


**Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.**

<b>Signed:</b>	<b>Officer:</b>	BT	<b>Date:</b>	4/5/2021	<b>Manager:</b>		<b>Date:</b>	
<b>Site Notice displayed</b>	N/A	<b>Photos uploaded</b>	Y					

<b>Application Ref:</b>	3/2021/0342	 <b>Ribble Valley Borough Council</b> <a href="http://www.ribblevalley.gov.uk">www.ribblevalley.gov.uk</a>
<b>Date Inspected:</b>	22/4/2021	
<b>Officer:</b>	BT	
<b>DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:</b>		<b>Decision</b>   Refusal

<b>Development Description:</b>	Proposed single storey side and rear extension and alterations to existing property.
<b>Site Address/Location:</b>	Holmfield, Long Row, Mellor. BB2 7EF

<b>CONSULTATIONS:</b>	<b>Parish/Town Council</b>
Mellor Parish Council have no objections.	

<b>CONSULTATIONS:</b>	<b>Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies</b>
None.	

<b>CONSULTATIONS:</b>	<b>Additional Representations.</b>
None.	

<b>RELEVANT POLICIES AND SITE PLANNING HISTORY:</b>
<p><b>Ribble Valley Core Strategy:</b></p> <p>Key Statement DS1 – Development Strategy          Key Statement DS2 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development          Key Statement EN1 – Green Belt          Policy DMG1 – General Considerations          Policy DMG2 – Strategic Considerations          Policy DMH5 – Residential and Curtilage Extensions</p> <p><b>NPPF</b></p>
<p><b>Relevant Planning History:</b></p> <p><b>3/2002/0561:</b>          Proposed conservatory and detached garage/store (Approved)</p>

<b>ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:</b>
<b>Site Description and Surrounding Area:</b>

The application relates to a detached bungalow property in Mellor. The property is constructed from natural stone, slate roof tiles and UPVC doors and windows. The proposal site is situated within an area of open countryside amongst other bungalow and farmstead properties.

**Proposed Development for which consent is sought:**

Consent is sought for the construction of a single storey rear extension, single storey side extension and internal and external alterations to the existing main dwelling and detached garage.

**Principle of development:**

The proposal is a domestic extension to a dwelling and is acceptable in principle subject to an assessment of the material planning considerations.

The proposal site is situated in the designated Green Belt. National planning legislation places considerable emphasis on the protection of greenbelt land with the primary aim of keeping green belt areas open wherever possible.

Green Belt areas are assigned optimum levels of protection from all types of development. The NPPF states that development proposals in green belt areas should be regarded as unacceptable unless they fall within the definition of specific exceptions which are detailed in para 145 of the NPPF. With specific regard to building alterations and extensions, paragraph 145, part C of the NPPF states that:

*'A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building.'*

Moreover, Key Statement EN1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy states that *'the overall extent of the Green Belt will be maintained to safeguard the surrounding countryside from inappropriate encroachment.'*

There are no specific definitions within the NPPF framework or RVBC Core strategy in relation to what constitutes 'disproportionate' and 'inappropriate encroachment' however the generally accepted approach is for an assessment on the increased footprint and volume that the development would create.

The proposed works comprise a single storey rear extension and single storey side extension which if implemented would almost double the footprint and volume of the original dwelling. Furthermore, the proposed works would be in addition to a previously approved proposal from 2002 which included the addition of a conservatory to the main property and a garage and outbuilding to the property's residential curtilage.

As such, it is considered that the proposed works would be a disproportionate addition to the original property in as much that the cumulative footprint and cubic volume of the previously approved works and current proposal would exceed the footprint and cubic volume of the original dwelling by a considerable measure which in turn would be entirely contrary to the guidance set out in Paragraph 145, part C of the NPPF and Key Statement EN1 of the RVBC Core Strategy.

**Residential Amenity:**

The proposed rear and side extensions will incorporate a significant amount of glass on their external elevations which will allow views towards the Northeast and Southeast of the property respectively. The nearest residential properties to Holmfield are located approximately 60 and 80 metres away to the South-east and South-west respectively therefore the proposed works will not allow any new opportunities for

overlooking into private areas, nor will they have any undue impact upon natural light or outlook for any neighbouring residents.

**Visual Amenity:**

The proposed rear extension will measure 4.9 x 11.4 metres with an eaves and roof height of 3.3 and 3.7 metres respectively while the proposed side extension will measure 7.1 x 10.2 metres with an eaves and roof height of 2.3 and 4.3 metres respectively.

As such, the proposed works would have some visual impact by virtue of their footprint and extensive use of glazing however both of the extensions would be subservient to the primary dwelling in as much that their eaves and roof pitch height would not exceed those on the main property. Moreover, the extensions would be sited largely out of public view to the side and rear of the property therefore it is not considered that the proposal would have any adverse impact on visual amenity.

**Landscape/Ecology:**

A bat survey carried out at the proposal site on 18/2/21 found no evidence of any bat related activity. Whilst the proposal will not impact on any protected landscapes, this does not override the fundamental objections in terms of the principle of development in a Green Belt area.

**Highways:**

Lancashire County Council Highways have not been consulted on the proposal however given that the proposed works will not affect the property's existing parking arrangement it is not considered that the proposal will have any undue impact upon highway safety.

**Observations/Consideration of Matters Raised/Conclusion:**

The proposal does not raise any concerns in relation to residential amenity in as much that the proposed works would not allow any new opportunities for overlooking or lead to any loss of natural light or outlook. The proposal will have some visual impact however the overall visual impact of the proposed works will be minimal due to the relatively screened siting of the extensions.

However, as stated previously, the proposed works would be a disproportionate addition to the main dwelling by virtue of their footprint and volume which would be contrary to the aims of paragraph 145 of the NPPF and Key Statement EN1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy both of which aim to retain the openness and permanence of the Green Belt through guarding against excessive development and inappropriate encroachment.

Section 13 of the NPPF states that inappropriate development within the Green Belt should only be approved in 'very special circumstances' whereby any potential harm to the Green Belt is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

The NPPF does not provide a clear definition as to what constitutes 'very special circumstances' however recent data on successful appeal decisions within the Green Belt suggests that certain factors, when taken in conjunction with one another, can be regarded as 'very special circumstances'. These factors may include the economic and social benefits that a proposed development could offer or the need to provide accommodation for rural workers or land for an identified housing shortage.

The applicant has attempted to justify the proposal through stating that the proposed works would provide annex accommodation for an elderly resident with health issues which in turn would allow the

occupants to provide comprehensive care for their relative. The applicant has also drawn attention to the fact that the proposal is a significant reduction on the design submitted at the pre-application stage which falls within the confines of permitted development. References have also been made to a neighbouring property within the Green Belt whereby planning permission has been granted for a number of extensions and outbuildings.

These comments are noted however it is of utmost importance that all planning applications should be considered on their own individual merits and whilst the above comments may carry some weight it is not considered in this particular case that they would amount to an occurrence of 'very special circumstances'.

It is for the above reasons and having regard to all material considerations and matters raised that planning consent be refused.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

That planning permission be refused for the following reason:

**01**

The proposed development would result in a disproportionate addition to the original property and is considered to be an inappropriate development in the Green Belt contrary to the provisions of Key Statement EN1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and Section 13 of the National Planning Policy Framework which attaches substantial weight to Green Belt harm. Furthermore, there are no very special circumstances demonstrated which would outweigh this harm.