

RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL REPORT TO PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Agenda Item No

meeting date: THURSDAY, 13 SEPTEMBER 2012
 title: PLANNING APPLICATIONS
 submitted by: DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY SERVICES

PLANNING APPLICATIONS UNDER THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990:

APPLICATION NO: 3/2012/0360/P (GRID REF: SD 383430 450440)
 PROPOSED NEW LIVESTOCK AND PARLOUR BUILDING AT MIDDLE BREAKS FARM,
 SETTLE ROAD, GISBURN

PARISH COUNCIL: No representations or observations received.

ENVIRONMENT
 DIRECTORATE
 (COUNTY SURVEYOR): Has no objections to the application on highway safety grounds.

ENVIRONMENT AGENCY: Has confirmed that it has no comments to make on this application.

LANCASHIRE COUNTY
 COUNCIL (LAND AGENT): Have considered this application and, although no written report has been prepared, have confirmed that they have no objections to this application.

ADDITIONAL
 REPRESENTATIONS: None received.

Proposal

Middle Breaks Farm comprises an existing dairy unit with surrounding land holding extending to approximately 145 acres. In addition, the applicants also farm Gisburn Cotes Farm (approx 3.5 miles away) located off the A59 Gisburn Road towards Sawley that comprises an additional land holding of approximately 69 acres. Stock is also out wintered on other farms.

Full planning permission is sought for a new livestock cubicle building with adjoining parlour and associated facilities. It is stated in the submitted Design and Access Statement that the new building is required in order to facilitate the modernisation, restructuring and consolidation of the existing dairy unit at this farm.

The proposed new livestock building is intended to relocate and consolidate the existing dairy herd within one building, comprising approximately 130 cubicles with the provision of a new parlour incorporating the installation of a new automated robotic milking system and associated/ancillary accommodation (ie dairy/wash room, chemical store, office etc). The adjoining building is to provide additional holding pens, straw pen and accommodation for dry cows relocated from Gisburn Coates Farm.

The existing range of dairy buildings at Middle Breaks Farm are then to be restructured to accommodate young stock that will be relocated from Gisburn Coates Farm/out wintered farms thereby consolidating all livestock on the two farms.

The proposed building comprises the approximately 73m x 16.5m livestock/parlour building, with the adjoining building having dimensions of 10.3m x 22.9m giving a total combined floor area of approximately 1,440m². The building would have an eaves height of approximately 4m and a ridge height of approximately 7.3m. The external walls would comprise concrete panels or concrete blocks to a height of approximately 1.8m with Yorkshire boarding above. The roof covering would be fibre cement profiled roofing sheets of natural grey colour to match the existing roof sheeting elsewhere on the farm and incorporating profiled translucent roof lights.

Site Location

Middle Breaks Farm is on the eastern side of Settle Road, Newsholme. There is an area of higher ground between the road and the farm buildings complex. The access track to the farm has a junction with the main road to the south of the buildings complex and then follows a route on the eastern side of the higher ground. The proposed building would be sited on relatively low lying ground immediately to the east of the existing group of farm buildings.

Relevant History

3/2003/0618/P – Proposed dairy building. Approved but not implemented and permission now therefore lapsed.

3/2005/0237/P – Out of parlour feed building and dry midden store, together with bulk feed bins. Approved.

3/2005/0238/P – Proposed earth bank slurry store in the position of the building previously approved by 3/2003/0618/P. Approved.

Relevant Policies

Policy G1 - Development Control.

Policy G5 - Settlement Strategy.

Policy ENV3 - Development in Open Countryside.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Environmental, AONB, Human Rights and Other Issues

This application is for the construction of a new building in order to modernise, restructure and consolidate an existing dairy unit. The County Council Land Agents have confirmed orally that they had no objections to the application. The building is therefore accepted as being necessary and appropriate for its proposed agricultural purpose.

The building is appropriately sited immediately adjoining the existing group of farm buildings and is also on relatively low lying ground. Its design and external materials are entirely appropriate for its purpose and location. The proposal would not therefore, in my opinion, have any detrimental effects upon the visual amenities of the locality.

There are no neighbouring dwellings that are close enough to be in any way affected by the proposal; and there are no highway safety considerations in relation to this application.

Section 3 of NPPF is entitled "Supporting a Prosperous Rural Economy". Paragraph 28 states that planning policies should support economic growth in rural areas in order to create jobs and prosperity by taking a positive approach to sustainable new development; and that, to promote a strong rural economy, local and neighbourhood plans should (amongst other things) promote the development and diversification of agricultural and other land based rural businesses.

This application is entirely in accordance with those stated intentions of NPPF to support the rural economy. As such, I can see no sustainable objections to this application.

SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR APPROVAL

The proposed development would improve the buildings and facilities at an existing dairy farm thereby supporting the rural economy and would not have any detrimental effects upon visual amenity, the amenities of any nearby residents or highway safety.

RECOMMENDATION: That planning permission be GRANTED subject to the following condition(s):

1. The development must be begun no later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.

REASON: Required to be imposed in pursuance to Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2. This permission shall relate to the proposal as shown on drawing numbers BS.11-083/02 REVA and 03 REVA.

REASON: For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure compliance with the submitted plans.

APPLICATION NO: 3/2012/0672/P (GRID REF: SD 373660 441508)
APPLICATION FOR THE CREATION OF A CROSSING FOR VEHICLES FROM ROAD TO
PROPERTY AT 14 FARADAY AVENUE, CLITHEROE, LANCASHIRE, BB7 2LW

CLITHEROE TOWN No observations or comments have been received within the
COUNCIL: statutory 21-day consultation period.

LCC ENVIRONMENT No objection in principle to this application on highway safety
DIRECTORATE (COUNTY grounds.
SURVEYOR):

ADDITIONAL No additional representations have been received.
REPRESENTATIONS:

Proposal

Planning permission is sought for the creation of a vehicular crossing to link the property no. 14 Faraday Avenue to Faraday Avenue itself. No's 8 and 10 have already carried out similar works involving the laying of concrete slabs or tarmac over the existing grass semi-circle that separates the properties and the highway. Notice has been served on the landowner.

Site Location

The application relates to a semi-detached dwelling within the settlement of Clitheroe.

Relevant History

None relevant.

Relevant Policies

Policy G1 - Development Control.
Policy G2 – Settlement Strategy.
National Planning Policy Framework.

Environmental, AONB, Human Rights and Other Issues

The scheme will simply allow the owner of no. 14 Faraday Avenue vehicular access to his property and allow the safe off-road parking of any vehicles within his ownership. The LCC Highways Officer considers that the layout for the driveway access and the location of the proposed gate must be designed to comply with LCC recommendations, and that should the Planning and Development Committee be minded to support this proposal, he would recommend the inclusion of specific highway conditions as the creation of the new access will require the provision of an additional drop kerb and associated alterations to the existing footway.

Adjacent properties have carried out similar development with success and there are no over-riding concerns with this proposed development that would cause me to make any other recommendation. As such, bearing in mind the above comments from the LCC Highways Officer, I consider the scheme to comply with the relevant policies, and I recommend the scheme accordingly.

SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR APPROVAL

The proposal represents an appropriate form of development that would not result in visual detriment to the surrounding area, and nor would its use have an adverse impact on highway safety.

RECOMMENDATION: That planning permission be GRANTED subject to the following condition(s):

1. The development must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.

REASON: Required to be imposed pursuant to Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2. The permission shall relate to the development as shown on Plan Drawing referenced as '14 Faraday Proposed 1/500'.

REASON: For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the submitted plans.

3. That part of the access extending from the highway boundary for a minimum distance of 5 metres into the site shall be appropriately paved in tarmacadam, concrete, block pavements, or other approved materials.

REASON: To prevent loose surface material from being carried onto the public highway thus causing a potential source of danger to other road users.

4. The kerbing at the vehicular crossing shall be reinstated in accordance with the Lancashire County Council Specification for Construction of Estate Roads, concurrent with the formation of the improved access.

REASON: This is to provide the necessary access and to maintain the proper construction of the highway.

INFORMATIVES

1. This consent requires the construction, improvement or alteration of an access to the public highway. Under the Highways Act 1980 Section 184 the County Council as Highway Authority must specify the works to be carried out. Only the Highway Authority or a contractor approved by the Highway Authority can carry out these works and therefore before any access works can start you must contact the Environment Directorate for further information by telephoning Area Surveyor East 01254 823831 or writing to the Area Surveyor East, Lancashire County Council, Area Office, Riddings Lane, Whalley, Clitheroe BB7 9RW quoting the planning application number.
2. This consent requires the construction, improvement or alteration of an access to the public highway. Under the Highways Act 1980 Section 184 the County Council as Highway Authority must specify the works to be carried out. Only the Highway Authority or a contractor approved by the Highway Authority can carry out these works and therefore before any access works can start you must contact the Environment Directorate for further information, details below:

Oliver Starkey, Public Realm Manager (Ribble Valley), Lancashire County Council, Willows Lane, ACCRINGTON BB5 0RT. 01254 770960 customerserviceeast@lancashire.gov.uk

APPLICATION NO: 3/2012/0682/P (GRID REF: SD)
PROPOSED EXTENSION TO CREATE A SUNROOM AT THE REAR OF THE PROPERTY AT
WINDWAYS, 8 GOOSEBUTTS LANE, CLITHEROE

TOWN COUNCIL: No representations received at the time of preparing the report.

UNITED UTILITIES: No objections.

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS: A letter of objection has been received from a nearby resident who objects to the proposed development for the reasons summarised below.

- The proposed development will overshadow the living room of the adjoining property leading to a loss of light.
- The proposal is contrary to the guidance given in the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance policies G1 and H10.

Proposal

The proposed development consists of a sunroom located to the rear of the property. The proposed development will project 4m from the rear of the existing dwelling and measure 3.75m in width. The development will have an eaves height of 3m and an overall height of 3.93m. The north west and south west elevations of the proposed development will be heavily glazed, whilst a row of windows are proposed in the north elevation. These will be located 2.4m from ground level. In addition to this, a roof light in the north facing roof slope is also proposed. The applicant has detailed in their submission that the development will be constructed from block and render. The proposed hipped roof will be finished with tiles to match the existing dwelling.

Site Location

The application relates to the property known as Windways, 8 Goosebutts Lane, Clitheroe. The development site is a semi detached dwelling which fronts Goosebutts Lane. The site is located within the settlement boundary of Clitheroe. The area is residential and consists of a range of differing house types.

Relevant History

3/2012/0440/P – Application for a Lawful Development Certificate for a proposed conservatory at the rear of the property – Approved.

3/2002/0786/P – Extension and alterations – Approved with conditions.

6/2/2003 – Bedroom extension built over existing garage – Approved (September 1972).

Relevant Policies

Policy G1 - Development Control.

Policy H10 - Residential Extensions.

Policy SPG – “Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings”.

Environmental, AONB, Human Rights and Other Issues

The key considerations in determining this application are the impact the development will have upon the character and setting of the dwelling and the impact the development will have upon the residential amenity of the area.

Members should note that a similar conservatory was proposed under application 3/2002/0786/P. The proposed conservatory was in the same position and of similar form and proportions to the development under consideration in this application. However, a conservatory was never approved under 3/2002/0786/P. The conservatory element was deleted from the approved scheme.

In addition to this a Certificate of Lawful Development – Proposed Use (3/2012/0440) has recently been issued in respect of a proposed conservatory to the rear of the property. The development proposed within this application projected 3m from the rear of the dwelling and measured 3.75m in width. The proposed eaves height was 3m with an overall height 3.95m. A Certificate of Lawful Development was granted because the development proposed was considered to be permitted development under The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (Amendment) (No.2) (England) Order 2008, Part 1, Class A.

In terms of the impact the proposed development will have upon the character and setting of the existing dwelling, I consider the development to be in-keeping. This is because the proposed development would appear subservient to the main dwelling in terms of scale and form and would have no impact upon the street scene. I am therefore of the opinion that the proposed development accords with policies G1 and H10 of the Local Plan and the Council's adopted SPG in respect to its character and appearance.

It is also relevant to consider the impact the extension would have upon the residential amenity of the area. The Council's SPG states 'extensions can have an effect on neighbouring properties due to their shadow which they cast. The larger the extension and closer to the neighbours property, the greater the effect. When deciding upon the location and size of an extension, this issue needs to be given serious consideration. Any proposal which reduces the level of daylight available to habitable rooms in neighbouring properties, or which seriously overshadows a neighbour's garden is likely to be refused'. This sort of impact is exacerbated in the case of semi-detached dwellings as they are adjoining. This generally, as is the case in this application, results in development that is located hard up to the common boundary of the properties and results in development being sited perpendicular to the adjoining property. In such circumstances, the Local Planning Authority use the 45 degree methodology developed by the Building Research Establishment (BRE) as set out in the Councils adopted SPG on Extensions and Alterations; to fully assess the impact the development would have upon the adjoining dwelling; in terms of potential loss of daylight. This methodology is by no means a statutory rule, nor does it form part of any planning legislation. It is merely a guide, of perhaps what could be deemed to be a method of best practice.

Additional plans have been received which show the relationship between the proposed development and the adjoining property. This allows the 45-degree methodology to be applied to the development; to provide an indication as to the level of shadowing that will be created.

In this instance, the proposed development fails this test in one aspect but passes in the other. The 45-degree point drawn from the furthest point of the proposed development passes well beyond the centre point of the patio doors of the adjoining dwelling. However when the 45-degree point is drawn from the eaves of the proposed development it passes the patio doors below the centre point, therefore passing this element of the test.

This would suggest that there would be some effect created by the proposed development; which subsequently may lead to a loss of daylight. However I do not believe that this potential loss of light would be sufficient to warrant refusing this application on these grounds. This is

because the development does not categorically fail the 45-degree test. Furthermore it should be noted that the patio doors of No.6, the adjoining dwelling, do not act as a principle window to the room they serve. The room in question is a through living room that has a large window at the opposite end fronting Goosebutts Lane.

Having considered the proposals and assessed the potential impact I recommend that planning permission is granted.

Summary Reason: The proposal has no significant detrimental impact on nearby residential amenity nor would it have an adverse visual impact.

RECOMMENDATION: That planning permission be GRANTED subject to the following condition(s);

1. The development must be began not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.

REASON: Required to be imposed pursuant to Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2. The permission shall relate to the development as shown on Plans carrying reference number TOM/02DWG02B Amendment B and TOM/02DWG03.

REASON: For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the submitted plans.

3. Before the development hereby permitted is first occupied, the windows located in the side elevation (North East facing) which face the adjoining dwelling shall be obscure glazed and maintained as such in perpetuity.

REASON: To safeguard the residential amenity of the area in accordance with policies G1 and H10 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan and the Councils adopted SPG on Extensions and Alterations.

4. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any Order amending, revoking or re-enacting that Order) the building(s) shall not be altered by the insertion of any window or doorway without the formal written permission of the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: In order to safeguard nearby residential amenity in accordance with Policies G1 and H10 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan and the adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance – “Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings”.

APPLICATION NO: 3/2012/0703/P (GRID REF: SD 365044 435289)
PROPOSED TWO STOREY EXTENSION AND DEMOLITION OF CONSERVATORY AT 34
WATER STREET, RIBCHESTER

PARISH COUNCIL: No observations received at the time of report preparation, though previously raised no objections.

ENVIRONMENT DIRECTORATE (COUNTY SURVEYOR):	Not formally consulted on this application but previously raised no objection.
ENVIRONMENT AGENCY:	Not formally consulted on this application but previously raised no objection as the application is to be considered in a low risk area.
LANCASHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL (COUNTY ARCHAEOLOGICAL UNIT):	Not formally consulted on this application but previously considered as the proposed site lies within the Roman settlement of Bremetenacum recommend that a condition should be imposed requesting an archaeological watching brief to be undertaken.
ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS AND STATUTORY ADVERTISEMENT:	At the time of preparing this report, three letters of objection have been received which raises concerns regarding the loss of natural light entering a property which currently consists of two dwellings as one larger unit but will be eventually returned as two units. Consider that the outlook from the property would be seriously affected due to a brick wall on the close boundary. It would also affect the financial returns of any property.

Proposal

The scheme seeks detailed consent for a two storey rear extension on a terraced property. The extension which would involve the demolition of the existing conservatory would measure approximately 4.8m x 3.250m and would have a maximum height of 5.2m and have a relatively shallow pitched roof. On the gable elevation that faces towards No 34 Water Street, there is one window at ground floor. The gable elevation facing the rear garden has a first floor window and a patio door arrangement on the ground floor but amended to incorporate a more traditional window which would help reduce any overlooking issues and perceived privacy issues. The proposal is to utilise render and slate and as submitted in terms of use of plastic windows.

Site Location

The property is located within the Ribchester Conservation Area and is one of a block of terraced properties.

Relevant History

3/2011/1025/P – Two storey extension. Refused.

3/2012/0445/P – Two storey extension. Refused.

Relevant Policies

Policy G1 - Development Control.
Policy ENV16 - Development Within Conservation Areas.
NPPF.
Ribchester Conservation Area Appraisal.

Environmental, AONB, Human Rights and Other Issues

The issues that need to be considered in relation to this application relate to the effect the proposal would have on residential amenity and with particular regard to privacy and natural daylight issues as well as the visual impact of the extension and in particular having regard to its setting within a Conservation Area.

I am mindful of the previous recommendation of the previously refused schemes which related to perceived loss of light entering an adjacent property's window as a result of the extension and also the first floor door has been an incongruous feature that would not preserve the character of appearance of the Conservation Area. Since the second refusal, a meeting has taken place and there has been a minor design change, which removes the full depth window which was in essence give the appearance of a patio door arrangement on the first floor to a more traditional window opening with stone surround. In assessing its impact on the Conservation Area, regard must be taken to its prominence although the mere fact that it cannot be readily seen is not in itself a reason to allow inappropriate development. However, I am of the opinion that having assessed its location and the extent of the work, that the extension and its window openings would no longer have an impact on the Conservation Area or the character of the building.

It is clear that this proposal would have an impact on the residential amenity of the adjacent property but I have assessed the proposal and mindful of the objections consider that the effect is not significant enough to warrant a recommendation of refusal. In this instance, due to the location of an industrial building at the rear of the property, there is some additional impact caused by the extension having a claustrophobic impact but having carefully assessed the overall impact, I do not consider this to be significant enough to warrant a refusal, although I do acknowledge that the location of this industrial building does further increase the impact.

It is considered that having regard to relevant material concerns, that this proposal is acceptable and that a recommendation of approval is appropriate.

SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR APPROVAL

The proposal has no significant detrimental effect on nearby residential amenity, nor would it have any significant visual impact that would be detrimental to the character of Ribchester Conservation Area.

RECOMMENDATION: That planning permission be GRANTED subject to the following condition(s):

1. The development must be begun no later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.

REASON: Required to be imposed in pursuance to Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2. The permission shall relate to the development as shown on plan reference B652402E received on 30 August 2012.

REASON: For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the submitted plans.

3. Precise specifications or samples of walling and roofing materials and details of any surface materials to be used including their colour and texture shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before their use in the proposed works.

REASON: In order that the Local Planning Authority may ensure that the materials to be used are appropriate to the locality in accordance with Policy G1 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan and the adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance – “Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings”.

4. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any Order amending, revoking or re-enacting that Order) the building(s) shall not be altered by the insertion of any windows on first floor without the formal written permission of the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: In order to safeguard nearby residential amenity in accordance with Policies G1 and H10 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan and the adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance – “Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings”.

5. The permission shall relate to the development as shown on Plan Drawing

REASON: For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the submitted plans.

6. Prior to the commencement of any ground disturbance on the site including any excavation of foundation design test pits, the developer shall have given the County Archaeologist, Lancashire County Council at least two weeks advance notice of such work, and shall in addition afford access to the site at all reasonable times to the County Archaeologist or other archaeologist nominated by the Local Planning Authority, to carry out a watching brief.

REASON: In view of the archaeological significance of the area, and to ensure that anything of archaeological importance may be adequately recorded in accordance with Policies G1, ENV14 and ENV15 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan.

7. In the event that any bats are found or disturbed during any part of the development, work shall cease until further advice has been sought from a licensed ecologist.

REASON: To comply with Policies G1 and ENV7 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan ensuring that no species/habitat protected by the Wildlife and Countryside ACT 1981 are destroyed.

C APPLICATIONS WHICH THE DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY SERVICES RECOMMENDS FOR REFUSAL

APPLICATION NO: 3/2012/0450/P (GRID REF: SD 361038 434759)
PROPOSED FIRST FLOOR EXTENSION TO CREATE 4 EN-SUITES TO EXISTING BEDROOMS INCLUDING PART DEMOLITION AND RE-BUILD OF KITCHEN TO GUEST HOUSE AT JENKINSONS FARM, THORN LANE, ALSTON, LANCASHIRE, PR3 3BQ

LONGRIDGE TOWN COUNCIL: Subject to the use of sympathetic materials, the Council has no objection to this application.

UNITED UTILITIES: No objection to the proposed development.

HEALTH AND SAFETY EXECUTIVE (HSE): HSE does not advise, on safety grounds, against the granting of planning permission in this case.

NATIONAL GRID: No observations or comments received within the statutory 21-day consultation period.

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS: No additional representations have been received.

Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a proposed first floor extension to the southeast facing elevation of the building in question. The scheme requires the part demolition and re-build of the existing single storey lean-to kitchen extension to the Guest House. The extension proposed would allow the internal reconfiguration of this area of the Guest House in order to create four en-suites for the four guest bedrooms that exist. These rooms currently share bathrooms that lie across the corridor within the Guest House.

The Guest House consists of 7 guest bedrooms, with 3 family bedrooms elsewhere in the building. Only 2 of the guest room's benefit from recently constructed en-suites, with the other 5 rooms sharing 4 bathrooms on the floor. The applicant's note that this proposal will allow them to update and modernise the existing facilities within the Guest House in order to improve the business and allow them to compete with the larger chains nearby such as the Swallow Hotel and Tickled Trout (near Preston close to the M6/A59). They note that they struggle to fill the rooms without en-suites once those with have been booked.

Site Location

The application relates to a property that has been run as a B&B since 1991. It is a family run business that helps sustain the existing working farm at Yew Tree nearby. The property is accessed off Thorn Lane; a single-track cul-de-sac off Alston Lane, and lies on the outskirts of Longridge (approximately 1.5 miles) within the open countryside.

Relevant History

3/2001/0917/P – Extension to form bathrooms at Bed and Breakfast – Granted Conditionally.

Relevant Policies

Policy G1 - Development Control.

Policy G5 – Settlement Strategy.

Policy ENV3 – Development in Open Countryside.

Policy H17 – Building Conversions – Design Matters.

Policy RT1 – General Recreation and Tourism Policy.

National Planning Policy Framework.

'Setting of Heritage Assets: English Heritage Guidance' (EH, October 2011).

Historic Environment Planning Practice Guide (HEPPG, March 2010).

Environmental, AONB, Human Rights and Other Issues

The main issues to consider with this scheme are the principle of the development, the visual impact of the scheme on the character and setting of the existing property and the potential visual impact on the surrounding countryside. There are no highway safety concerns as there is to be no increase in the number of bedrooms/visitors to the site.

The policy basis against which this scheme should be appraised is set out in the context of national, regional and local development plan policies. At a national level the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) came into force on 27 March 2012 and states that 'at the heart of the NPPF is a presumption in favour of sustainable development', which means that for decision making purposes that:

Where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date, granting permission unless,

- any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this framework taken as a whole; or
- specific policies in this framework indicate development should be restricted.

I am mindful of the statement in NPPF cited above which advocates a presumption in favour of sustainable development unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. The site under consideration here lies outside any saved settlement boundaries and as such should be considered in accordance with Local Plan Policy G5, which allows for small-scale tourism developments appropriate to a rural area subject to the development being in accordance with Local Plan Policy RT1. Policy RT1 notes that the Borough Council will approve development proposals that extend the range of tourism and visitor facilities in the Borough subject to certain criteria being met. These criteria include not conflicting with other policies in the Local Plan and that the development should not undermine the character, quality or visual amenities of the plan area by virtue of its scale, siting, materials or design. It is these elements of the policy where the proposal is considered to be contrary.

Architecturally and historically the property (circa 1800s), is a house with a barn attached. There was also originally a stable building extension and a lean-to shippon (circa 1844-1892), with the lean-to shippon demolished and re-built in the early 80s. The house and barn are stone built with a slate roof, and due to the age of the property the building is considered to be a 'non-designated heritage asset'. Paragraph 17 'Core Planning Principles' of the National Planning Policy Framework notes that planning should '*conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of this and future generations*', with Paragraph 126 stating that local planning authorities should recognise that '*heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource*' which should be conserved in a

'manner appropriate to their significance'. Local planning authorities should also take into account *'the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets ... the wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits that conservation of the historic environment can bring ... the opportunities to draw on the contribution made by the historic environment to the character of a place'*. These paragraphs highlight the importance of the conservation, preservation and enhancement of any non-designated heritage assets as important considerations when assessing such proposals.

Paragraph 131 provides advice when determining planning applications relating to heritage assets, noting that local planning authorities should take account of:

- the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and
- the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

Paragraph 132 provides more advice when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset noting that great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. It continues noting that the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be, and that the significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification. Paragraph 133 notes that where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to or total loss of significance of a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss.

From a Local Plan Policy point of view, Policy ENV3 considers development within the Open Countryside, and stipulates that 'development will be required to be in keeping with the character of the landscape area and should reflect local vernacular, scale, style, features and building materials,' and that 'proposals to conserve, renew and enhance landscape features will be permitted, providing regard has been given for the characteristic landscape features of the area'. Local Plan Policy H17 discusses the importance of good design to protect the rural environment, and that traditional farm buildings should remain largely unaltered and remain looking like farm buildings. It notes more specifically that 'Planning permission will be granted providing the design is of a high standard, in keeping with local tradition, particularly in terms of materials, geometric window form and window and door openings.'

In considering the proposed extension to the property, the Agent notes that the lean-to extension to be removed is not an original part of the property (re-built in the 80s). Whilst this is not disputed, any extension proposed must be in keeping with the historic and traditional linear form of the building. The proposal was considered at Pre-Application stage and at this time it was noted that the character and setting of the property/non-designated heritage asset would be detrimentally affected by the inappropriate and out of keeping two-storey extension (that would be replacing a more traditional lean-to extension) as the two storey gable ended extension at 90 degrees to the main linear form of the building coupled with the lean-to at right angles to the main property, neither conserves, renews nor enhances the existing features of the building. Whilst the reasoning behind the proposed extension is appreciated, namely the requirement for additional en-suite facilities on site, it still remains my view that a more suitable proposal would be to investigate either replicating the two-storey extension on the north facing elevation of the building that contains en-suite bathrooms for two rooms within the B&B (this was an extension

to the original farmhouse not the barn, and as such the relevant Policies by which we would assess such a proposal are slightly different), or via reorganising the internal layout of this portion of the building.

I am mindful of Paragraph 131 of the NPPF that notes 'local planning authorities should take account of the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality', however the scheme also conflicts with the next sentence which states that new development should make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness. I am also mindful of Paragraph 132 of the NPPF that notes 'great weight should be given to the asset's conservation', and Paragraph 133 that notes that where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to or total loss of significance of a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss. The scheme is considered to lead to substantial harm to the heritage asset and the public benefits are not considered to be sufficient to significantly outweigh the impact on the character and historic appearance of the property in question due to the fact that other options could be implemented that would safeguard the intrinsic character of the property whilst providing a workable solution.

Therefore in considering the scheme, the Council cannot therefore support the principal of developing this due to the irreversible, significant and detrimental visual impact the development of the site would have on the character and setting of the building, and on this basis, the scheme is not considered to be compliant with the current national and local plan policies.

The proposal is recommended accordingly.

RECOMMENDATION: That planning permission be REFUSED for the following reason:

1. Approval of this scheme would be contrary to the guidance contained within the NPPF, the HEPPG and Local Plan Policies G1, G5, ENV3, H17 and RT1. The character and setting of the property/non-designated heritage asset would be detrimentally affected by the inappropriate and out of keeping two-storey extension proposed, that would be replacing a more traditional lean-to extension, as it is considered that the two storey, gable ended extension at 90 degrees to the main linear form of the building, coupled with the new lean-to extension set at right angles to the main property, that would neither conserve, renew nor enhance the existing features of the building. The incongruous design and scale of the extension will not present a harmonious development that sympathetically and satisfactorily impacts on the character of the non-designated heritage asset, and would result in the domination of the traditional linear form of the existing traditional building and its setting, creating a development that will have an unacceptable visual impact.

ITEMS DELEGATED TO DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY SERVICES UNDER SCHEME OF DELEGATED POWERS

The following proposals have been determined by the Director of Community Services under delegated powers:

APPLICATIONS APPROVED

<u>Plan No:</u>	<u>Proposal:</u>	<u>Location:</u>
3/2011/0738/P	Proposed demolition of existing lean-to building attached to existing agricultural barn and change of use of existing agricultural barn into two residential units and construction of new covered area between modern barn and existing agricultural building at barn opposite	Cold Coates Farm Collins Hill Lane Chipping
3/2012/0563/P	Proposed new agricultural building for the housing of dairy cattle	Bolton Fold Farm Alston Lane, Alston
3/2012/0060/P	Proposed erection of an 18.5m high wind turbine (22.52m to blade tip) – peak power of 12Kw	Crawshaw Farm Newton-in-Bowland
3/2012/0127/P	Demolition of redundant agricultural building and partially constructed farmworkers dwelling and erection of 2no holiday cottages	Dewhurst Farm Longsight Road Langho
3/2012/0249/P	Proposed new first floor extension above existing double garage	3 Carr Croft, Rimington
3/2012/0253/P	Substitution of house type. Amend approved application 3/2010/0877/P with additional roof lights and window openings.	Lane Ends Barn Balderstone
32012/0356/P	Conversion and redevelopment of a redundant public house and hotel with conference facilities into 3 private residential properties	Moorcock Inn Slaidburn Road Waddington
3/2012/0403/P	Proposed change of use from shop to shop with self-contained flat above	62 Whalley Road Clitheroe
3/2012/0442/P	Proposed 4 No retail shop units for agricultural supplies	Gisburn Action Mart, Gisburn
3/2012/0449/P	Proposed erection of two holiday units, patio garden and extend vehicular access	Park Hey House Stonygate Lane Knowle Green
3/2012/0453/P	Proposed use of the annex as a separate dwelling	The Conkers Dewhurst Road, Langho
3/2012/0489/P	Conversion of barn to dwelling. Replacement of agricultural building with a garage and creation of curtilage	Wittons Farm Bolton-by-Bowland, Clitheroe
3/2012/0491/P	To erect carport to cover vehicles and glass veranda to cover back patio	Kenmare, Littlemoor Road Clitheroe

<u>Plan No:</u>	<u>Proposal:</u>	<u>Location:</u>
3/2012/0502/P	Application for discharge of condition no. 3 (relating to a method statement – spillages of oils, fuels or chemicals) of planning consent 3/2012/0090/P at Land off private access track	Newton Road Dunsop Bridge
3/2012/0505/P	Proposed loft conversion and provision of two dormers to front elevation. Refurbish existing rear extension and provide new flat roof with lantern rooflight. Provide single storey rear extension with sunroom, utility and accessible toilet	16 Whalley Road Langho
3/2012/0519/P	Proposed extension of existing detached dwelling to form kitchen and dining room, utility room and entrance hall. Proposed new window openings in East gable wall and North flank wall	Wheatley Cottage Four Acre Lane Thornley
3/2012/0522/P	Application for the renewal of planning permission 3/2009/0548P for the Construction of a Stable Block	Paddock at High Ridge Primrose Lane, Mellor
3/2012/0524/P	Bank protection/stabilisation works consisting of rock armour wall, rip rap and regarded bank and improved temporary construction access junction	Holden Waste Water Treatment Works Bolton-by-Bowland Road Holden
3/2012/0528/P	Proposed change of use of the first and second floors from residential to office use, the ground floor is currently used as an office	18 Castlegate Clitheroe
3/2012/0529/P	Proposed extension to an existing stable building to be used for storage	Nookhouse Farm Longsight Road Clayton-le-Dale
3/2012/0530/P	Application for discharge of condition no. 3 (relating to details of conservation type roof lights) of planning consent 3/2012/0212/P	Withinreap Barn Moss Side Lane Thornley with Wheatley
3/2012/0533/P	Proposed demolition of the former Women's Institute Building and the erection of one dwelling on land at	Lynbrook Longsight Road Clayton-Le-Dale
3/2012/0537/P	Proposed single storey rear extension with a lean-to roof with two velux roof lights and double doors. Removal of existing external wall to kitchen to open kitchen area	30 Kirkmoor Road Clitheroe
3/2012/0541/P	Proposed single storey garage	Pear Tree Cottage Gallows Lane, Ribchester
3/2012/0543/P	Proposed use of premises for A1 retail use.	37 Inglewhite Road Longridge
3/2012/0547/P	Outline application for the erection of a new build ¾ bedroom detached dwelling house with detached garage within the existing garden rear of an existing property	Police Rural Beat House Manor Avenue/Preston Rd Ribchester

<u>Plan No:</u>	<u>Proposal:</u>	<u>Location:</u>
3/2012/0549/P	Proposed rear extension to form home office	New Marls Farm Ribchester Road, Dinckley
3/2012/0551/P	Application to discharge condition No.6 (containment and storage of manure) of planning consent 3/2010/0202P at former	De Tabley Arms Barker Brow Clayton-le-Dale
3/2012/0553/P	Erection of a conservatory to the rear of the existing bungalow (brickwork will match existing bungalow which is built in Bradstone)	2 Whinney Lane Langho
3/2012/0557/P	External alterations to the existing building to accommodate internal refurbishment works to office space and creation of ancillary laboratory (Use Class B1 (b) on the ground floor	United Utilities White Bull WTW Preston Road Longridge
3/2012/0559/P	Proposed demolition of the existing conservatory and replacement on same footprint with flat roofed sun lounge	Beechwood Lower Lane Longridge
3/2012/0565/P	Proposed erection of two new build semi-detached houses (1 x 3 bedroom 5 person and 1 x 2 bedroom 4 person) with off-road parking and private gardens	George Street Clitheroe
3/2012/0566/P	Application to discharge condition no.3 (materials), condition no.6 (precise details of solar and solar PV panels), condition no. 9 (landscaping details), condition no. 10 (disposal of foul and surface waters) and condition no. 11 (foul drainage scheme) of planning permission 3/2011/0861P relating	Brookside Farm Moss Side Lane Thornley
3/2012/0570/P	Proposed two storey extension to the rear	28 Wesley Street Sabden
3/2012/0574/P	Certificate of Lawful Development for proposed works to stream crossing point over Easington Brook to include the demolition of the existing structure, followed by construction of the replacement structure, involving sheet piling, shuttering and pouring concrete. No new or altered access, drainage or hard standing required	Manor House Farm Easington Road Slaidburn
3/2012/0581/P	Proposed single storey rear extension on front elevation to form dining room, extended hallway and ground floor wc	53 Riverside Clitheroe
3/2012/0582/P	Proposed part demolition of rear conservatory. Provision of single storey rear extension	Sycamore House Knowsley Road, Wilpshire
3/2012/0591/P	Proposed single storey rear extension following demolition of existing conservatory extension and proposed first floor side extension	Woodacre Cottage Fleet Street Lane Ribchester

<u>Plan No:</u>	<u>Proposal:</u>	<u>Location:</u>
3/2012/0592/P	Proposed change of use of barn to a 3 bed dwelling	Bowfields Farm Bowfields Lane, Balderstone
3/2012/0596/P	Installation of new pitched roof construction over existing flat roof infill	Greenacre, Showley Road Clayton-le-Dale
3/2012/0598/P	Application to discharge condition no.3 (detailed plans showing siting, design and external appearance of mobile homes, landscaping, boundary treatment and parking) and condition no. 4 (foul drainage scheme) of appeal decision APP/T2350/A/11/2157512 relating to planning application 3/2010/0959/P	Stubs Wood Farm Rimington Lane Rimington
3/2012/0600/P	Retrospective application for removal of the existing roof light and installation of new velux roof light to existing study/bedroom at 2 nd floor level	52 York Street Clitheroe
3/2012/0707/P	Application to discharge condition no 3 (updated protected species survey) of planning permission 3/2012/0435/P	16 Hesketh Road Longridge

APPLICATIONS REFUSED

<u>Plan No:</u>	<u>Proposal:</u>	<u>Location:</u>	<u>Reasons for Refusal</u>
3/2011/1032/P	Outline application for proposed 'log cabin' style holiday lodges	Whins Lodge Whalley Old Road Langho	Policies G1, ENV3, ENV4, RT1 and NPPF – detriment to the openness of the greenbelt and to the character and visual amenities of the open countryside locality.
3/2012/0159/P	Raise the roof to part of the existing house. Provide a two storey extension for a garage and dressing room/en-suite at	6 Knowsley Road Wilpshire	The proposal by virtue of its design would result in a development that would have a severely detrimental impact upon the residential amenity of the area. This would be contrary to Policies G1 and H10 of the Districtwide Local Plan and the Council's adopted SPG on alterations and extensions.

<u>Plan No:</u>	<u>Proposal:</u>	<u>Location:</u>	<u>Reasons for Refusal</u>
3/2012/0525/P	Proposed machinery/ tractor shed consisting of a steel frame, concrete panels and Yorkshire boarding	Fellview Barn Baygate Bolton by Bowland	Policy G1, G5 and ENV1 – No agricultural justification detrimental to visual amenity Policy G1 – adverse affect on nearby residential amenity due to noise by nature of the intended use.
3/2012/0552/P	Demolition of existing bungalow and replacement with a two-storey detached dwellings	Shay Cross Old Back Lane Wiswell, Clitheroe	Contrary to Local Plan Policies, the NPPF and the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. Due to the scale, massing and design of the proposed replacement dwelling, approval of this proposal would have an adverse visual impact on the character, setting and appearance of the street scene, adjacent Listed Buildings and the CA that neither preserves or enhances this location, and would have an unacceptable impact on the residential amenity of the occupiers of the nearest dwellings by virtue of its over dominating appearance.
3/2012/0605/P	Proposed demolition of prefabricated garage followed by the erection of a single storey extension incorporating a garage with utility room – toilet	6 Valley View Grindleton	The proposal by virtue of its scale, design and massing would result in a development that would be totally
Cont/			

<u>Plan No:</u>	<u>Proposal:</u>	<u>Location:</u>	<u>Reasons for Refusal</u>
Cont...	areas and entrance porch. Increased with to existing vehicular access		incongruous to the detriment of the character and setting of the street scene. This would be contrary to Policies G1 and H10 of the Districtwide Local Plan and the Council's adopted SPG on Alterations and Extensions.

CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS FOR A PROPOSED USE OR DEVELOPMENT

<u>Plan No:</u>	<u>Proposal:</u>	<u>Location:</u>
3/2012/0470/P	Application for a Lawful Development Certificate for the proposed use of a holiday cottage adjacent to Woodhouse Gate Farm, as permanent residential accommodation	Woodhouse Gate Farm Catlow Road Slaidburn
3/2012/0546/P	Application for a Lawful Development Certificate for the proposed conversion of the garage into annex accommodation	Pinfold Farm, Preston Road Ribchester

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (GENERAL PERMITTED DEVELOPMENT) ORDER 1995 PARTS 6 & 7 PRIOR NOTIFICATION OF AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY BUILDINGS AND ROADS PRIOR APPROVAL REQUIRED / FURTHER DETAILS REQUIRED

<u>Plan No:</u>	<u>Proposal:</u>	<u>Location:</u>
3/2012/0588/N	Open fronted building with a sloping roof for use as sheep housing	Lane Side Farm, Alston Lane Alston, Preston, PR3 2BN

APPLICATIONS WITHDRAWN

<u>Plan No:</u>	<u>Proposal:</u>	<u>Location:</u>
3/2012/0210/P	General purpose agricultural building for livestock housing and general storage	Back Lane Farm Back Lane Chipping
3/2012/0355/P	4kw solar PV installation to the south facing elevation, 16 x 250 kwh black PV modules, approximately 28m ² roof area	The Bungalow Copster Green
3/2012/0483/P	Demolition of existing garage and stable buildings and replacement with garage building linked to house via glazed porch	Pepper Hill Wiswell
3/2012/0513/P	Retention of new field access	Land off Old Clitheroe Road Stonyhurst

<u>Plan No:</u>	<u>Proposal:</u>	<u>Location:</u>
3/2012/0604/P	Conversion of garage to room, formation of door and improved vehicular access	Austin House Slaidburn Road, Waddington

SECTION 106 APPLICATIONS

<u>Plan No</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Date to Committee</u>	<u>Number of Dwellings</u>	<u>Progress</u>
3/2010/0078P	Old Manchester Offices Whalley New Road Billington	20/5/10	18	With agent and applicants solicitor
3/2010/0929P	Land between 36 & 38 Henthorn Road Clitheroe	14/7/11	8	Signed Legal Agreement received from Applicant
3/2011/0784	Old Whalley Nurseries Clitheroe Road Whalley	12/4/12	6	With Applicant
3/2012/0065	Land off Dale View Billington	24/5/12	12	With Agent
3/2011/1064	Sites off Woone Lane a) rear of 59-97 Woone Lane & b) Land to South-West of Primrose Village phase 1 Clitheroe	21/6/12	113	With applicants solicitor
3/2011/1071	Land at Chapel Hill Longridge	19/7/12	53	Negotiations on going
3/2012/0014	Land adj Greenfield Avenue Low Moor Clitheroe	19/7/12	30	With Planning
3/2012/0379	Primrose Mill Woone Lane Clitheroe	16/8/12	14	Deed of Variation With Legal
<u>Non Housing</u>				
3/2011/0649P	Calder Vale Park Simonstone	15/3/12		Subject to departure procedures so no progress on Section 106
3/2012/0455	Shireburn Caravan Park Edisford Road Waddington	7/8/12		Deed of Variation With Legal

<u>Plan No</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Date to Committee</u>	<u>Time from First Going to Committee to Decision</u>	<u>Number of Dwellings</u>	<u>Progress</u>
3/2011/0776	Land off Whiteacre Lane Barrow	12/4/12	19 weeks	7	Decision 22/8/12

APPEALS UPDATE

<u>Application No:</u>	<u>Date Received:</u>	<u>Applicant/Proposal/Site:</u>	<u>Type of Appeal:</u>	<u>Date of Inquiry/Hearing:</u>	<u>Progress:</u>
3/2011/0300 O	17.1.12	Mr & Mrs Myerscough Outline application for the erection of a country house hotel and spa Land adjacent to Dudland Croft Gisburn Road Sawley	-	Hearing adjourned on 12.7.12	Awaiting response from The Planning Inspectorate
3/2011/0624 D	17.2.12	Mr Ken Dobson Fit secondary glazing (Listed Building Consent) Vicarage House Vicarage Fold Wiswell	WR	-	AWAITING DECISION
3/2011/0567 D	16.3.12	Mr D Ashton Proposed erection of a holiday cottage (Re-submission) Pinfold Cottage Tosside	WR	-	Awaiting site visit
3/2011/0703 O	16.4.12	Mr T Brown Proposed erection of a three-bedroom, two-storey detached dwelling with attached garage (Re-submission of 3/2011/0315P) 43 Hawthorne Place Clitheroe	WR	-	AWAITING DECISION
3/2011/0095 D	11.5.12	Mr & Mrs S Cherry Re-submission of refused application application 3/2010/0002P for two affordable dwellings in garden area of existing house, demolition of outbuilding, realigning of vehicular access to Cherry Hall and removal of part of wall to site Cherry Hall Grindleton	WR	-	AWAITING DECISION

<u>Application No:</u>	<u>Date Received:</u>	<u>Applicant/Proposal/Site:</u>	<u>Type of Appeal:</u>	<u>Date of Inquiry/Hearing:</u>	<u>Progress:</u>
3/2011/0849 D	16.5.12	Mr K Kay Proposed new detached garage, boundary wall, gates and hard landscaping Great Mitton Hall, Mitton Road, Mitton	Householder appeal	—	APPEAL DISMISSED 21.8.12
3/2011/1001 D	30.5.12	Ms Pamela Oliver New detached dwelling within the curtilage of 1 Portfield Bar Whalley	WR	—	Awaiting site visit
3/2011/0025 O	25.6.12	J-J Homes LLP Outline planning application for residential development (ten dwellings) Land off Chatburn Old Road Chatburn	WR	—	Awaiting site visit
3/2012/0158 C	6.7.12	LPA Receiver for Papillion Properties Ltd Outline application for the erection of 73 open market detached dwellings and 31 social housing properties Site 2 Barrow Brook Business Village Barrow	—	Hearing to be held 9.10.12	
3/2011/0729 D	9.7.12	Mrs Joan H Porter Demolition of redundant agricultural sheds. Conversion and extension of existing barns to 1no. new dwelling and improvements to existing access Lawson House Farm Bolton-by-Bowland Road Sawley	WR	—	Awaiting site visit

<u>Application No:</u>	<u>Date Received:</u>	<u>Applicant/Proposal/Site:</u>	<u>Type of Appeal:</u>	<u>Date of Inquiry/Hearing:</u>	<u>Progress:</u>
3/2011/0893 D	10.7.12	Mr F P Cherry Outline application for one dwelling situated in the old car park at Hodder Place Old Car Park Hodder Place Stonyhurst	WR	-	Awaiting site visit
3/2012/0160 D	16.7.12	Mr Ian Scholey Proposed two-storey side extension incorporating kitchen, lounge, two further bedrooms and house bathroom. Single storey rear extension to include downstairs cloaks and utility room. Existing shippon to be demolished 74 Knowsley Road Wilpshire	Householder appeal	-	APPEAL DISMISSED 28.8.12
3/2012/0164 D	15.8.12	Mr J Shaw Proposed garage extension with accommodation in the roof to the Southern gable elevation with dormer to the front and rear roof slope. Proposed dormer to front elevation of main property and single storey lean-to extension to the rear 8 Rogersfield Langho	Householder appeal and Application for costs	-	Notification letter sent 21.8.12 Questionnaire sent 22.8.12 AWAITING DECISION
3/2012/0325 D	17.8.12	Mr Lee Dolman Retrospective application for the insertion of a window to the front gable elevation. Re-submission of application 3/2011/0779P Old Chapel Barn Preston Road Alston	Householder appeal	-	Notification letter sent 23.8.12 Questionnaire sent 24.8.12 AWAITING DECISION

<u>Application No:</u>	<u>Date Received:</u>	<u>Applicant/Proposal/Site:</u>	<u>Type of Appeal:</u>	<u>Date of Inquiry/Hearing:</u>	<u>Progress:</u>
3/2012/0390 O	28.8.12	Mr Julian Hindle, Haydock Developments Ltd Proposed erection of a dwelling Land between 52 & 54 Knowsley Road Wilpshire	WR	-	Notification letter and questionnaire to be sent by 7.9.12 Statement to be sent by 5.10.12

LEGEND

- D – Delegated decision
- C – Committee decision
- O – Overturn