|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Signed:** | **Officer:** | **LW** | | | | **Date:** | | **30/04/25** | | **Manager:** | | **KH** | **Date:** | **30/04/25** |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Application Ref:** | | | | 3/2025/0190 | | | | | | |  | | | |
| **Date Inspected:** | | | | 6/11/24 | | | **Site Notice:** | | N/A | |
| **Officer:** | | | | LW | | | | | | |
| **DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:** | | | | | | | | | | | **APPROVAL** | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Development Description:** | | | | | Proposed demolition of existing single storey porch/ bedroom/ utility, car port, conservatory and detached garage. Construction of two-storey side extension, single storey rear extension and new front porch. Replacement windows and doors, alterations and resurfacing of driveway and installation of solar panels and render finish to SE side elevation. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Site Address/Location:** | | | | | 10 Barker Lane, Mellor, BB2 7ED. | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | | **Parish/Town Council** | | | | | | | | | |
| No comments received with respect to the proposed development. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | | **Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies** | | | | | | | | | |
| **LCC Highways:** | | | | | No objection subject to conditions. | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **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  Key Statement EN1: Green Belt  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:**  3/2024/0803: Proposed demolition of existing single storey porch/ bedroom/ utility, car port, conservatory and detached garage. Construction of two-storey side extension, single storey rear extension and new front porch. Replacement windows and doors, alterations and resurfacing of driveway and installation of solar panels and render finish to SE side elevation (Approved).  6/9/3325: Car port and sun lounge to rear (Approved).  6/9/2431: 2 detached houses and garages (Approved). | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Site Description and Surrounding Area:**  The application relates to a detached two-storey dwellinghouse at no.10 Barker Lane. The property comprises brick, stone and render to the external elevations, along with concrete roof tiles and white uPVC windows and benefits from an existing conservatory, integral car port and detached garage. The site to which the proposal relates is located outside of any defined settlement area and on land designated as Green Belt. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Proposed Development for which consent is sought:**  Consent is sought for the proposed demolition of the existing single storey porch/ bedroom/ utility, car port, conservatory and detached garage and the construction of a two-storey side extension, single storey rear extension and new front porch.  The application is a resubmission of 3/2024/0803 which was granted consent following amendments, the scheme proposed as part of this application being the same as the original scheme proposed under 3/2024/0803.  The proposed two storey side extension would project a maximum of 6.6m from the north-western side elevation of the application property, with a depth of 11.3. A hipped roof form would be incorporated measuring a maximum of 5.1m to the eaves and 6.9m to the ridge. To the front elevation of the extension a garage door and 2no. first floor windows would be featured, along with a personnel door and 2no. ground and first floor windows to the rear. To the north-western side elevation of the extension, a further 2no. ground floor windows would be included.  The proposed single storey rear extension would project a maximum of 3.5m from the rear elevation of the application property and would extend a width of 7.7m. A flat roof form and lantern light would be featured measuring a maximum of 3.4m in height, whilst a set of bi-folding doors would be included to the rear.  The new front porch would measure 1.2m by 9.5m and would incorporate a flat roof measuring 2.8m in height. To the front elevation, a large element of glazing would be featured along with a double access door.  In respect in materiality, the proposed development would be finished to match the external facing materials of the existing property including render, brickwork and stone to the elevations and concrete roof tiles. The existing white uPVC windows would be replaced with black uPVC throughout, with new stone window surrounds and solar panels to the south-eastern roof pitch also proposed.  As part of the overall development, alterations are also proposed to the existing driveway, including the widening of the existing access and resurfacing. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Principle of Development:**  The application site lies within the designated Green Belt and therefore Key Statement EN1 of the Core Strategy and national Green Belt policy contained within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is engaged.  The NPPF states that there is a general presumption against inappropriate development in the Green Belt and advises that when considering any planning application, the Local Planning Authority should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the green belt.  As set out in the NPPF and Key Statement EN1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy, the essential characteristic of the Green Belt is its openness. NPPF paragraph 154 states that the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. However, the extension or alteration of a building that does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building is considered an exception where they preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land in Green Belt. Development which is harmful to the Green Belt should only be permitted in ‘very special circumstances’ and these will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.  There are no specific definitions within the NPPF or Ribble Valley Core Strategy in relation to what constitutes ‘disproportionate’, however the generally accepted approach is for an assessment of the increased volume that the development would create above that of the original building.  The NPPF defines ‘original building’ as ‘a building as it existed on 1 July 1948 or, if constructed after 1 July 1948, as it was built originally’. Therefore, any extensions built since 1948 cannot be used to justify additional floor space or volume. Furthermore, in terms of calculating the size of the ‘original building’, outbuildings are generally not included.  Historic planning applications indicate that the original built form of the building included a modest two-storey detached dwellinghouse and single storey integral garage/ porch, with previous planning consents allowing for the construction of an integral car port to the north-western side elevation and conservatory to the rear.  The agent has provided a comparison of volumes taking account of the original building and the proposal. Whilst it is noted that the submitted ‘Proposed Volume Calculations’ plan shows the existing building to have a volume of 509.5m3, this figure is in fact understood to be the volume of the original building, excluding the existing car port and conservatory. These calculations thus indicate a 60.9% increase in cubic volume from original to proposed.  In seeking to justify the principle of this development in terms of Green Belt Policy, the applicant has referred to appeal decision APP/T2350/W/16/3164118 which granted consent for the erection of two detached houses following the demolition of the existing house at no.30 Barker Lane. In that case, the Inspector deemed the proposal to be ‘limited infilling in a village’ which is an accepted exception for development in the Green Belt under paragraph 154 of the NPPF. However, as this application relates to an extension of an existing building, the appeal decision at no.30 Barker Lane is not considered to be directly comparable with the proposed development and is therefore given limited weight.  With the above in mind, it is considered that the proposed works would result in a disproportionate addition to the original building in as much that the cumulative cubic volume increase of the proposal would be significant in relation to the original property which in turn would result in Green Belt harm contrary to the guidance set out in Paragraph 154 of the NPPF and Key Statement EN1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy. Furthermore, there are no very special circumstances demonstrated which would outweigh this harm. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Impact Upon Residential Amenity:**  The openings proposed to the front and rear of the development would provide views similar to those afforded by the existing window configuration featured to the front and rear of the main dwellinghouse. It is noted that 2no. windows are proposed to the north-western facing side elevation of the development which would face towards the neighbouring property at no.12 Barker Lane; however, these openings are proposed to be obscurely glazed and as such, no new opportunities for direct overlooking or loss of privacy are anticipated in this respect.  Furthermore, the proposed single storey rear extension would be sited approximately 1.3m away from no.8 Barker Lane and would extend 3.5m beyond the rear elevation of this neighbouring property. The proposed development would also be situated approximately 5m from no.12 Barker Lane. As such, it is not considered that any undue impact by way of overshadowing, loss of outlook or daylight would be resultant in this respect.  In view of the above, it is not anticipated that the proposed works would result in any significant undue harm upon the existing amenities of any nearby residents that would warrant the refusal to grant planning permission. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Visual Amenity/External Appearance:**  The proposed two-storey side extension would be publicly viewable from the highway of Barker Lane and would comprise a sizeable footprint. Despite this, the proposal would be set back from the principal elevation of the application property by approximately 2m and down from the main ridgeline. Given the above and taking into account the existing built form of the dwellinghouse, it is not considered that the proposed development would read as an overtly incongruous or over dominant addition to the proposal site or surrounding area.  Furthermore, the proposed single storey rear extension would appear appropriate in size and scale in relation to the existing property, whilst the proposed porch would appear similar to the existing single storey, flat roof porch/ bedroom/ utility in which it would replace and therefore would not appear an overly anomalous or out of keeping addition to the street scene. The proposed materiality is also considered acceptable insofar that Barker Lane is characterised by a variety of different house types with differing architectural details and external facing materials. It is also not considered that the proposed replacement windows and doors, new driveway and installation of solar panels to the south-eastern elevation would result in any undue harm that would warrant the refusal to grant planning permission in this particular instance. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Highways and Parking:**  Lancashire County Council Highways have been consulted on the proposed development and raised no objection subject to the imposition of conditions. The proposal is therefore considered acceptable in respect to highway safety and parking. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Landscape/Ecology:**  A Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment Report has been submitted with the application, dated 4th November 2024. The report concludes that no evidence was recorded to suggest bats were roosting within the building and no bats were observed or recorded using the building for roosting. The property is considered to be of negligible potential for roosting bats and the survey effort is considered to be reasonable to assess the roost potential of the building with no further survey work being deemed necessary.  Despite this, a Precautionary Method Statement and Reasonable Avoidance Measures have been included in order to minimise or remove any potential disturbance to roosting bats. Were the application to be approved, the measures outlined within this section of the report would be secured by way of a planning condition.  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 refused for the following reason: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **01:** | | | The proposed development would result in a disproportionate addition to the original property in as much that the cumulative cubic volume increase of the proposal would be significant in relation to the original property. The proposal is therefore considered to be inappropriate development in the Green Belt contrary to the provisions of Key Statement EN1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy (2008-2028) and Section 13 of the National Planning Policy Framework which attaches substantial weight to Green Belt harm. | | | | | | | | | | | |