|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Signed:** | **Officer:** | **MC** | | | | **Date:** | | **15/04/2025** | | **Manager:** | | **LH** | **Date:** | **15/4/25** |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Application Ref:** | | | | 3/2025/0069 | | | | | | |  | | | |
| **Date Inspected:** | | | | N/A | | | **Site Notice:** | | 20/02/2025 | |
| **Officer:** | | | | MC | | | | | | |
| **DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:** | | | | | | | | | | | **APPROVAL** | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Development Description:** | | | | | Proposed construction of single-storey extension to side and rear and replacement sewage treatment package. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Site Address/Location:** | | | | | 1 Cockleach Cottages Chipping Road Longridge Preston PR3 2NB | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | | **Parish/Town Council** | | | | | | | | | |
| Thornley and Wheatley Parish Council note the previously refused scheme and raise no issues with the current scheme. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | | **Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies** | | | | | | | | | |
| **LCC Highways** | | | | | The Highway Authority do not object to the proposed development subject to conditions. The suggested conditions include:   * Driveway surface material * Layout designed to provide forward gear manoeuvring * Construction Management Plan | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **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:**  **3/2024/0815**  Proposed demolition of detached garage and construction of two-storey and single-storey extensions to side and rear, incorporating front dormer, including new, integral double garage and replacement sewage treatment plant.  Refused  **6/10/1767**  Timber garage  Granted in 1969 subject to condition which restricts the use of the garage | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **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 southern and eastern site boundaries adjoin open fields.  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. To the rear, the adjoining property has been extended at two storey level and both properties have a single storey outbuilding. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Proposed Development for which consent is sought:**  It should be noted that the drawings have been amended prior to the determination of this application. The proposed wraparound extension has been separated to form a rear extension to a depth of approximately 3.9 metres and an eaves height of approximately 2.1 metres, extending up to the common boundary with the adjoining property. In addition, two side extensions are proposed to form a porch and a bedroom with en-suite. The roof of the side has been reduced so that it now sits in line with the bottom of the first-floor window to the flank elevation. The proposed materials of construction would match the existing dwellinghouse. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **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 2 Cockleach Cottages. The proposed extension would be built up to the boundary and would have a depth of approximately 4 metres and an eaves height of approximately 2 metres at the closest point to the common boundary. Due to the orientation of the dwelling, there would likely be some impact by way to the amenity of the occupiers of no. 2, however the extension would have a fairly low eaves height and a hipped roof with a shall pitch, sloped away from the neighbouring property. Whilst no. 2 has had a single storey rear extension granted up to the site boundary (planning ref: 3/2024/0902), as this has not been constructed, an assessment must be made to their amenity without the proposed extension.  Regardless, whilst there would be some impact by way of overshadowing and loss of light, this is not considered to be significant or result in any adverse impact due to the low eaves height and roof pitch. Some weight is also given to the permitted development fall-back position that the occupiers could extend up to the boundary up to 3 metres in depth under Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the General Permitted Development Order (2015) as amended.  As such, it is not anticipated that the proposed development would result in any significant undue harm upon the amenity of any nearby residential properties and the development is 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 extensions are considered to be an improvement from the refused scheme as well as the originally proposed scheme. The materials of construction would match those of the existing dwelling which could be secured by planning condition and the reduction in size and scale of the extensions by way of footprint, siting and roof height would constitute subservient additions to the main dwelling which would not harm the character and appearance of the dwelling or the terrace of dwellings. Notwithstanding this, the amended plans show part of the walls to be rendered which would not follow the external materials of the dwellings, however the applicant has agreed to a condition to ensure the front and flank elevations would match the existing stone walls as these elevations would be more visible from the public realm.  As such, the proposal is considered to accord with Policies DMG1, DMG2 and DMG5 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy subject to conditions. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **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 subject to the imposition of conditions. The conditions relate to the provision of the parking and turning areas prior to the first use of the development and its retention, the surfacing of the driveway materials prior to the first occupation of the development and the submission of a Construction Traffic Management Plan.  The site would retain two parking spaces within the driveway which is considered to be acceptable.  Subject to the suggested conditions, the proposal is considered to accord with Policy DMG1 and DMG3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Landscape/Ecology:**  There is a tree located to the front of the site, however due to the siting of the tree in relation to the size of the tree crown, it is not likely that this would be impacted by the proposed extension. The tree is not protected by way of a Tree Preservation Order and could be removed without consent.  A preliminary roost assessment has been submitted by the applicant. The refused scheme was considered to have a negligible risk to bats as noted by the Countryside Officer, however they noted that the survey is valid for 18 months, which an updated assessment would then be required.  Given the survey found the building to be negligible suitability for bats, it would not be reasonable to request a further survey, however it was previously considered a condition could be added to any grant of permission to ensure the development proceeds in accordance with the recommendations outlined in paragraph 6.2 of the Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment dated 22 August 2024. It should be noted that the development does not now involve the intrusion into the roof and the extensions are single storey only.  As such, it would be reasonable to add an informative to advise the applicant how to proceed, in the event that bats are discovered.  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 approval subject to conditions. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **RECOMMENDATION**: | | | That planning consent be granted subject to conditions. | | | | | | | | | | | |