-storey extension to rear. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Site Address/Location:** | | | | | 2 Cockleach Cottages Chipping Road Longridge Preston PR3 2NB | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | | **Parish/Town Council** | | | | | | | | | |
| Thornley and Wheatley Parish Council raise no issues with the planning application however they wish to make the Council aware that the property next-door to no 2 Cockleach Cottages i.e. no 1 has recently been sold just in case post has been redirected and the neighbour notification has not reached the new owners. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | | **Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies** | | | | | | | | | |
| **LCC Highways** | | | | | No objection – the proposal would not have a significant impact on highway safety of capacity. | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | | **Additional Representations.** | | | | | | | | | |
| No representations received. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **RELEVANT POLICIES AND SITE PLANNING HISTORY:** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ribble Valley Core Strategy:**  Key Statement DS1: Development Strategy  Key Statement DS2: Sustainable Development  Policy DMG1: General Considerations  Policy DMG2: Strategic Considerations  Policy DMG3: Transport & Mobility  Policy DMH5: Residential and Curtilage Extensions  Policy DME1: Protecting Trees and Woodlands  Policy DME3: Site and Species Protection & Conservation  National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Relevant Planning History:**  **3/2014/1107**  Proposed front porch.  Approved with Conditions  **3/1998/0458**  Vehicle Storage Building  Approved with Conditions  **3/1987/0080**  Replacement of existing garage, utility and store with new double garage  Approved with Conditions  **3/1984/0119**  Replacement of existing metal chimney with new stone and brick stack  Approved with Conditions  **3/1980/0201**  Proposed two storey extension  Approved with Conditions | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Site Description and Surrounding Area:**  The application site is occupied by a two storey, semi-detached dwelling located outside the settlement boundary of Longridge, within the Open Countryside. The site is located outside of the Longridge Neighbourhood Plan Area and is predominantly rural in character with sporadic built form within the vicinity. The northern and eastern site boundaries adjoin open fields. The site also has a detached dual pitched roof garage located to the side of the dwelling and a larger utilitarian style outbuilding located to the rear of the site.  The application site is accessed off Chipping Road with a low-level stone-built wall extending along the front boundary and into the site, along with hedge and tree to the front of the site. The dwelling has been extended in the past by addition of a two-storey side/rear extension and a porch. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Proposed Development for which consent is sought:**  The proposed development is for the demolition of the existing boundary wall and toilet block located to the rear of the site. The wall and toilet block adjoins the boundary with no. 1.  A single storey rear extension is also proposed which would have a hipped roof and extend at the boundary with the adjoining property at no. 1.  Following discussions between the agent for the application and the Planning Officer, the proposed extension has been amended in size so that the depth has been reduced and the flank wall has been set in from the existing flank wall of the dwelling to help create subservience. The extension would now extend to the rear of the existing two storey extension by approximately 3.8 metres with a total depth of just over 7 metres.  In addition, the external materials of construction would be stone walls to match the existing house with slates to the roof. The existing windows are Rosewood uPVC and the proposed windows would match with brown aluminium bi-fold doors to the rear and a rosewood composite door. There are also 3 no. glazing panels proposed to the roof of the extension to include two panels to the south-west facing roof slope and one to be inserted to the north-east facing roof slope. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Principle of Development:**  The application relates to the extension of an existing dwellinghouse. The proposal is therefore considered acceptable in principle, subject to an assessment of the material planning considerations. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Impact Upon Residential Amenity:**  Ribble Valley Core Strategy Policy DMG1 provides specific guidance in relation to amenity and states that all 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’*  The main property that would be impacted by the proposed extension is the adjoining property 1 Cockleach Cottages. The adjoining property is not extended to the rear at ground floor level and the closest ground floor window serves a dining room. The drawings have been amended so that the rear of the extension would not extend beyond the existing toilet block. It is acknowledged that there would likely be some impact on the occupiers of no. 1 Cockleach Cottages, however this is not considered to be detrimental. The reason being that no. 2 is located to the North of no. 1 and as such, there would not likely be any significant overshadowing or loss of light as a result of the extension. In addition, the eaves height of the extension would be fairly low at approximately 2.1 metres with the roof hipped away from the boundary. As such, whilst the whole area between the rear window and the toilet block would be infilled with the toilet block replaced, the level of harm is not considered to adversely affect the amenities of the surrounding area to a level that would warrant refusal of the scheme.  The proposed development is therefore compliant with the above parts of Policy DMG1. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Visual Amenity/External Appearance:**  Ribble Valley Core Strategy Policy DMG1 provides specific guidance in relation to design and 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, style [and] consider the density, layout and relationship between buildings, which is of major importance. Particular emphasis will be placed on visual appearance and the relationship to surroundings.’*  In addition, Ribble Valley Core Strategy Policy DMG2 states that:  *‘Within the open countryside 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 materials, landscaping and siting’.*  Lastly, Policy DMH5 states that:  *‘Proposals to extend or alter existing residential properties must accord with Policy DMG1 and any relevant designations within which the site is located’.*  The proposed extension is relatively large in terms of footprint when compared to the original dwelling. It would however be single storey and located to the rear of the property. As such, when viewed in conjunction with the existing detached garage from the main road or from the Public Right of Way at Lord’s Lane, it is not considered to be detrimental to the character of the open countryside. The materials of construction are considered to be in keeping with the character of the existing dwelling and the modern glazing panels, whilst slightly incongruous with the traditional design are not highly visible from the public realm and would be mostly obscured from view behind the existing dwelling and detached garage.  On balance, the reduced width and depth of the extension is considered to be acceptable and would not add a significant level of bulk and massing to the dwelling that would be to the detriment of the appearance of the existing semi-detached cottages.  As such, on balance, the proposed development is considered to comply with Policies DMG1, DMG2 and DMH5 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy subject to a condition to ensure the external materials of the development permitted match those stated within the application form. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Highways and Parking:**  Ribble Valley Core Strategy Policy DMG3 states that:  *‘All development proposals will be required to provide adequate car parking and servicing space in line with currently approved standards’.*  In addition, Policy DMG1 states that all development must:  *‘1. consider the potential traffic and car parking implications.*  *2. ensure safe access can be provided which is suitable to accommodate the scale and type of traffic likely to be generated’.*  Lancashire County Council Highways have been consulted in regard to the proposed development and raised no objection to the proposal as the development would not impact existing parking or access arrangements. They consider the proposal would have no impact on highway safety or capacity in the immediate vicinity of the site.  As such, the proposal is considered to accord with Policy DMG1 and DMG3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Landscape/Ecology:**  With regards to biodiversity net-gain, the development is exempt from having to achieve the mandatory Biodiversity Net Gain requirement as it is a householder application. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **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 granted subject to condition(s). | | | | | | | | | | | |