|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Signed:** | **Officer:** | **SK** | | | | **Date:** | | **30.04.25** | | **Manager:** | | **LH** | **Date:** | **30.4.25** |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Application Ref:** | | | | 2024/1030 | | | | | | |  | | | |
| **Date Inspected:** | | | | N/A | | | **Site Notice:** | | N/A | |
| **Officer:** | | | | Stephen Kilmartin | | | | | | |
| **DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:** | | | | | | | | | | | **APPROVAL** | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Development Description:** | | | | | Variation of Condition 1 (approved plans) of planning permission 3/2021/0010 (for Variation of condition 1 of 3/2018/0975 proposed plot substitutions and house types) to regularise finished floor levels as built. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Site Address/Location:** | | | | | **Land east of Chipping Lane Longridge** | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | | **Parish/Town Council** | | | | | | | | | |
| No representations received in respect of the application. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | | **Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies** | | | | | | | | | |
| **LCC Highways:** | | | | |  | | | | | | | | | |
| United Utilities have offered the following observations:  *‘Further to our review of the submitted documents, Drawing 459/ED/105, Rev L - Dated 25.10.21,*  *United Utilities has no objection to the request to vary Condition 1.’* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | | **Additional Representations.** | | | | | | | | | |
| No representations received in respect of the application. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **RELEVANT POLICIES AND SITE PLANNING HISTORY:** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ribble Valley Core Strategy:**  Key Statement DS1 – Development Strategy  Key Statement DS2 – Sustainable Development  Key Statement DMI2 – Transport Considerations  Policy DMG1 – General Considerations  Policy DMG2 – Strategic Considerations  Policy DMG3 – Transport and Mobility  National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Relevant Planning History:**  **2021/0010:**  Variation of Condition of planning application 3/2018/0975. Condition 1 - Proposed plot substitutions and house types. (Approved)  **2018/0975:**  Approval of reserved matters (layout, scale, appearance and landscaping) for Phases 2 and 3 for the erection of 193 dwellings, pursuant to outline planning permission 3/2017/0232. (Approved) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Proposed Development for which consent is sought:**  The application seeks to vary condition 1 (approved plans) of extant planning permission 3/2021/0010. The submitted details seek consent to regularise the as-built finished floor levels compared to that which was consented pursuant to permission 3/2021/0010.  In this respect the submitted information states that 148 plots have been constructed at finished floor levels that deviate from those pursuant to planning permission 3/2021/0010 with the deviations ranging from -150mm under to +1275mm above the previously consented levels. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Impact Upon Residential Amenity:**  Taking account that the proposal seeks to regularise finished floor levels, due consideration must be given in respect of the potential of the constructed floor levels to result in adverse impacts(s) upon existing nearby residential amenities.  In this respect the supporting information states:  *‘Whilst the FFL have increased at some plots, only 3no. plots include a difference greater than 1m. The difference in FFL for all other plots is below 1m, and in some cases the difference is a lower FFL of - 150mm (Plots 2, 174 and 180). We, therefore, consider these differences to be very minor in nature when considered in the context of the wider development.*  *In terms of impact on the amenity of nearby properties, the southern extent of the Site has a direct interface with the gardens of neighbouring properties along Crumpax Meadow, Redwood Drive and Firwood Close. As such, we have given consideration to any potential harm to the amenity of these residents.*  *The plots along the southern extents of the Site includes plots 14-22, 36-44, 65-75 and 81-87. The largest difference in FFL amongst these plots is at Plot 41 whereby there is a difference in +1,275mm compared to the approved FFLs.*  *However, as shown on the Finished Floor Level Comparison Plan (drawing no. 459/ED/166 Rev.C), Plot 41 is orientated on its side and is set back from adjacent properties to the south. This is shown in the extract in Figure 1 below which demonstrates that plot 41, which has the largest difference in FFL, is not positioned close to existing properties to the south, at approximately 45m away. Therefore, we consider any impact on residential amenity to be negligible in relation to those dwellings which existed before Bowland Meadow was constructed.*  *Furthermore, the other plots situated along the southern extent of the Site, as identified above, also ensure suitable interface distances between habitable windows and garden areas of nearby properties, ranging from circa 20m to 30m. This is achieved through appropriate building orientation, location of driveways, separation created by Camellia Street and Fuchsia Way, and the presence of the southern green-buffer margin and associated footpath/cycleway which separates the Site from existing properties to the south. These separation distances have already been deemed appropriate when the Council approved the reserved matters for Phases 2 and 3’.*  Taking account of the above matters and taking account of the impact(s) of the raised finished floor levels and subsequent building heights, in concert with the spatial offset distances from existing nearby residential receptors, it is not considered that the resultant measurable impacts would be so severe as to warrant the refusal to grant permission for the proposed variation of condition 01 of planning permission 3/2021/0010.  In this respect the proposal does not raise any significant direct conflicts with Policy DMG1 which seeks to protect against development which would result in adverse impacts upon standards of existing residential amenity and to ensure adequate levels of residential amenity for occupiers of proposed development(s). | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Visual Amenity/External Appearance:**  The application seeks to vary condition 1 (approved plans) of extant planning permission 3/2021/0010. The submitted details seek consent to regularise the as-built finished floor levels compared to that which was consented pursuant to permission 3/2021/0010. In this respect the submitted information states that 148 plots have been constructed at finished floor levels that deviate from those pursuant to planning permission 3/2021/0010 with the deviations ranging from -150mm under to +1275mm above the previously consented levels.  As such and given the ranges in deviation over and above that of the consented levels, due consideration must be given in respect of the potential of the changes in levels to result in adverse visual impacts upon the character and visual amenities of the area. In respect of these matters, whilst some of the variances in finished floor levels are above 1m in height, these upper tolerances are restricted to 3 plots within the entirety of the size, with the majority of other finished floor levels ranging on average between +250mm - +600mm.  As such, the variances - when read across the entirety of the site, are unlikely to result in significant measurable material impacts over and above that of the previous permission to a degree that would warrant the refusal to grant permission for the proposed variation of condition 01 of planning permission 3/2021/0010.  In respect of the above, proposal does not raise any significant direct conflicts with Policy DMG1 of the Ribble valley Core Strategy insofar that the variation of condition 1 will result in no measurable significant harm to the character or visual amenities of the area. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Highways and Parking:**  The remit of the application solely relates to that of finished floor levels with no other variations proposed in respect of layout or matters affecting highway infrastructure/configuration. As such the proposal to vary conditions 01 is unlikely to result in any material adverse impacts upon the safe operation of the immediate highway over and above that of the original approval to which the application relates.  As such the proposal raises no significant measurable conflict(s) with Key Statement DMI2 or Policy DMG3 which seek to ensure the continued safe operation of the highways network and to ensure adequate vehicular parking provision and pedestrian infrastructure is brought forward to accommodate development. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Landscape/Ecology:**  The remit of the application solely relates to that of finished floor levels with no other variations proposed in respect of layout or landscape matters. Matters relating to landscape and ecology are conditioned and controlled under the remit of a number of other associated applications relating to the site. As such and given the overall landscape strategy is not affected by the proposed variation, it is not considered that the variation of condition 1, in respect of the current application, raises any material conflicts with the aims and objectives of the Ribble valley Core Strategy.  As such and taking account of the above, the proposal does not raise any significant measurable conflict(s) with Policies DME1, DME2 nor DME3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy which seek to protect against adverse impacts upon habitat, biodiversity, ecology or protected species and species of conservation concern. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **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 to vary condition 1 be granted subject to the imposition of conditions. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |