


Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.

Signed:	Officer:		Date:		Manager:		Date:	
----------------	-----------------	---	--------------	---	-----------------	--	--------------	--

Application Ref:	3/2019/0297	 Ribble Valley Borough Council <small>www.ribblevalley.gov.uk</small>
Date Inspected:	15 th April 2019	
Officer:	LG	
DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:		APPROVAL

Development Description:	Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of replacement with associated external works
Site Address/Location:	34 Painter Wood, Billington

CONSULTATIONS:	Parish/Town Council
No comments received	

CONSULTATIONS:	Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies
LCC Highways:	No objection in principle – request a Construction Management Plan due to known issues in the surrounding highway network.
United Utilities:	Request details of proposed surface water drainage system by way of pre-commencement condition
CONSULTATIONS:	Additional Representations.
No neighbour comments received.	

RELEVANT POLICIES AND SITE PLANNING HISTORY:
Ribble Valley Core Strategy: Key Statement DS1 – Development Strategy Key Statement EN1 – Green Belt Key Statement EN4 – Biodiversity and Geodiversity Policy DMG1 – General Considerations Policy DME3 – Site and Species Protection and Conservation National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
Relevant Planning History: N/A

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:
Site Description and Surrounding Area: The application site comprises a detached bungalow, located to immediately to the south of the Billington settlement boundary. The dwelling is one of several modernist properties along this stretch of Painter Wood which appear to have been built during the same period in the late 1950's/early 1960's. Subsequent alterations and extensions have eroded their original uniformity, however the overall style is notable and a departure from the surrounding architecture.

Steep and complex topography characterises the surrounding landscape. This is visible within the plot itself, which rises steeply from the roadside, with the dwelling broadly central within the curtilage on a level plateau. The site also marks the edge of the Green Belt boundary and is therefore covered by this designation.

Proposed Development for which consent is sought:

Permission is sought for the demolition of the existing dwelling and the erection of a replacement.

Principle of Development:

Key Statement EN1 of the Core Strategy and Paragraphs 143-147 of the National Planning Policy Framework detail the approach to development within the Green Belt.

The Framework generally considers the erection of new buildings to be harmful, unless one of a number of listed exceptions can be met. Failure to satisfy these criteria would render a proposal inappropriate by definition and require the demonstration of very special circumstances to outweigh that harm. Paragraph 145 provides the following exceptions which would be relevant to this proposal:

d) the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces;

g) limited infilling or partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land, whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would;

- not have a greater impact on the openness of the existing development than the existing development;

Neither the Framework nor the Core Strategy provide a definition as to the scope of the phrase 'materially larger'. However, case law and interpretation through appeal decisions suggest that modest increases in size can be supported, subject to a consideration of the associated impact on openness.

The concept of openness is generally accepted to be the absence of built form. The assessment required when considering new development in Green Belt must therefore take in to account both visual and spatial dimensions of the scheme. In the case of a replacement building, this would be directly linked to the scale (a combination of volume, footprint and prominence) arising from any additions above that which already exists. Development which results in an unacceptable reduction in openness will not be supported. This will be considered in more detail below.

Visual Amenity & Openness:

The replacement dwelling would be larger than the existing bungalow, although the general appearance would take a clear architectural lead from the original. The footprint of the property would increase by way of small scale additions to the rear elevation and in this regard the associated impacts on landscape and openness are minimal.

The most significant change would be the introduction of a cantilevered upper floor. This is not dissimilar to an addition at 40 Painter Wood which was consented in 2007 and found to be acceptable within the Green Belt. As such an extension of this nature would not be anomalous in terms of its overall design and form. The addition is set back from the principal elevation and due to the steeply sloping nature of the site, would not have a significant visual presence in the landscape. Whilst the introduction of the additional volume would have some direct impact on openness and is likely to be

at the upper limit of is proportionate, I do not consider this to be of a level which would undermine the spatial qualities of the designation in this location. With this in mind, it is also deemed necessary to remove permitted development rights relating to the further extension of the dwelling, which cumulatively could create greater harm.

The design approach is contemporary which is appropriate in this location and features such as vertical louvres would be introduced to soften the new glazing at first floor. The material palette includes render to the principal and side elevations, with areas of grey vertical cladding to the less prominent areas at the upper floor side and rear elevations. Accounting for the considerable variety in architectural vernacular and material use in the locality, this approach is acceptable in principle. It would, however, be prudent to condition the submission of samples prior to the commencement of any above ground works to ensure that the LPA are satisfied with the particular style, texture and colour finishes.

Aside from the new dwelling, associated works are to take place within the curtilage including the widening of the existing driveway, the creation of more useable parking areas and some modest re-profiling of the garden with associated retaining structures (circa 1m in height). These aspects of the scheme are ancillary in nature and would not generate significant or unacceptable landscape issues.

It is therefore considered that the development would not undermine the stated purposes of the Green Belt in terms of openness and would not generate any other harm by way of its design and appearance.

Residential Amenity:

Whilst the scale of the building is to increase, the relationship with the adjacent neighbours would not be unduly affected by the greater massing or by the creation of new window openings. The side elevations of the new upper floor would remain blank and the new rear facing windows would not impinge on the privacy of neighbouring gardens.

To the front elevation a recessed balcony area would be provided at first floor, flanked by projecting side walls and canopy roof. This raises no adverse amenity issues and would not result in overlooking.

Trees/Ecology:

No tree removal is proposed as part of the development, nor should any be unduly affected by the proposed works, accounting for the extent of the existing hardstanding at the site.

The application is also supported by a Bat Survey which was undertaken in March, during the hibernation period and outside of the optimal season for assessment. Whilst no evidence was found during that initial survey, it would be prudent to seek an updated assessment prior to demolition. This can be controlled by condition.

Highways:

LCC Highway Engineers have raised no objection to the proposals as a whole but due to know issues in the surrounding road network, a Management Plan has been requested to ensure that the construction process is suitably controlled. A pre-commencement condition will be added to require the submission of details prior to first works on site, which has been agreed by the applicant.

Drainage:

The Agent has confirmed their intention to utilise the existing drainage connection, which would be

overseen during the Building Regulation stage of the development process. United Utilities had requested a pre-commencement to control future surface water arrangements, however as there is no change in circumstances it is not considered necessary to introduce controls in this regard.

Observations/Consideration of Matters Raised/Conclusion:

With all the above taken into consideration, the application is recommended accordingly.

RECOMMENDATION:

That planning consent be granted.