

# RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL

---

please ask for: OLWEN HEAP  
direct line: 01200 414408  
e-mail: olwen.heap@ribblevalley.gov.uk  
my ref: OH/CMS  
your ref:  
date: 31 March 2014

Council Offices  
Church Walk  
CLITHEROE  
Lancashire BB7 2RA

Switchboard: 01200 425111  
Fax: 01200 414488

[www.ribblevalley.gov.uk](http://www.ribblevalley.gov.uk)

Dear Councillor

The next meeting of the **PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE** is at **6.30pm** on **THURSDAY, 10 APRIL 2014** at the **TOWN HALL, CHURCH STREET, CLITHEROE.**

I do hope you can be there.

Yours sincerely

CHIEF EXECUTIVE

To: Committee Members (copy for information to all other members of the Council)  
Directors  
Press  
Parish Councils (copy for information)

## AGENDA

### Part I – items of business to be discussed in public

1. Apologies for absence.
- ✓ 2. To approve the minutes of the last meeting held on 13 February 2014 – copies enclosed.
3. Declarations of Interest (if any).
4. Public Participation (if any).

### DECISION ITEMS

- ✓ 5. Planning Applications – report of Director of Community Services – copy enclosed.
- ✓ 6. Forest of Bowland AONB Management Plan 2014/19 – report of Director of Community Services – copy enclosed.

## INFORMATION ITEMS

- ✓ 7. Consultation Responses to Other Planning Authorities Local Plan Work – report of Director of Community Services – copy enclosed.
- ✓ 8. Building at Risk - Dog Kennels, Gisburne Park - Grade II listed and Grade II Historic Park and Garden – report of Director of Community Services – copy enclosed.
- ✓ 9. Core Strategy Update – report of Director of Community Services – copy enclosed.
- ✓ 10. Appeals:
  - (a) 3/2013/0703/P – Two storey rear extension and dormer and skylights to front elevation at Goose Chase, Preston Road, Ribchester – appeal dismissed.
  - (b) 3/2013/0447/P – Conversion and extension of house to create two dwellings at Bleak House, Stonyhurst – appeal dismissed.
  - (c) 3/2013/0909/P – Conservatory extension to the south elevation at 9 Manor Road, Whalley – appeal dismissed.
  - (d) 3/2013/0793/P – New carport, boundary wall and external landscaping at Great Mitton Hall, Mitton Road, Clitheroe – appeal allowed with conditions.
  - (e) 3/2012/0630/P – Outline permission for up to 504 dwellings (Barrow Lands) at land to the south-west of Barrow and west of Whalley Road, Barrow – appeal allowed with conditions. Application for partial award of costs – granted.
  - (f) Budget Monitoring – report of Director of Resources – copy enclosed.
- 11. Reports from Representatives on Outside Bodies (if any).

## Part II - items of business **not** to be discussed in public

NONE

REVISED INDEX OF APPLICATIONS BEING CONSIDERED MEETING DATE 10 APRIL 2014						
<u>Application No:</u>	<u>Page:</u>		<u>Officer:</u>	<u>Recommendation:</u>	<u>Site:</u>	
<b>A APPLICATIONS REFERRED BACK TO COMMITTEE FOR APPROPRIATE CONDITIONS:</b>						
				NONE		
<b>B APPLICATIONS WHICH THE DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY SERVICES RECOMMENDS FOR APPROVAL:</b>						
3/2014/0132/P	1		CS	AC	Higher House, Higher House Fm Kiln Lane, Paythorne	
3/2014/0148/P	14		JM	AC	AJA Smith Transport Salthill Ind. Estate, Clitheroe	
3/2014/0153/P	17		DR	AC	Unit 6, Up Brooks Industrial Estate, Clitheroe	
3/2014/0154/P	23		JM	AC	Northcote, Northcote Road Langho	
3/2014/0172/P	27		DR	AC	Former LCC Depot Land off Dixon Road, Longridge	
3/2014/0186/P	33		SK	AC	Lamb Roe Cottage Clitheroe Road, Barrow	
<b>Q APPLICATIONS WHICH THE DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY SERVICES RECOMMENDS FOR REFUSAL:</b>						
			SK	NONE		
<b>D APPLICATIONS UPON WHICH COMMITTEE DEFER THEIR APPROVAL SUBJECT TO WORK DELEGATED TO DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY SERVICES BEING SATISFACTORILY COMPLETED</b>						
3/2013/0440/P	Added report		SK	DEFER	Land rear of Pendle Street East Sabden	
<b>E APPLICATIONS IN 'OTHER' CATEGORIES:</b>						
				NONE		

**LEGEND**

AC Approved Conditionally  
R Refused  
M/A Minded to Approve

AD Adrian Dowd  
CB Claire Booth  
CS Colin Sharpe  
DR Daniela Ripa

JM John Macholc  
MB Mark Baldry  
SK Stephen Kilmartin  
SW Sarah Westwood

## RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL REPORT TO PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Agenda Item No

meeting date: THURSDAY, 10 APRIL 2014  
title: PLANNING APPLICATIONS  
submitted by: DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY SERVICES

### PLANNING APPLICATIONS UNDER THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990:

APPLICATION NO: 3/2014/0132/P (GRID REF: SD 382888 352342)  
PROPOSED CREATION OF A STATIC CARAVAN/LODGE PARK WITH 12 STATIC CARAVANS/LODGES, CAR PARKING AND AN INTERNAL ACCESS ROAD AT HIGHER HOUSE, HIGHER HOUSE FARM, KILN LANE, PAYTHORNE

PARISH COUNCIL: The Parish Council object strongly to the proposed development on grounds that are summarised as follows:

1. Visual/Landscape. The existing Twyn Ghyll holiday park is close to the proposed development and large parts of that site are visible, particularly in the winter. Whilst the semi-natural woodland planting stated in the application might help to filter any residual views of the site, the Parish Council would argue that it would be several years before the vegetation on the site is of sufficient height to screen the development from the hamlet of Paythorne. The site would also be visible to the residents of Newsholme who reside in houses along the A682. Any lighting of the internal roads within the site would further exacerbate the visual impact on the landscape. The development of timber lodges will result in long-term changes and there will be a permanent loss of open space, namely an agricultural field, due to the proposed development. Policies ENV3 and G5 of the Local Plan must be considered and there will be a significant visual impact on the local landscape by introducing a degree of urbanisation imposed on an otherwise rural view in the event that this development is approved. Policy RT5 states that development must not take place on land that is susceptible to flooding but it is accepted within the submitted Design and Access Statement that areas of poor drainage are evident within the proposed site. Any lighting of the development would also have an adverse effect on residential amenity from a security point of view.
2. Highway. The proposal would bring more traffic into the hamlet increasing the risk of accidents. Some motorists drive through the hamlet at excessive speeds. On occasions (eg if there is an accident on the A682) the road through Paythorne is used as an access road to Settle. The bridge at the bottom of the hamlet is a

Scheduled Ancient Monument and has been repaired on numerous occasions due to highway accidents. A further caravan development will increase the likelihood of this happening again. At pre-application stage, the County Council Highway Engineer commented that an initial proposal of 14 caravans would result in significant traffic generation for this location. Policy G1 states that developments should be provided with a safe access that is suitable to accommodate the scale and type of traffic likely to be generated. There is no mention in this application that the access to the site is shared by the occupants of Higher House Farm who carry on a farming business and who use the access as safe passage for their animals when they are moving them.

3. Need. NPPF states that Local Planning Authorities should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area but, the Parish Council does not consider there to be a need for a further caravan park in Paythorne as there are numerous such developments within a five mile radius. Whilst section 3 of NPPF does encourage support for the local economy, it is subject to the requirement that developments respect the character of the countryside. In the opinion of the Parish Council, this development does not respect the character of the countryside which is mainly agricultural and open countryside. It is argued in the submitted application documents that the siting of the lodges close to the existing caravan site and public house will become part of a group of existing buildings and will not be seen in isolation. The converse argument could be put forward that this would be an extension of the caravan business that is already overwhelming and well catered for in this area. This proposal could not be justified on the basis of a farm diversification as there is no farm business associated with the applicant. Policy ENV3 states that developments that benefit the area can be allowed in open countryside locations but it is not considered that there will be any benefits to the area or the local community as a result of this proposed development. There are people who live permanently on the Twyn Ghyll site and the same could happen on the proposed development.
4. Size. Policy G1 requires developments to be sympathetic to their locality in terms of size, intensity and nature. Whilst accepting that this is a small site, the Parish Council considers that it is an addition to the caravan industry already introduced in the small hamlet. The Parish Council asks where the developments will stop as they are already overwhelmed with 295 caravans

on the Twyn Ghyll site when there are only 33 households within the Paythorne area with a total of 75 people on the electoral role.

5. Services. Policy G1 requires developments to be provided with adequate arrangements for servicing and public utilities. The people in the hamlet already experience problems with the drop in water pressure due to the caravans at Twyn Ghyll. There have also be experiences of raw sewage in the road due to an inefficient sewage plant in the hamlet.
6. Residential amenity. With more visitors to the area there is an increased risk to privacy and security for the residents of Paythorne.
7. Closing statement. If this development is approved where would development in the area end? Paythorne is a small hamlet that is already overwhelmed by the caravan park at Twyn Ghyll and approval of yet another development will surely open the floodgates for further planning applications within the area. In relation to an application in 2007 for an extension for a further 75 caravans at Twyn Ghyll it was stated that, in landscape terms, a further expansion of the caravan park beyond what is currently proposed would be a matter of concern. Surely this statement has to be applied to the area of Paythorne as a whole.

ENVIRONMENT  
DIRECTORATE  
(COUNTY SURVEYOR):

Originally stated that he had no objections to the proposal subject to an increase in the width of the access road at its junction with Kiln Lane to 5m for a minimum length of 8m measured from the edge of the carriageway of Kiln Lane. This would only entail increasing the width of the surfacing of the access road and not an increase in the distance between the field boundary hedges/fences. In addition, the County Surveyor requested the provision of at least one passing place on the access road.

An amended plan was received on 26 March 2014 that shows the access road widened at its junction with Kiln Lane and the provision of a passing place on the access road both in accordance with the County Surveyor's requirements. The County Surveyor has therefore confirmed that, subject to compliance with the amended plan, he has no objections to the proposed development.

LANCASHIRE COUNTY  
COUNCIL  
(ARCHAEOLOGIST):

Having checked their records, confirms that the application has no significant archaeological implications.

UNITED UTILITIES:

Do not express any objections to the application and make the general points that their records show that there are no known public sewers in the vicinity of the proposed development; and that a separate metered water supply to each unit will be required at the applicant's expense.

ADDITIONAL  
REPRESENTATIONS:

Six letters have been received from nearby residents who express objections to the application on grounds that are summarised as follows:

1. The development will cause further danger to pedestrians on the narrow roads that have blind bends and no footpaths but are already busy with traffic associated with Twyn Ghyll Caravan Park and through traffic.
2. Two vehicles will not be able to pass on the access drive.
3. It is difficult for long vehicles to turn onto the access road from the main road.
4. Visibility in both directions is very poor when exiting the access road.
5. The number of vehicles movements for 12 caravans will be in excess of what is estimated in the application documents.
6. Construction traffic and vehicles bringing the mobile homes to the site would have to use the narrow access track to the site.
7. The caravans will have a negative impact on the landscape. The proposed tree screening is inadequate and should be changed to include more evergreen species.
8. The view from the recently upgraded Pennine Bridle path will be spoilt.
9. The proposal could cause problems for livestock in adjoining fields.
10. Noise nuisance to nearby residents such as music being played and dogs barking.
11. Will the site affect the water and electricity supply of existing residents?
12. NPPF states that Local Planning Authorities should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area; and that Local Plans should meet

objectively assessed needs. The presence of an already well-established caravan park of 290 caravans/lodges with plenty of available free pitches for the new season in 2014 fully caters for the needs for tourism in this small hamlet and as such, no further development of this type is necessary.

13. Is this development truly sustainable? Developments of this type result in the loss of valuable farming land. The very things that attract rural tourism such as peace, tranquillity and open spaces are being permanently removed ironically by the processes which drive people to the countryside in the first place. The effect of this will be felt sadly by future generations.
14. Policy G5 of the Local Plan states that planning permission will only be granted for small-scale developments that are essential to the local economy or the social wellbeing of the area. This development does not provide jobs outside the applicant's family and does not therefore benefit the local economy.
15. Policy RT1 of the Local Plan states that the Council will approve proposed developments that extend the range of tourism and visitor facilities in the borough. This proposal does not appear to offer anything more than is already adequately provided by the existing caravan park at Twyn Ghyll.
16. It is claimed in the application documents that the proposal represents an agricultural diversification. This is not the case because since purchasing the working farm, the applicant has never engaged in any form of farming except for recreationally keeping a few horses in the paddock.
17. The proposal will cause light pollution.
18. Contrary to what is stated in the application documents, the access to the site is not a "private drive" but is a "shared drive" with the working farm at Higher House Farm.

### **Proposal**

Full planning permission is sought for the creation of a development providing 12 timber lodges with associated access road, car parking and landscaping. The lodges would be for holiday use only (which would be controlled by appropriate conditions in the event of planning permission being granted).



The lodges fall within the definition of static caravans in the Caravan Act and are moveable. Each lodge has dimensions of 15.24m x 6.1m (50ft x 20ft) and would be approximately 3m high. Each unit would have a decked area and there would be parking provision for 2 cars adjacent to each unit.

The units would be located around the outside of a looped internal access road.

In the central part of the site area there would be a semi natural amenity space covering approximately 0.5 hectares. This will incorporate a linear wetland area that will facilitate the attenuation of surface water from the site in the form of a Sustained Urban Drainage Scheme (SUDS) whilst also contributing to the natural wetland resources for birdlife and aquatic plant communities within the landscape.

Significant areas of semi-natural woodland planting are proposed around the boundaries of the site.

The proposed development also includes alterations to the existing access road into the site in the form of widening at its junction with Kiln Lane and the provision of a passing place.

### **Site Location**

The application site has an area of approximately 3.47 hectares and forms part of the land associated with Higher House, Higher Farm. It is located to the northwest of the group of farm buildings that comprise the farmhouse and various agricultural buildings. There is also a barn that has been converted to form a separate dwelling plus two recently built safe catering holiday homes that had been constructed on the site of a former dilapidated agricultural building.

The main part of the application site comprises a parcel of semi-improved agricultural pasture that is characterised by a gently rolling landform. The pasture is bounded by timber post and wire fencing which, for the most part is located adjacent to boundary hedges where mature trees and remnant hedgerows also reinforce the boundary. The application site also includes the existing access to Higher House as this will be the means of access to the proposed development.

The site is within the Open Countryside as designated in the Local Plan but it is outside and several kilometres away from the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The site is located approximately 0.4km to the north of the village of Paythorne, which is in turn approximately 3.5km north of Gisburn.

### **Relevant History**

3/2009/0061/P – Proposed conversion of agricultural building to holiday cottage and replacement of existing agricultural building with two new build holiday cottages. Approved with conditions.

3/2011/1046/P – Proposed variation of condition number 14 of permission 3/2009/0061/P to allow the barn conversion holiday let to be capable of unrestricted residential occupation, but with the two new build units remaining as holiday lets. Approved.

## **Relevant Policies**

### *Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan*

Policy G1 - Development Control.

Policy G5 - Settlement Strategy.

Policy ENV3 - Development in Open Countryside.

Policy ENV7 - Species Protection.

Policy ENV10 - Nature Conservation.

Policy ENV13 - Landscape Protection.

Policy RT1 - General Recreation and Tourism Policy.

Policy RT5 - New Static Caravan Sites and Extensions to Existing Sites.

### *Core Strategy Regulation 22 Submission Draft – Post Submission Version (including proposed main changes)*

Policy DMG1 – General Considerations.

Policy DMG2 – Strategic Considerations.

Policy DME2 – Landscape and Townscape Protection.

Policy DME3 – Site and Species Protection and Conservation.

Policy DMB1 – Supporting Business Growth and the Local Economy.

Policy DMB3 – Recreation and Tourism Development.

### *National Planning Policy Framework*

Section 3 – Supporting a Prosperous Rural Economy.

## **Environmental, AONB, Human Rights and Other Issues**

The matters for consideration in the determination of this application relate to the principle of the development and the effects of the proposal upon visual amenity/landscape, wildlife/ecology, residential amenity and highway safety. These matters are discussed below under appropriate headings.

### **The Principle of the Development**

The principle of the proposal needs to first be considered in relation to the advice comprised in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The basic intention of NPPF is the achievement of sustainable development. Section 3 of NPPF relates to supporting a prosperous rural economy. Paragraph 28 advises Local Planning Authorities to support economic growth in rural areas in order to create jobs and prosperity by taking a positive approach to sustainable new development. To promote a strong rural economy, Authorities should:

- support the sustainable growth and expansion of all types of business and enterprise in rural areas, both through conversion of existing buildings and well-designed new buildings;
- promote the development and diversification of agricultural and other land based rural businesses;
- support sustainable rural tourism and leisure developments that benefit businesses in rural areas, communities and visitors, and which respect the character of the countryside. This should include supporting the provision and expansion of tourist and visitor facilities in appropriate locations where identified needs are not met by existing facilities in rural service centres;

- promote the retention and development of local services and community facilities and villages such as local shops, meeting places, sports venues, cultural buildings, public houses and places of worship.

The application relates to part of a former agricultural enterprise that has recently diversified into tourism in the form of two existing holiday cottages. This application therefore relates to an expansion of that existing tourism use. I consider that the proposal would result in increased business for local shops, public houses, restaurants etc for the general benefit of the local rural economy. The proposal, in my opinion, therefore satisfies the basic intention of NPPF to support a prosperous rural economy.

Saved Policy RT1 of the Local Plan states that the Council will approve development proposals which extend the range of tourism and visitor facilities in the Borough subject to a number of criteria being satisfied. Policy DMB3 in the emerging Core Strategy carries forward the general presumption in favour of tourism/visitor related proposals, again subject to compliance with the same criteria.

I consider that the proposed development does comply with the general stated intentions of Policies RT1 and DMB3 such that the proposed development is considered, purely as a matter of principle, to be acceptable.

The criteria that need to be satisfied under these Policies are as follows:

1. The proposal must not conflict with other Policies of the Plan.
2. The proposal must be physically well related to an existing main settlement or village or to an existing group of buildings, except where the proposed facilities are required in conjunction with a particular countryside attraction and there are no suitable existing buildings or developed sites available.
3. The development should not undermine the character, quality or visual amenities of the plan area by virtue of its scale, siting, materials or design.
4. The proposals should be well related to the existing highway network. It should not generate additional traffic movements of a scale and type likely to cause undue problems or disturbance. Where possible the proposals should be well related to the public transport network.
5. The site should be large enough to accommodate the necessary car parking, service areas and appropriate landscaped areas.
6. The proposal must take into account any nature conservation impacts using suitable survey information and where possible seek to incorporate any important existing associations within the development. Failing this then adequate mitigation will be sought.

These are therefore the detailed considerations that are relevant to this application and that will be discussed under appropriate headings below. In principle, however, the proposal is considered to be acceptable when considered in relation to NPPF, the Local Plan and the emerging Core Strategy.

## Effects Upon the Landscape/Visual Amenity

Criteria 2 and 3 of RT1/DMB3 fall to be considered under this heading.

I consider that the proposal is well related to the existing group of buildings at Higher House/Higher House Farm that includes an existing tourism element in the two holiday cottages. It is also in the general vicinity of the existing much larger caravan development at Twyn Ghyll. As such, I consider the proposal to satisfy criterion 2.

With regards to criterion 3, the application documents include a report entitled "Assessment of Effects on Landscape and Visual Amenity". At the end of a thorough and detailed report, it is concluded that "no significant landscape or visual effects have been identified as a result of the proposed timber lodge development and overall it is considered to be a relatively subtle intervention in the landscape. Its scale, siting and associated landscape mitigation measures are deemed acceptable with some benefits in terms of landscape character and resource". The Council's Countryside Officer has studied the submitted report and does not disagree with its findings and conclusions.

A Design and Access Statement has also been submitted with the application. This includes sections under headings "Existing Landscape Context", "Landscape Proposals" and "Planting Proposals" and also contains detailed schedules relating to semi-natural woodland planting and individually planted trees. The planting proposals are shown in detail on one of the submitted application plans.

It is stated in the Design and Access Statement that the application site consists of semi-improved agricultural pasture and is largely characterised by a gently rolling landform. It is stated that the pasture is bounded by timber post and wire fencing which, for the most part, is located on hedge banks where mature trees and remnant hedgerows also reinforce the boundary.

It is stated that the immediate surrounding landscape has a rural character and generally comprises agricultural pastures, usually long and narrow in shape which are divided by hedgerows, remnant hedgerows and large mainly Ash mature hedgerow trees.

The proposed landscaping scheme includes significant areas of semi-natural woodland planting on the boundaries of the site.

The Council's Countryside Officer has given detailed consideration to all the submitted documents and plans relating to planting. He considers this element of the proposal to be acceptable as it would appropriately screen the proposed development.

With regards to the effects of the proposal on the landscape, the Countryside Officer therefore has no objections to the proposed development. As case officer for the application, and having visited the site, I have no reasons to disagree with the conclusions of the Countryside Officer. I therefore consider, overall that, subject to the implementation of the proposed landscape planting scheme, the proposed development would not have any unduly detrimental effects upon visual amenity. As such, I consider that the proposal satisfies the requirements of criterion 3 of Policies RT1 and DMB3.

## Effects Upon Wildlife/Ecology

An Ecological Appraisal has been submitted with the application. This includes the findings of appropriate surveys relating to vegetation and habitats, badgers, bats, birds, brown hare, invertebrates and reptiles.

At the end of a very comprehensive report, the following mitigation/recommendations are made:

1. In relation to compensatory planting and habitat enhancement, the roots of significant trees on the site boundary should be adequately protected during work in accordance with industry standards; the landscaping scheme should utilize plants which are wildlife friendly, in particular night flowering species would be beneficial to bats; linear lines of vegetation could be incorporated into the site boundaries; and areas of scrub/shrub should be extended from the site boundaries into the development area to create larger foraging areas for bats.
2. With regards to badgers, no mitigation for this species is required as the surveys have concluded that badger activity is unlikely to occur at or near to the site.
3. In relation to bats, it is concluded that there is no potential for bats to roost on the site, as existing trees are all outside the site boundaries, but bats may forage along the boundaries of the site. Whilst there is already some artificial lighting from houses in the local area, additional external floodlighting of the site should be minimised. Any external lighting at the site should be directed downwards only. In particular light spill onto the trees should be avoided. A screen of vegetation should be retained around the site perimeter in order to ensure that darker suitable commuting and foraging groups will still occur over and around the site.
4. In relation to birds, nesting by birds within the development area is considered unlikely to occur although birds may nest within trees on the site boundaries. Any scrub or ruderal vegetation to be trimmed or cleared should be checked for nesting birds before they are removed. Ideally this should occur outside the bird nesting period March to September. If scrub clearance is to occur in the March to September period a check for nesting birds should be conducted first by a suitably qualified individual. If nesting birds are found at the site all works must cease and further ecological advice must be obtained with a view to a detailed method statement and programme of mitigation measures being prepared and implemented.
5. In relation to brown hares, the incorporation of shrub/scrub planting within the site would provide daytime refuges for the species, particularly in winter when site activity by holiday makers would be reduced. An impact on significant foraging areas is unlikely to occur.
6. In relation to invertebrates landscaping should include native or wildlife friendly species including night flowering plants.
7. With regards to reptiles there is no requirement for specific mitigation measures for these species. However, as a precautionary measure, in the unlikely event that any signs of any reptile activities are subsequently found, all site works must cease and further ecological advice must be obtained with a view to a detailed method statement and programme of mitigation measures being prepared and implemented.

Subject to compliance with the recommendations/mitigation measures in the report, the Countryside Officer has no objections to the application in relation to this particular consideration.

I have no reasons to question the findings of the Ecological Appraisal or their acceptance by the Countryside Officer. As such, I consider that, subject to appropriate mitigation measures, the proposal will satisfy the requirements of criterion 6 of Policies RT1 and DMB3.

### Residential Amenity

The nearest dwelling to the site that is not in the applicant's ownership is Higher House Farm. This property, however, would be screened from the proposed holiday lodges by existing building at Higher House and by existing and proposed natural screening. Due to this screening and the distance between the site and that nearest neighbouring dwelling, I do not consider that the proposal would have any unduly detrimental effects upon the amenities of any nearby residents.

### Highway Safety

The County Surveyor does not consider that the amount of traffic associated with the proposal would have an undue impact on the local highway network. He expressed no objections to the application subject to certain alterations to the existing access road into the site. Those required alterations have been shown on an amended plan. The appropriate level of parking (ie 2 spaces per unit) is to be provided within the development.

There are therefore no highway safety objections to the proposal; and, in my opinion, criteria 4 and 5 of Policies RT1 and DMB3 are satisfied.

### Conclusion

Overall, it is considered that the application relates to an appropriate tourism related development that would support the rural economy as required by NPPF and would not result in any seriously detrimental effects upon any of the relevant interests as described in this report. It is therefore considered that permission should be granted subject to appropriate conditions.

One of the required conditions will specify that the units shall be occupied for holiday purposes only. In accordance with the Good Practice Guide on Planning for Tourism (2006) and also to be consistent with numerous decisions recently made by this Council in relation to holiday occupancy conditions, the condition will not specify a closure period.

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 development as shown on Drawings Numbers 728.200 D, 728.201A, 728.202, SWE-V6-2013-01-25 REV5, DAS-16-05-13-V4 REV3, and

Gre/304/1505/03 REVA (amended plan received by the Local Planning Authority on 26 March 2014)

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

3. The terms of occupancy of the 12 caravans/lodges hereby permitted shall be as follows:
  - (i) The caravans/lodges shall be occupied for holiday purposes only.
  - (ii) The caravans/lodges shall not be occupied as a person's sole or main place of residence.
  - (iii) The owners/operators shall maintain an up to date register of the names of all owners/occupiers of the individual caravans/lodges, and of their main home address, and shall make this information available at all reasonable times to the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: In accordance with the requirements of Policies G1 and RT5 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan and Policies DMG2 and DMB3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy Regulation 22 Submission Draft - Post Submission Version (including proposed main changes). In order to ensure that the approved holiday accommodation is not used for unauthorised permanent residential accommodation. The register required in 3 above shall normally be collected by the caravan site licence holder or his/her nominated person.

4. Prior to the commencement of development, details of the precise colour finish of the timber walls and the colour and profile of the roof tiles of the caravans/lodges shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, there shall be no alterations to the external colour finishes of the units without the prior written permission of the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: In the interests of visual amenity and to comply with Policy G1 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan and Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy Regulation 22 Submission Draft - Post Submission Version (including proposed main changes).

5. Prior to the first use of any of the caravans/lodges hereby permitted, the access into the site shall be widened to 5m for a minimum distance of 8m from the highway edge of Kiln Lane and a passing place shall have been provided to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority in accordance with the details shown on Drawing Number Gre/304/1505/03 REVA. Thereafter, the widened access and passing place shall be permanently retained clear of any obstruction to their designated use and purpose.

REASON: In the interests of highway safety and to comply with Policy G1 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan and Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy Regulation 22 Submission Draft - Post Submission Version (including proposed main changes).

6. Prior to commencement of any site works including delivery of building materials and excavations for foundations or services all existing trees on the boundaries of the site shall be protected in accordance with the BS5837 2012 [Trees in Relation to Construction] the details of which shall be agreed in writing and implemented in full under the supervision of a

qualified arboriculturalist and in liaison with the Countryside/Tree Officer. A tree protection - monitoring schedule shall be agreed and tree protection measures inspected by the local planning authority before any site works are begun. The root protection/exclusion zone shall remain in place until all building work has been completed and all excess materials have been removed from site including soil/spoil and rubble. During the building works no excavations or changes in ground levels shall take place and no building materials/spoil/soil/rubble shall be stored or redistributed within the protection/exclusion zone, in addition no impermeable surfacing shall be constructed within the protection zone. No tree surgery or pruning shall be implemented without prior written consent, which will only be granted when the local authority is satisfied that it is necessary is in accordance with BS3998 for tree work and carried out by an approved arboricultural contractor.

REASON: In order to ensure that any trees affected by the development that are considered to be of visual, historic or botanical value are afforded maximum physical protection from the potential adverse effects of development in order to comply with Policies G1 and ENV13 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan and Policies DMG1 and DME2 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy Regulation 22 Submission Draft - Post Submission Version (including proposed main changes).

7. The submitted landscaping scheme (Drawing Number 728.201 A) shall be implemented in the first planting season following occupation or use of the development and shall be maintained thereafter for a period of not less than 5 years to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority. This maintenance shall include the replacement of any tree or shrub that is removed, or dies, or is seriously damaged, or becomes seriously diseased, by a species of similar size to those originally planted.

REASON: In the interests of the amenity of the area and to comply with Policy G1 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan and Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy Regulation 22 Submission Draft - Post Submission Version (including proposed main changes).

8. Precise details of the surface material for the internal access road shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of development.

REASON: In the interests of visual amenity and to comply with Policy G1 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan and Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy Regulation 22 Submission Draft - Post Submission Version (including proposed main changes).

9. Precise details of the height, type and location of any external lighting installations shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to their installation at the site. Thereafter, there should be no alterations to the approved details without the prior written permission of the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: In the interests of visual amenity and to comply with Policy G1 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan and Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy Regulation 22 Submission Draft - Post Submission Version (including proposed main changes).



10. There should be no extensions or alterations to the holiday caravans/lodges hereby permitted, and no additional structures (including walls, fences, sheds or additional raised decking areas) shall be constructed unless a further planning permission has first been granted in respect thereof.

REASON: In the interests of visual amenity and to comply with Policy G1 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan and Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy Regulation 22 Submission Draft - Post Submission Version (including proposed main changes).

11. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in complete accordance with the recommendations and mitigation measures comprised in Section 7 of the Ecological Appraisal by Envirotech (report no 1654 dated 1 July 2013) that was submitted with the application.

REASON: In the interests of protecting the ecology of the site in accordance with the requirements of Policy ENV10 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan and Policy DME3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy Regulation 22 Submission Draft – Post Submission Version (including proposed main changes).

APPLICATION NO: 3/2014/0148/P (GRID REF: SD 7555 4257)  
PROPOSED ERECTION OF PHASED REAR EXTENSION OF EXISTING INDUSTRIAL BUILDING AND ALTERATIONS TO EXISTING VEHICULAR DOOR OPENINGS ON EXISTING BUILDINGS AT AJA SMITH TRANSPORT LTD AND DELI SOLUTIONS, SALTHILL INDUSTRIAL ESTATE, LINCOLN WAY, CLITHEROE

- TOWN COUNCIL: No objections.
- COUNTY SURVEYOR (HIGHWAYS): Initial concerns regarding the need for transport assessment but on the basis of additional information, no objection.
- ENVIRONMENT AGENCY: No observations received at the time of preparing this report.
- NATURAL ENGLAND: No objections.
- LANCASHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL (ECOLOGY): No objections to the proposal but suggest the views of Natural England be requested.

**Proposal**

This application seeks detailed planning permission for the extension of the business known as Deli Solutions into the adjoining industrial building occupied by AJA Smith Transport as well as an extension at the rear of the building. The proposal incorporates the extension into the adjacent industrial building which will have some minor changes to the design elevation as well as an extension planned over two phases which will provide an additional 2,600m<sup>2</sup> of gross internal floor space.

The first phase would be at the rear of the building known as Steadplan building; there would be approximately 1,150m<sup>2</sup> internal floor space. The ridge height of the proposed extension will be

approximately 9m at the maximum with the extension stepping down as it follows the site boundary to the lowest ridge of approximately 7.5m. The extension is at the rear of the main building and would be in excess of the full width of the building as phase 1 of the extension would project approximately 40m and encroach towards the eastern part of the Salthill SSSI. Due to the constraints of the site boundary the extension is staggered and tapers towards the adjoining Farmhouse Fayre building. The maximum depth of the extension would be 22m and goes to approximately 5m on the southern part of the site.

The proposed materials would be similar to the existing building and be of a portal frame design with bare-face block work to a height of approximately 2.7m with metal cladding to the upper walls and roof. The proposed material colours would be a Merlin Grey for the roof and a Goose Wing Grey for the walling material.

The proposal as amended would provide for existing vehicular access points for in and out only and 85 car parking spaces, cycle and motor bike provision located predominantly on the site frontage. The turning facilities would be within the existing concrete or tarmac apron.

### **Site Location**

The site is located within the existing Clitheroe industrial estate off Lincoln Way and on both the eastern and southern site of the boundary adjacent to the Crosshill Quarry SSSI.

### **Relevant History**

None specific to this application.

### **Relevant Policies**

*Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan*

Policy G1 - Development Control.

Policy G2 - Settlement Strategy.

Policy ENV8 - Sites of Special Scientific Interest.

Policy EMP7 - Extensions/Expansions of Existing Firms.

Policy T1 - Development Proposals - Transport Implications.

*Ribble Valley Core Strategy Regulation 22 Submission Draft – Post Submission Version  
(including proposed main changes)*

Key Statement DS1 – Development Strategy.

Key Statement DM12 – Transport Considerations.

Policy DMG1 – General Considerations.

Policy DMG2 – Strategic Considerations.

Policy DMG3 – Transport Mobility.

Policy DME3 – Site and Species Protection and Conservation.

Policy DMB1 – Supporting Business Growth and the Local Economy.

### **Environmental, AONB, Human Rights and Other Issues**

#### **Principle**

Planning applications are required to be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. It is clear that this proposal is located within

the main industrial area of Clitheroe and that the use itself is considered to be acceptable. It is within the main settlement of Clitheroe so it is in a relatively sustainable location for the expansion of existing firms, it is also relevant to have regard to the promotion and wellbeing of existing businesses.

I am of the opinion that this proposal is acceptable in relation to the principle and would not lead to any adverse impacts in relation to the strategy contained within the Council's key documents.

### Highway

There has been no observations received from Lancashire County Council Highway Authority and I am of the opinion that given the location within the main industrial area that it is situated in Clitheroe, it would not lead to any issues regarding sustainable transport criteria. It should also be noted that the existing haulage business would have resulted in larger vehicular movements than the current proposal. I consider that adequate parking facilities exist within the site and both the egress and that the site gives adequate visibility in relation to access and egress from the site.

### Residential Amenity

There are no residential properties in the vicinity and as such, no impact is caused by this development other than possible intrusion caused by activities in close proximity to the public footpath. However, having regard to the previous development and the distance away from the footpath I do not consider that this would be a material consideration that would result in any significant harm.

### Landscape and Visual Impact

The proposal itself is relatively self-contained and due to the topography of the site the extensions will not be readily visible other than from the footpath which borders the site. I do not consider that the resultant increase in footprint would cause any significant harm in relation to visual amenity impact. The extension will be seen against the main backdrop of the existing building.

### Ecology

In relation to the ecology issues it is noted that there has been no objection from Lancashire County Council who are of the opinion that the impacts are unlikely to result in significant ecological impacts. It is noted that the site is adjacent to Salthill Quarry Biological Heritage Site and the Salthill, Bellman Park Quarries SSI and Salthill Quarry Nature Reserve. In their consideration they do not object to the planning application.

### Planning Balance

I am satisfied that the benefits of securing additional employment use on this site and a limited visual impact or harm to ecology would mean that it is correct to recommend approval to the scheme.

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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in complete accordance with submitted plans: Drawing references 4436-14B (as amended 17/3/14), 4436-18, 4436-11 and Transport Statement dated 14/3/14 and materials specified in letter and drawings dated 17/3/14.

REASON: For the avoidance of doubt.

3. This permission shall relate to the contamination report submitted with the application. If, during development contamination not previously identified was found to be present on the site, then no further development shall be carried out until the developer has submitted a remediation strategy to the Local Planning Authority with measures agreed and implemented.

REASON: To protect the water environment from contamination and to comply with Policy G1 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan and Policy DMG1 of the Core Strategy Regulation 22 Submission Draft – Post Submission Version (including proposed main changes).

4. Notwithstanding any details on the approved plans no development shall commence on the extension or engineering works relating to the car parking areas, until a scheme for the disposal of foul and surface waters has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: To prevent the increased risk of flooding and pollution and to comply with Policy G1 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan and Policy DMG1 of the Core Strategy Regulation 22 Submission Draft – Post Submission Version (including proposed main changes).

APPLICATION NO: 3/2014/0153 (GRID REF: SD 375015 441982)  
RETROSPECTIVE APPLICATION FOR CHANGE OF USE FROM B1 LIGHT INDUSTRY TO FITNESS STUDIO (SUI GENERIS) AT UNIT 6 UP BROOKS BROOKSIDE INDUSTRIAL UNITS TAYLOR STREET CLITHEROE BB7 1NL

CLITHEROE TOWN COUNCIL: Assume that all concerns raised by local residents when the original application was submitted have been addressed.

ENVIRONMENT DIRECTORATE (COUNTY SURVEYOR): A maximum of 8 parking spaces should be provided and marked on site for sole use of the gym. Parking space 6 should be omitted from the plans as it would restrict access to parking space 5.

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS: Five letters of objection have been received from the occupants of neighbouring properties. The main concerns raised are:

- The units have not been constructed for these purposes – there

- is no soundproofing and noise carries loudly
- The application will not address the issue of noise disturbance – the report only includes estimates of anticipate noise reduction and does not state whether the measures would be sufficient
  - The unit operated with doors and windows open last summer and classes were instructed outside, offering no noise control
  - Noise at unsociable hours – raised voices, loud music, thumping of weights and equipment, noises from people exerting themselves, traffic and raised voices outside the unit as people arrive and leave, loud hissing from compressed air
  - The use causes more noise than the existing businesses combined
  - Increased traffic at unsociable hours
  - Disturbance when trying to sleep, when children are trying to concentrate on homework, unable to enjoy a family meal without being disturbed, being woken in the morning by shouting and loud music
  - The applicant has altered the forecourt of the premises
  - The area is primarily residential and the occupants should be afforded consideration. Residents should be entitled to peace and quiet at night and weekends
  - Police have been called to deal with excessive noise late and night and early in the morning
  - Noise disturbance is affecting quality of life, causing stress and tension
  - Noise can be heard from rear facing rooms when windows are closed, when windows are open noise can be heard throughout the house
  - Gym has a yard to the front that could be used for outside exercise offering no sound resistance, particularly now the days are getting lighter

### **Proposal**

Planning permission is sought retrospectively for the change of use of the light industrial unit (Use Class B1/B8) to a fitness studio (sui generis). The studio is known as 'The Unit' and operates fitness classes such as spin, circuits and Zumba. The use has been operating since August 2013. Planning permission was refused in January 2014 for the retrospective change of use, which is resulting in undue noise disturbance to neighbouring residential properties.

The opening hours sought by the applicant are 06:00-21:00 Monday to Friday and 07:00-14:00 Saturdays. The unit would be closed on Sundays and bank holidays.

### **Site Location**

Upbrooks Industrial Estate is located at the eastern end of Taylor Street where it becomes Up Brooks road. There are 7 units within this part of the industrial estate to the south of Up Brooks and the application relates to the middle unit within a row of 3 adjacent to the southern boundary of the estate. This row of units is adjoined to the south by the rear gardens of properties at Bracken Hey, with No's 33 and 35 Bracken Hey immediately to the rear of unit 6.

Planning permission was granted in February 2011 (3/2010/0917) for the erection of a sixth industrial unit within Brookside Industrial Estate and this unit has subsequently been subdivided. This application relates to one of the units, the authorised use of which is B1 (light industrial) and B8 (storage and distribution). There are now seven units in total in this part of the industrial estate.

### **Relevant History**

3/2013/0920 – Retrospective application for change of use from B1 light industry to fitness studio (sui generis) – Refused 20/01/2014.

Reason for refusal:

1. The use, by reason of noise disturbance, is resulting in serious harm to the amenity that the occupants of neighbouring residential properties should reasonably expect to enjoy and this harm is having a significant adverse impact on the health and quality of life of these occupants. The proposal is therefore contrary to the NPPF, Policy G1 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan and Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy (Regulation 22 Submission Draft Post Submission Version Including Proposed Main Changes).

3/2010/0917 - Resubmission of proposed industrial building ref: 3/2009/0162P (retrospective) – Approved with conditions 25/02/2011.

3/2009/0162 - Resubmission of application 3/2008/0939/P for proposed erection of a steel portal framed building for light industrial use – Approved with conditions 31/07/2009.

3/2008/0939 - Proposed erection of a steel portal framed building for light industrial use – Refused 19/12/2008.

### **Relevant Policies**

*Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan*

Policy G1 - Development Control

Policy EMP11 – Loss of Employment Land

Policy T7 - Parking Provision

*Ribble Valley Core Strategy Regulation 22 Submission Draft – Post Submission Version (Including Proposed Main Changes)*

Key Statement DMI2 – Transport Considerations

Key Statement EC1 – Business and Employment Development.

Policy DMB1 – Supporting Business Growth and the Local Economy

Policy DMG1 – General Considerations

Policy DMG2 – Strategic Considerations

Policy DMB1 – Supporting Business Growth and the Local Economy

Policy EC1 – Business and Economic Development

## **Environmental, AONB, Human Rights and Other Issues**

### **Principle**

The authorised use of the unit is B1 (business) and B8 (storage and distribution). Uses within Class B1 are defined by the Use Classes Order 1987 as uses that can be carried out in a residential area without detriment to the amenity of that area by reason of noise, vibration, smell, fumes, smoke, soot, ash, dust or grit.

Planning permission is sought for the change of use of the unit from Use Class B1/B8 to a fitness facility (sui generis). The principle of the change of use is normally dependent on considerations such as the loss of business floorspace and adequacy of off-road car parking. The unit the subject of the application backs onto residential properties to the rear, hence in addition to these considerations, the principle of the change of use would therefore be dependent on whether or not the use could operate without detriment to the amenity of the area.

The application form states that the unit has been vacant since it was constructed. Whilst no evidence has been provided to demonstrate attempts to market the unit, I consider that it would be unreasonable to refuse the application on the loss of business floor space, given the restricted size of the unit. The employment benefits of the proposed use are likely to be comparable to the existing use.

### **Amenity**

The unit is adjoined to the south by the rear gardens of properties at Bracken Hey, with No's 33 and 35 Bracken Hey immediately to the rear of unit 6. The residential properties are sited on raised ground sloping away from the ground level at the unit. The unit itself is situated approximately 3m from the boundary with these properties and there are a row of deciduous trees the subject of a tree preservation order along the common boundary.

The unit is a typical steel frame portal construction with a single entrance door and roller shutter door to the front elevation and a fire exit door to the rear. Internally, there are full height solid block walls between the unit and those adjoining, however the front and rear walls of the unit do not benefit from full height solid block walls, as the solid wall terminates approximately 2.5m above the internal floor level. The construction therefore offers little sound attenuation, with noise able to break out from the front and rear walls and the roof of the unit. The noise assessments undertaken by the applicant and the Council's Environmental Health Officer demonstrate that the use of the unit is resulting in noise disturbance to the occupants of neighbouring residential properties. The nature of the noise varies dependent upon the activity being undertaken within the unit but neighbouring residents identify this noise as raised voices including those of the instructors, noise from amplified music, thumping of weights and equipment, noises from people exerting themselves, traffic, raised voices outside the unit as people arrive and leave and the hissing of compressed air.

Residents should clearly be able to enjoy peace and quietude in the confines of their property, particularly during the early morning and late evening when residential areas are expected to be quiet. During the summer months, residents would sit out in the garden and windows would be open – it would clearly be unreasonable to permit a level of noise that would render a private garden unusable during times when the use is operating, or would result in the need for windows to be closed to prevent noise disturbance occurring.

I am also mindful of the residents' perception of the noise disturbance – the persistent and intermittent nature of the noise, in particular the raised voices of the instructors and noise disturbance at times when residential areas are expected to be quiet, could increase residents' perception of noise. This includes people arriving and leaving early in the morning and late in the evening, with noise from people conversing outside the building, from car doors being slammed and engines starting.

The applicant has submitted a design and access statement which includes a noise report from an acoustic consultant. The report notes that noise escape from the roof is most unlikely to be significant compared through escape through the back wall. The report identifies that the main escape of noise is through the back wall and the most effective method of noise reduction would be to create an additional wall internally in front of the existing rear wall and block the rear access door. The applicant proposes to undertake these works, along with other works recommended by the acoustic consultant.

As no physical works are proposed to the roof of the unit, there remains a degree of uncertainty about whether the proposed measures would adequately reduce noise breakout to an acceptable level. In view of this, the head of environmental health recommends that planning permission should only be granted for a temporary period to allow the measures to be installed and noise monitoring to take place to assess the effectiveness of the proposals. It is considered reasonable to allow the applicant a period of 28 days from the date of the permission in which to complete the noise proposals identified in the design and access statement. A temporary permission for six months would offer a reasonable time within which noise monitoring could be undertaken by the applicant under the supervision of the environmental health officers to assess the effectiveness of the proposals.

In respect of opening hours, the hours sought by the applicant are 06:00-21:00 Monday to Friday and 07:00-14:00 Saturdays. The head of environmental health has advised that the opening hours should be restricted until the measures proposed have been implemented and the monitoring demonstrates that the measures are effective. As such, I consider the permitted opening hours should be 08:00-19:00 Monday to Friday and 08:00-14:00 Saturdays. If the proposed measures are proven to be effective, extended opening hours could be considered as part of a future application.

### **Highways and Parking**

The local highway authority advise that a maximum of 8 car parking spaces would be required. The applicant has submitted a car parking plan showing 12 car parking spaces to the front of the unit, however parking space 6 would restrict access to space 5 and as such would need to be omitted. A condition is recommended to require a maximum of 8 car parking spaces to be allocated and marked on site for the sole use by unit 6. Subject to this condition, the local highway authority consider the proposal to be acceptable in respect of parking and highway safety. Cycles are proposed to be stored within the building.

### **Conclusion**

The applicant proposes to undertake physical works to the unit and implement management measures to mitigate and reduce noise to prevent undue noise disturbance to neighbouring residential properties. Noise levels would be monitored under the supervision of the head of environmental health to assess the effectiveness of these measures. As such, it is recommended that planning permission be granted for a limited period to allow the proposed



measures to be implemented and to allow monitoring to be undertaken to assess whether the measures sufficiently reduce noise at the nearest sensitive receptors.

RECOMMENDATION: That planning permission be GRANTED for a temporary period subject to the following conditions:

1. This permission is granted for a limited period expiring on 31<sup>st</sup> October 2014; the use hereby permitted shall be discontinued at or before the expiration of the period specified in this condition.

REASON: To allow the local planning authority to monitor the use following implementation of the measures proposed by the applicant, in the interests of the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring residential dwellings, having regards to Policy G1 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan, Policy DMG1 of the Core Strategy (Regulation 22 Submission Draft Post Submission Version Including Proposed Main Changes) and the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans, drawing reference numbers 4492-02A (Proposed Plans, Elevations and Site Plan); unless otherwise required by condition of this permission.

REASON: To clarify the permission.

3. Within 28 days of the date of this permission, the proposed mitigation measures shall be implemented in complete accordance with the Design and Access Statement (version 1.01 dated 18<sup>th</sup> February 2014) to achieve the anticipated reduction in noise levels at the site boundary. Following the completion of the works, noise measurements shall be taken by a suitable qualified acoustic consultant appointed by the applicant under the supervision of the Council's Environmental Health Officer, the results of which shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The noise level at the site boundary with the nearest sensitive receptor shall not exceed 35dB at any time or 5dB above existing background levels, whichever is the higher.

REASON: In order to safeguard nearby residential amenity, having regards to Policy G1 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan, Policy DMG1 of the Core Strategy (Regulation 22 Submission Draft Post Submission Version Including Proposed Main Changes) and the National Planning Policy Framework.

4. The use hereby permitted shall operate in complete accordance with the Design and Access Statement (version 1.01 dated 18<sup>th</sup> February 2014) unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

REASON: In order to safeguard nearby residential amenity, having regards to Policy G1 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan, Policy DMG1 of the Core Strategy (Regulation 22 Submission Draft Post Submission Version Including Proposed Main Changes) and the National Planning Policy Framework.

5. The use of the premises in accordance with this permission shall be restricted to the hours between 0800-1900 Monday to Friday, 0800-1400 on Saturdays. The use shall not be carried out at any time on Sundays and Bank Holidays.

REASON: In order to safeguard nearby residential amenity, having regards to Policy G1 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan, Policy DMG1 of the Core Strategy (Regulation 22 Submission Draft Post Submission Version Including Proposed Main Changes) and the National Planning Policy Framework.

6. Within 14 days of the date of this permission, a maximum of 8 car parking spaces shall be marked on site for the sole use of unit 6 in accordance with the submitted site plan (drawing reference 4492-02A) with the exception of car parking space 6, which shall be omitted. Thereafter, the parking spaces shall be retained at all times for the parking of vehicles unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

REASON: To ensure adequate parking provision is retained for the parking of vehicles associated with the use in accordance with Policy T7 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan and Policy DMG1 of the Core Strategy (Regulation 22 Submission Draft Post Submission Version Including Proposed Main Changes).

7. All doors and windows shall be closed when the premises are in use and no classes or fitness instruction shall take place outside the building at any time.

REASON: In order to safeguard nearby residential amenity, having regards to Policy G1 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan, Policy DMG1 of the Core Strategy (Regulation 22 Submission Draft Post Submission Version Including Proposed Main Changes) and the National Planning Policy Framework.

APPLICATION NO: 3/2014/0154/P (GRID REF: SD 7862 3487)  
PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW BEDROOM LODGE BUILDING WITH GUEST BEDROOMS AND ACCESS TRACK AND CAR PARKING AT NORTHCOTE MANOR HOTEL, NORTHCOTE ROAD, LANGHO, BB6 8BE

PARISH COUNCIL: No observations received.

ENVIRONMENT DIRECTORATE (COUNTY SURVEYOR): No objection on highway grounds but request condition regarding construction of site access.

### **Proposal**

This application seeks the erection of a free standing bedroom lodge and associated car parking located at the rear of the existing main building. The new building is approximately where a previous consent exists for a spa block.

The building is a three storey construction with 10 bedrooms with en suite facilities and a separate reception area to the main building. The building reflects the design of the existing Northcote structure which is a mixture of red brick, blue slate roof and stone detailing. The approximate size of the building is 29m x 20m with a maximum height of 12m.

The front elevation is to have balconies and flat roof dormers with the rear elevation which faces towards the A59 roundabout would have a separate gable elevation and a single storey

structure for storage and equipment and is predominantly constructed of red brick with some stone quoin detailing.

The car parking area which would provide additional spaces of a total of 52 spaces would also have an access track and service road to serve the new bedroom block. There is some additional planting to supplement the existing copse of trees adjacent to the A59 roundabout. The scheme also provides for the helipad which has a previous consent under application reference 3/2013/0637/P.

### **Site Location**

The site is located within the open countryside close to the A59 roundabout from Northcote Road. It is within the area of land previously granted permission as an expansion of the existing facility.

### **Relevant History**

3/2009/0133/P – Extension to existing hotel and corporate new bedroom block, spa building, landscaping and parking. Approved with conditions.

3/2012/0332/P – Renewal of consent ref: 3/2009/0133/P. Approved with conditions.

3/2013/0637/P – Design amendments for the main hotel and staff welfare facilities. Approved with conditions.

### **Relevant Policies**

#### *Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan*

Policy G1 - Development Control.

Policy ENV3 - Development in Open Countryside.

Policy RT1 - General Recreation and Tourism Policy.

Policy EMP7 – Extensions/ Expansions.

#### *Ribble Valley Core Strategy Regulation 22 Submission Draft – Post Submission Version (including proposed main changes)*

Policy DMG1 – General Considerations.

Policy DME2 – Landscape and Townscape Protection.

Policy DMB3 – Recreation and Tourism Development.

Policy DMB1 – Supporting business growth and the local economy.

### **Environmental, AONB, Human Rights and Other Issues**

The main issues to consider in this proposal relate to the visual impact of the new building and any resultant ecology impacts in relation to the adjoining tree cover and existing highway safety issues due to any additional impacts the proposal would have on the existing highway network. It is also relevant to take account of the extant consents that exist and the previous approval for a bedroom block and spa facility.

### Principle

In terms of the principle of the development the Council has an active policy encouraging appropriate expansion of the existing employment businesses within the borough but it is predicated on having regard to other material considerations such as the visual impact and highway safety. In view of the previous consent I consider there would be no significant differences in relation to the policy on employment and that approval of such a facility would further enhance the existing business in relation to safeguard of employment as well as add to the recreation and tourism benefit to the borough.

### Highway Issues

In terms of highway safety the County Surveyor did not object to the previous application. I do not consider this scheme would significantly add to traffic generation on the highway network and subject to appropriate conditions relating to the access I consider this to be acceptable.

### Visual Amenity

In terms of visual amenity issues I consider that the proposal would be more dominant than the previously approved spa scheme which had a lower profile and was in fact a flat roof design of the more modern appearance. This proposal reflects the existing character of the main Northcote Manor and is of similar architectural design. Although I consider that there will be a greater visual impact than the previous scheme, I am satisfied that the design and siting is now satisfactory. During process of this application significant amendments have been secured relating to design improvements and re-siting of the building to protect the tree cover and lessen the visual impact.

### Ecology/Landscape

I am satisfied that based on the secured amendments and appropriate landscaping condition there is no significant impact.

### Planning Balance

I am satisfied that the limited visual impact does not outweigh the benefit the development would have in relation to safeguarding the existing businesses and providing economic growth and extension to recreation and tourism facilities in the borough.

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 development permitted shall be in accordance with amended plans dated 19 March 2014 and plan references POO2A; P003A; P004A and P005A.

REASON: For the avoidance of doubt.

3. This permission shall be in full accordance with the tree report dated 18 March 2014 and tree strategy drawing P008A received on 19 March 2014. The landscaping scheme shall be implemented in the first planting season following completion and shall be maintained thereafter for a period of not less than five years to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority. This maintenance shall include replacement of any tree or shrub which is removed, dies or becomes seriously damaged or diseased by a species of a similar size to those originally planted.

REASON: In the interests of the amenity of the area and to comply with Policies G1 and ENV2 of the Districtwide Local Plan and Policies DMG1 and DME2 of the Core Strategy Regulation 22 Submission Draft Post Submission Version (including proposed main changes).

4. No part of the development hereby approved shall commence until a scheme for the construction of the site access has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the highway authority.

REASON: In order to satisfy the planning and highway authorities that the final details of the access are acceptable before work commences on site and to comply with Policy G1 of the Districtwide Local Plan and Policy DMG1 of the Core Strategy Regulation 22 Submission Draft Post Submission Version (including proposed main changes).

5. No part of the development hereby approved shall be occupied or opened for trading until the approved scheme referred to in Condition 4 above has been constructed and completed in accordance with the scheme details.

REASON: In order that the traffic generated by the development does not exacerbate unsatisfactory highway conditions in advance of the completion of the scheme and to comply with Policy G1 of the Districtwide Local Plan and Policy DMG1 of the Core Strategy Regulation 22 Submission Draft Post Submission Version (including proposed main changes).

6. The materials to be used within the scheme shall be in accordance with the submitted photographic detail under reference 7309P(010).

REASON: For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure that the materials used are appropriate to the locality and to comply with Policy G1 of the Districtwide Local Plan and Policy DMG1 of the Core Strategy Regulation 22 Submission Draft Post Submission Version (including proposed main changes).

7. Prior to being discharged into any watercourse, surface water sewer or soakaway system, all surface water drainage from parking areas shall be passed through trapped gullies with an overall capacity compatible with the site being drained.

REASON: To prevent pollution of the water environment in accordance with Policy G1 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan and Policy DMG1 of the Core Strategy Regulation 22 Submission Draft Post Submission Version (including proposed main changes).

APPLICATION NO: 3/2014/0172

(GRID REF: SD 360634 437273)

OUTLINE APPLICATION FOR PROPOSED REDEVELOPMENT OF LAND FOR RESIDENTIAL PURPOSES AT THE FORMER LCC DEPOT, LAND OFF DIXON ROAD, LONGRIDGE

PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL: No comments received.

ENVIRONMENT  
DIRECTORATE  
(COUNTY SURVEYOR): No objection.

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS: One letter has been received from the occupant of a neighbouring property, which states that they have no objection to the development as it would be a good use of the land. The letter seeks assurance from the developer that any dirt and dust arising from the development affecting their property is cleaned by the developer.

Two letters of objection have been received from neighbouring properties. The main concerns raised include:

1. Dixon Road is not wide enough to allow simultaneous access and egress, refuse lorries will be unable to collect from the properties. There are times when the rubbish goes uncollected for 6 weeks.
2. Insufficient parking – each property will likely have two cars not one and the junction has no capacity for additional vehicles.
3. Sharley Fold Farm is a listed building and would be overlooked by the proposed properties.
4. The site is adjoined by listed buildings and is within the conservation area – the proposal would detract from the conservation area and listed buildings
5. The site is already raised above the level of the church grounds and a three storey development would be overbearing and would overshadow the listed church – it would effectively be four storeys high. The previous proposal was limited by condition to two storey height
6. Insufficient drainage due to local topography.
7. Construction works and excavations may compromise the boundary wall forming the curtilage of Sharley Fold Farm, a listed building.
8. Proposal would result in the loss of existing on street parking for other residents of Dixon Road
9. A tree overhangs the site.
10. The proposal is clearly undeliverable as the repeated need to renew the application demonstrates.

## **Proposal**

Outline planning permission is sought for the redevelopment of the former depot and associated land for residential purposes. Permission is sought for access only, with all other matters reserved for subsequent approval. Indicative plans have been submitted with the application and these are marked 'for illustrative purposes only'. The indicative plans show a two-three three storey building with associated parking and a detached garage to provide up to 9 residential units.

## **Site Location**

Dixon Road lies to the north of Berry Lane close to its junction with Market Place within the town centre of Longridge. The site is located at the far end of Dixon Road immediately adjacent to Longridge conservation area and comprises of a former depot - the majority of the site is hard standing, with a single storey building located adjacent to the northern boundary. The site therefore comprises brownfield land. The car park of St Paul's Church adjoins the site to the north west and the church itself lies to the west of the car park. St Paul's Church is grade II listed and lies within Longridge conservation area, but its car park lies outside the conservation area boundary. Longridge Library, a 1960s building, adjoins to the south, whilst the grade II listed Sharley Fold Farm adjoins to the east, both of which are within the conservation area. No's 1-8 Sharley Fold adjoin to the north.

## **Relevant History**

3/2011/0093 - Application for the renewal of planning consent 3/2008/0784P for Outline Planning Permission for the re-development of land for residential use – Approved with conditions 23-03-2011.

3/2008/0784 - Outline application for the re-development of land for residential development - Approved with conditions 19-12-2008.

3/2004/0445 - Residential development with Ribble Valley Borough Council transport depot, 6no. apartments in three storey block and 2no. semi-detached houses – Refused 16-06-2004.

## **Relevant Policies**

Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan:

Policy G1 - Development Control

Policy G5 - Settlement Strategy

Policy ENV7 - Species Protection

Policy ENV16 - Development Within Conservation Areas

Policy ENV17 - Details Required with Proposals in Conservation Areas

Policy T1 - Development Proposals - Transport Implications

Policy T7 - Parking Provision

Ribble Valley Core Strategy Regulation 22 Submission Draft – Post Submission Version (including proposed main changes):

Key Statement DS1 – Development Strategy

Key Statement DS2 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

Key Statement EN3 – Sustainable Development and Climate Change

Key Statement EN4 – Biodiversity and Geodiversity

Key Statement EN5 – Heritage Assets  
Key Statement H1 – Housing Provision  
Key Statement H2 – Housing Balance  
Policy DMG1 – General Consideration  
Policy DMG2 – Strategic Considerations  
Policy DMG3 – Transport and Mobility  
Policy DME3 – Site and Species Protection and Conservation

### **Environmental, AONB, Human Rights and Other Issues**

Outline planning permission has previously been granted for the development of the site for residential purposes (3/2011/0093, which was a renewal of a previous consent 3/2008/0784). The previous applications granted outline consent with access and layout, however this application is outline with access only – all other matters are reserved for subsequent approval, hence only matters of access and principle are to be considered as part of this application.

#### **Principle**

The principle of the development has been established by the grant of the previous consents, however it is necessary to consider any material changes in circumstances since those permissions were granted. Whilst there are no material changes at the site, other than general deterioration in its appearance as a result of under-use, there have been significant material changes in planning policy, namely the introduction of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in March 2012 and the National Planning Practice Guidance in March 2014. However, given the site forms previously developed land within the urban boundary, its redevelopment to provide housing accords with local and national planning policy and is therefore considered to be acceptable in principle.

#### **Impact on Longridge Conservation Area and Listed Buildings**

The site lies immediately adjacent to Longridge conservation area and two listed buildings – the Church of St Paul and Sharley Fold farmhouse, both grade II listed. The proposed redevelopment of the site would therefore affect the setting of the conservation area and these listed buildings. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires special regard to be had to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas and Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires special regard to be had to the desirability of preserving listed structures or their settings or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they may possess.

The site currently detracts from the setting of Sharley Fold, the Church of St Paul and Longridge conservation area and I consider its redevelopment to provide housing presents an opportunity to enhance and better reveal the significance of these assets. As design, layout, appearance and scale are reserved matters, it anticipated that any subsequent application would propose a scheme of high quality design appropriate to the site context, which preserves the setting of the listed buildings and enhances the character and appearance of the conservation area.



## **Access and Highways**

Access to the site is proposed from Dixon Road, which remains as previously approved. The local highway authority has raised no objection to the proposed access arrangement and as such, the proposal is considered to be acceptable in respect of access and highway safety.

The issues raised by the objectors in respect of access were addressed during the course of previous applications. In the interests of clarify, the comments of the local highway authority in respect of the previous applications were as follows:

The first 6m of Dixon Road north of Berry Lane is adopted - the width of the road is 5.0m at its junction with Berry Lane, varying from 4m to 5.4m in width along its length. It is considered that vehicles entering Dixon Road have clear visibility along the adopted length. In relation to access for refuse and other larger vehicles, while two way movements cannot be maintained for its full length, there are locations allowing vehicles to pull to the side of the carriageway in order to secure access. The comments you have received recently regarding the ability of some larger vehicles, such as refuse vehicles, to access the site safely and conveniently have considerable merit, however the amendments that have been made to the site layout are sufficient to secure an area for the safe manoeuvring of vehicles within the site, allowing them to enter and leave in a forward gear.

The site layout proposed in any subsequent application should ensure satisfactory provision for vehicles to manoeuvre within the site so they are able to enter and leave in a forward gear.

## **Protected Species**

A bat survey has been undertaken as the existing building on the site would be demolished. The survey found no evidence of bats using the building and concludes that the structure is unsuitable for bat habitat, hence no mitigation measures or enhancement measures are necessary. The proposal would therefore have no undue impact on bats. The site does contain some overgrown vegetation and as such, a condition requiring vegetation removal to be undertaken outside the bird nesting season is necessary, unless the site has been checked for the presence of nesting birds prior to its removal.

## **Reserved Matters**

Matters of scale, layout, design and appearance are reserved for subsequent consideration, however indicative plans have been submitted with the application. The indicative plans show a two-three storey development to provide up to 9 residential units and these plans are the same indicative plans submitted previously. The previous consents included a condition for any subsequent reserved matters proposals to be limited in height to two storeys and I concur that the overall scale and height of the development shown on the indicative plans would be inappropriate in the context of this site. Whilst scale is a reserved matter and is not therefore a consideration of this application, it is recommended that a similar condition is applied in the interests of clarity. A three storey development would detract from the character and appearance of the adjoining listed buildings, particularly given the scale of the building shown on the indicative plans. However, I consider these matters could be adequately addressed in the subsequent application for reserved matters.

## **Conclusion**

The proposal would contribute to the provision of housing in the Borough and would represent an effective use of brownfield land in the settlement boundary. The proposal would enhance the setting of designated heritage assets, would have no undue impact on highway safety and no adverse impacts have been identified that would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the proposal. I conclude that the proposal represents sustainable development and accords with the NPPF, Policies G1, G5, ENV16 and T7 of the Districtwide Local Plan, Key Statements DS2, H1 and EN5 and Policies DMG1 and DMG3 of the Core Strategy (Post Submission Version Including Proposed Main Changes).

RECOMMENDATION: That outline planning permission be GRANTED subject to the following conditions:

1. An application for approval of reserved matters shall be made to the Local Planning Authority not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission and the development shall be begun not later than the expiration of two years from the final approval of the reserved matters.

REASON: Required to be imposed pursuant to Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. No development shall take place without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority of the reserved matters, that is, details of: (i) the layout (ii) the scale (iii) the appearance (iv) the means of access to the buildings (including the provision to be made for vehicle and cycle parking) and (v) the landscaping of the site (including any proposed changes to existing ground levels, means of enclosure and boundary treatment, hard surfaced areas and materials planting plans, specifications and schedules, existing plants to be retained and showing how account has been taken of any underground services);  
(b) The approved proposals relating to means of access to the buildings and parking provision shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to the first occupation of the development and retained thereafter at all times;  
(c) The approved proposals relating to landscaping shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details in the first planting season following the first occupation of the development. Any trees or shrubs planted in accordance with this condition which are removed, uprooted, destroyed, die or become severely damaged or seriously diseased within 5 years of planting shall be replaced within the next planting season by trees or shrubs of similar size and species to those originally required to be planted, unless the Local Planning Authority give its written consent to any variation.

REASON: To comply with Policy G1 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan and Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy (Post Submission Version Including Proposed Main Changes) in order that the Local Planning Authority should be satisfied as to the details, because the application was made for outline permission without the details referred to in the condition.

3. Notwithstanding the indicative plans, the height of the development proposed in any subsequent reserved matters application shall not exceed two storeys.

REASON: In the interests of nearby residential amenity and to protect the character and appearance of nearby listed buildings and the conservation area, having regard to Policies G1 and ENV16 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan and Policies DMG1 and EN5 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy (Post Submission Version Including Proposed Main Changes).

4. The reserved matters application shall be accompanied by a scheme for the disposal of foul and surface waters. The scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details prior to the completion of the development.

REASON: To prevent increased risk of flooding and pollution of the water environment and to ensure satisfactory means of foul drainage in accordance with Policies ENV7, ENV9 and ENV13 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan and Policies EN2, EN4, DME2 and DME3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy (Post Submission Version Including Proposed Main Changes).

5. Prior to the commencement of development, the following information shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority (LPA) for approval in writing:
  - (a) A Desk Study which assesses the risk of the potential for on-site contamination and ground gases and migration of both on and off-site contamination and ground gases.
  - (b) If the Desk Study identifies potential contamination and ground gases, a detailed Site Investigation shall be carried out to address the nature, degree and distribution of contamination and ground gases and shall include an identification and assessment of the risk to receptors as defined under Part IIA of the Environmental Protection Act 1990, focusing primarily on risks to human health and controlled waters. The investigation shall address implications of the health and safety of site workers, of nearby occupied building structures, on services and landscaping schemes and on wider environmental receptors including ecological systems and property. The sampling and analytical strategy shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA prior to the site investigation survey.
  - (c) If the site investigation indicates remediation is necessary, a Remediation Statement detailing the recommendations and remedial measures to be implemented within the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA. The remediation shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed statement and on completion of the development/remedial works, the developer shall submit a Verification Report to the LPA for approval in writing that certifies that all works were completed in accordance with the agreed Remediation Statement prior to the first occupation of the development.

REASON: To prevent pollution of ground and surface waters both on and off site and to ensure the site is suitable for its end use in accordance with Policies ENV7, ENV9 and ENV13 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan and Policies EN2, EN4, DME2 and DME3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy (Post Submission Version Including Proposed Main Changes).

6. Demolition and site clearance shall be undertaken outside the nesting bird season [March - August inclusive] unless the vegetation has been surveyed for nesting birds by a suitably qualified ecologist immediately prior to its removal and the survey submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the vegetation removal. Demolition and site clearance shall be undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the survey.

REASON: To ensure that there are no adverse effects on the favourable conservation status of birds in accordance with Policies G1 and ENV7 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan, Policies DMG1 and DME3 and Key Statement EN5 of the Core Strategy (Post Submission Version Including Proposed Main Changes).

7. No site works shall take place until a Construction Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved Statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period and shall provide for:
- The parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;
  - Areas for loading, unloading and storage of plant and materials;
  - Wheel washing facilities;
  - Periods when plant and materials trips should not be made to and from the site (mainly peak hours, but the developer to suggest times when trips of this nature should not be made);
  - Routes to be used by vehicles carrying plant and materials to and from the site;
  - Measures to ensure that construction vehicles do not impede adjoining accesses;
  - The erection and maintenance of security hoardings;
  - Details of the storage of potential ground and water contaminants; and
  - A scheme to control noise and dust during the construction phase.

REASON: In the interests of residential amenity and highway safety, having regard to Policy G1 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan and Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy (Post Submission Version Including Proposed Main Changes).

APPLICATION NO: 3/2104/0186 (GRID REF: SD 373502 437619)  
PROPOSED EXTENSIONS TO AND REMODELLING OF EXISTING DWELLING AT LAMB ROE COTTAGE, CLITHEROE ROAD, BARROW, CLITHEROE BB7 9AQ

PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL: No response

ENVIRONMENT DIRECTORATE (COUNTY SURVEYOR): Raised initial concerns regarding the lack of adequate parking provision. This issue has been addressed through the receipt of amended plans.

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS: None received

### **Proposal**

The application seeks full consent for the proposed remodelling and extension of Lamb Roe Cottage, Clitheroe Road, Barrow. The submitted details propose the erection of a two-storey extension/accommodation element to the west of the existing dwelling with a single storey link element connecting the proposal and the parent property. The proposal will provide an additional two bedrooms at first floor with additional lounge area at ground floor.

The proposed extension will be faced in a mixture of natural stone and render to match that of the existing dwelling with aluminium PPC windows and slate roofing. The two-storey element of

the proposal matches the eaves height of the existing dwelling with a ridge height set below that of the existing allowing it to remain visually subservient, this is further reinforced by the physical and visual separation between this element of the proposal and the parent property.

### **Site Location**

The application relates to Lamb Roe Cottage which is located at the southern extents of Exton Terrace fronting Clitheroe Road. Directly to the north are a number of two-storey terraced properties with The Eagle restaurant/bar being located directly to the south and Spread Eagle Farm to the southwest. The existing property is a two storey stone-faced cottage with attached garage with the overall scale of the building being reminiscent of a 'coach-house'. The property benefits from an extensive garden area to the west.

The primary elevation of the dwelling is setback significantly from the inherent building line along Clitheroe Road, with the attached single-storey garage fronting the road.

### **Relevant History**

08/0322 - Certificate of Lawfulness application for the continued use of land to the rear of the property as a domestic garden, and for the continued use on that land of the building housing the games/storage room. (Granted)

### **Relevant Policies**

#### **Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan:**

Policy G1 - Development Control.

Policy H10 – Residential Extensions.

SPG – “Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings”.

#### **Ribble Valley Core Strategy (Regulation 22 Submission Draft):**

Policy DMG1 – General Considerations.

Policy DMH5 – Residential & Curtilage Extensions.

### **National Planning Policy Framework**

### **Environmental, AONB, Human Rights and Other Issues**

In assessing the acceptability of the proposal the main issues for consideration relate to the overall scale and appearance of the proposal, any impact upon existing residential amenity and the potential impact upon landscape/ecology.

The proposal has benefited from extensive pre-application discussion/guidance which established an acceptable scale and overall design approach at an early stage. It is considered that the proposal, as submitted, is fully reflective of the issues discussed and all initial concerns have been mitigated through by the submitted design.

Inn relation to the overall appearance of the proposal it is considered that the extension responds positively to the inherent language of the existing dwelling and the immediate context, with the introduction of a 'feature' coplanar corner glazing system on the east elevation at first floor aiding to visually delineate between the existing property and the proposed extension.

The scale and overall footprint/articulation of the proposal responds well to both the constraints of the site and the overall form and language of the existing dwelling whilst remaining clearly visually subservient, it is also considered that the two-storey element is set adequately back from the main building frontage so as to not appear overly dominant upon approach.

It is not considered that the proposal would be of detriment to neighbouring residential amenities by virtue of the proposed window locations and offset distances from neighbouring dwellings nor will the proposal result in any direct over-looking issues that would result in a loss of privacy or any potential loss of light/overbearing impact, largely due to the orientation of the property and the distances from proposed neighbouring boundaries and dwellings.

Therefore, having carefully considered all of the above matters I consider that the proposal would not be of detriment to the visual amenity of the area or the residential amenities of neighbouring/nearby occupiers.

**RECOMMENDATION:** That planning permission be GRANTED subject to the following conditions:

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. Precise specifications or samples of walling, roofing and window framing materials and including their colour and texture shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to their use in the proposed development.

**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 Policy DMG1 of the Core Strategy 2028 to 2018 A Local Plan for Ribble Valley Regulation 22 Submission Draft.

3. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in complete accordance with the submitted plans:

- Drawing Ref: 190 Job No.11 Rev B (As amended 26<sup>th</sup> March 2014)

**REASON:** For the avoidance of doubt since the proposal was the subject of agreed amendments and to clarify which plans are relevant.

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>
3/2013/0506/P	Replacement of 5 No crittall single glazed windows to front elevation	Clitheroe Royal Grammar School, York Street Clitheroe
3/2013/0724/P	Flat roof enclosure between	Ribchester Village Hall and Ribchester Museum
3/2013/0537/P	Application to discharge condition No.3 (Materials) and condition No.4 (window glazing) of planning permission 3/2013/0231P	Ashton, Eastham Street Clitheroe
3/2013/0738/P	Planning permission is sought for the variation of condition no 9 of planning permission 3/20108/1005/P to replace proposed dry stone walls with stock proof fencing and to extend the residential curtilage approved under the same application	11 Whinney Lane Langho
3/2013/0896/P	Proposed conversion of barn to form 2no. dwellings with associated works, including erection of a quadruple garage and formation of access to Bowland Gate Lane via an existing gateway	Brocklehurst Farm Bowland Gate Lane West Bradford
3/2013/0946/P (PA) & 3/2013/0967/P (LBC)	Conversion of pig sty to form additional living accommodation with associated works	Greaves Farm Holden Lane Bolton-by-Bowland
3/2013/0980/P	Construction of a new earth bank lagoon for the storage of digestate produced at the anaerobic digestion plant	Wilcross Farm at Watt Close Farm Burnley Road, Gisburn
3/2013/1001/P	Proposed housing development of 3 x two storey 3 bedroomed houses (resubmission of application 3/2012/1113/P)	Parker Avenue Clitheroe
3/2013/1007/P	Removal of condition 1 of planning permission 3/2005/0289/P (3/2005/0289/P was a resubmission of 3/2004/0297/P to modify applications BO1318, BO1609, BO1806 and 3/1999/0662/P) to allow year round holiday use of the units	Todber Caravan Park Burnley Road Gisburn
3/2013/1014/P	Erection of single storey stable block providing 3 stables and associated tack and feed store	Fletcher Farm Osbaldeston Lane Osbaldeston

<b><u>Plan No</u></b>	<b><u>Proposal</u></b>	<b><u>Location</u></b>
3/2013/1016/P	Two storey rear and side extensions and erection of a detached garage	15 Clitheroe Road Whalley
3/2013/1017/P	Change of use for annex section of the house to be used as a holiday let	Cottam House Cottage Writtenstone Lane Longridge
3/2013/1034/P	Change of use of former Public Conveniences to Class A1 retail shop (fruit and vegetables)	Public Conveniences Mellor Brow, Mellor
3/2013/1039/P	Application to discharge Conditions 3 and 8 of planning permission 3/2013/0877 dated 6/12/2013	2 Parlick Avenue Longridge
3/2013/1041/P (Building 3) & 3/2014/0142/P (Building 2)	Erection of agricultural livestock building(s) to accommodate breeding sheep	Dockber Laithe Farm Sawley
3/2013/1045/P	Loft conversion with two dormer windows to the rear elevation and a porch	2 Long Close, Clitheroe
3/2013/1047/P	Variation of condition 2 of planning permission 3/2012/0241/P	Chatburn Village Motor Co. Sawley Road, Chatburn
3/2013/1049/P	Proposed bedroom extension above the existing garage	3 Bradyll Court Brockhall Village Old Langho
3/2013/1057/P	Amendment to approved application 3/2013/0206 relating to the proposed workshop/ studio building	Fern Cottage Hollin Hall Lane, Longridge
3/2013/1067/P	Proposed single storey kitchen extension	The Black Horse Pimlico Road Pimlico, Clitheroe
3/2013/1068/P	First floor rear extension	76 Downham Road Chatburn
3/2013/1069/P	Variation of condition 2 of planning permission 3/2011/0222/P	Fort Vale Engineering Ltd Caldervale Park, Simonstone
3/2013/1074/P	Removal of condition No 3 (agricultural occupancy condition) and No 4 (employed at Boot Farm) of planning permission 3/1998/0782/P	Hob Croft Alston Lane Longridge
3/2014/0006/P	First floor extension to provide master/ensuite bedroom, utility extension, bay window and covered roof area, new roof finish (slate) to existing house roof (concrete tiles)	Former Police Station Slaidburn Road Newton in Bowland
3/2014/0014/P	External wall insulation rendering to match existing. Development and finished in Weber render (colour 012 earth) over which Derbyshire Spa aggregate – will be applied	1 Kirklands Chipping
3/2014/0015/P	External wall insulation rendering to match existing. Development and finished in Weber render (colour 012 earth) over which Derbyshire Spa aggregate – will be applied	2 Kirklands Chipping



<b><u>Plan No</u></b>	<b><u>Proposal</u></b>	<b><u>Location</u></b>
3/2014/0016/P	External wall insulation rendering to match existing. Development and finished in Weber render (colour 012 earth) over which Derbyshire Spa aggregate – will be applied	3 Kirklands Chipping
3/2014/0017/P	External wall insulation rendering to match existing. Development and finished in Weber render (colour 012 earth) over which Derbyshire Spa aggregate – will be applied	4 Kirklands Chipping
3/2014/0018/P	External wall insulation rendering to match existing. Development and finished in Weber render (colour 012 earth) over which Derbyshire Spa aggregate – will be applied	7 Kirklands Chipping
3/2014/0019/P	External wall insulation rendering to match existing. Development and finished in Weber render (colour 012 earth) over which Derbyshire Spa aggregate – will be applied	8 Kirklands Chipping
3/2014/0020/P	External wall insulation rendering to match existing. Development and finished in Weber render (colour 012 earth) over which Derbyshire Spa aggregate – will be applied	9 Kirklands Chipping
3/2014/0021/P	External wall insulation rendering to match existing. Development and finished in Weber render (colour 012 earth) over which Derbyshire Spa aggregate – will be applied	11 Kirklands Chipping
3/2014/0022/P	External wall insulation rendering to match existing. Development and finished in Weber render (colour 012 earth) over which Derbyshire Spa aggregate – will be applied	12 Kirklands Chipping
3/2014/0023/P	External wall insulation rendering to match existing. Development and finished in Weber render (colour 012 earth) over which Derbyshire Spa aggregate – will be applied	14 Kirklands Chipping
3/2014/0024/P	External wall insulation rendering to match existing. Development and finished in Weber render (colour 012 earth) over which Derbyshire Spa aggregate – will be applied	15 Kirklands Chipping
3/2014/0025/P	External wall insulation rendering to match existing. Development and finished in Weber render (colour 012 earth) over which Derbyshire Spa aggregate – will be applied	16 Kirklands Chipping
3/2014/0026/P	External wall insulation rendering to match existing. Development and finished in Weber render (colour 012 earth) over which Derbyshire Spa aggregate – will be applied	17 Kirklands Chipping
3/2014/0027/P	External wall insulation rendering to match existing. Development and finished in Weber render (colour 012 earth) over which Derbyshire Spa aggregate – will be applied	18 Kirklands Chipping

<b><u>Plan No</u></b>	<b><u>Proposal</u></b>	<b><u>Location</u></b>
3/2014/0028/P	External wall insulation rendering to match existing. Development and finished in Weber render (colour 012 earth) over which Derbyshire Spa aggregate – will be applied	19 Kirklands Chipping
3/2014/0029/P	External wall insulation rendering to match existing. Development and finished in Weber render (colour 012 earth) over which Derbyshire Spa aggregate – will be applied	20 Kirklands Chipping
3/2014/0030/P	External wall insulation rendering to match existing. Development and finished in Weber render (colour 012 earth) over which Derbyshire Spa aggregate – will be applied	22 Kirklands Chipping
3/2014/0031/P	External wall insulation rendering to match existing. Development and finished in Weber render (colour 012 earth) over which Derbyshire Spa aggregate – will be applied	23 Kirklands Chipping
3/2014/0032/P	External wall insulation rendering to match existing. Development and finished in Weber render (colour 012 earth) over which Derbyshire Spa aggregate – will be applied	24 Kirklands Chipping
3/2014/0033/P	External wall insulation rendering to match existing. Development and finished in Weber render (colour 012 earth) over which Derbyshire Spa aggregate – will be applied	26 Kirklands Chipping
3/2014/0034/P	External wall insulation rendering to match existing. Development and finished in Weber render (colour 012 earth) over which Derbyshire Spa aggregate – will be applied	The Shambles 29 Kirklands Chipping
3/2014/0035/P	External wall insulation rendering to match existing. Development and finished in Weber render (colour 012 earth) over which Derbyshire Spa aggregate – will be applied	31 Kirklands Chipping
3/2014/0036/P	External wall insulation rendering to match existing. Development and finished in Weber render (colour 012 earth) over which Derbyshire Spa aggregate – will be applied	32 Kirklands Chipping
3/2014/0038/P	Alterations to existing dwelling including 2 storey extension and single storey addition at the rear to create a master bedroom with en suite and a new dining/kitchen/garden room	36 Limefield Avenue Whalley
3/2014/0041/P	Single Storey extension to the rear	8 Chapel Hill Longridge
3/2014/0046/P	External wall insulation rendering to match existing. Development and finished in Weber render (colour 012 earth) over which Derbyshire Spa aggregate – will be applied	30 Kirklands Chipping

<b><u>Plan No</u></b>	<b><u>Proposal</u></b>	<b><u>Location</u></b>
3/2014/0047/P	External wall insulation rendering to match existing. Development and finished in Weber render (colour 012 earth) over which Derbyshire Spa aggregate – will be applied	27 Kirklands Chipping
3/2014/0048/P	External wall insulation rendering to match existing. Development and finished in Weber render (colour 012 earth) over which Derbyshire Spa aggregate – will be applied	25 Kirklands Chipping
3/2014/0049/P	External wall insulation rendering to match existing. Development and finished in Weber render (colour 012 earth) over which Derbyshire Spa aggregate – will be applied	13 Kirklands Chipping
3/2014/0050/P	External wall insulation rendering to match existing. Development and finished in Weber render (colour 012 earth) over which Derbyshire Spa aggregate – will be applied	10 Kirklands Chipping
3/2014/0051/P	Proposed implement storage building	Carr Meadow Barn Carr Lane, Balderstone
3/2014/0053/P	Proposed demolition of all buildings on site (existing house kennels and various outbuildings) and erection of a dwellinghouse (including bed and breakfast element) reduced footprint scheme of existing approved application 3/2012/0010/P	The Eaves, Pendleton Road Wiswell
3/2014/0054/P	Internal renovation and repairs	Dower House 41 Lowergate, Clitheroe
3/2014/0061/P	Application for discharge of condition no. 5 relating to landscaping of planning permission 3/2013/0760/P	The Old Smithy Little Bowland Road Bowland with Leagram
3/2014/0062/P	Discharge of condition 8 (land contamination) of planning consent 3/2013/0271/P	Land at George Lane Read
3/2014/0073/P	Loft Conversion with front and rear dormer. Single Storey extension to create garage and utility. New porch to front entrance	42 Hillcrest Road Langho
3/2014/0076/P	Demolition of existing rear extension and outbuilding and erection of single storey rear extension	4 Greenacres Read
3/2014/0077/P	Replacement of two existing wood panel garages with a new build brick and block garage	3 Larkhill Cottages Old Langho
3/2014/0078/P	Demolish existing garage and store. Construct new garage and store	Laycock Farm Northcote Road, Langho
3/2014/0082/P	Demolition of existing conservatory and erection of replacement sunroom to rear	Cayley Cottage 1 Victoria Avenue, Chatburn
3/2014/0084/P	Erection of agricultural building 18.2m wide x 22.86m long for calf rearing	Little Town Farm Chipping Road, Thornley

<b><u>Plan No</u></b>	<b><u>Proposal</u></b>	<b><u>Location</u></b>
3/2014/0088/P	Non-material amendment application relating to the relocation of the window in the study into the gable on Plot No 4 and attaching the original approved detached garage to the gable elevation on Plot No 2	Abbey Farm Nethertown Close Whalley
3/2014/0092/P	Discharge of condition No 6 (bat provision) of planning application 3/2013/0985	Cob House, Green Lane Grindleton
3/2014/0094/P	Proposed kitchen/dining room extension and detached double garage	64 Inglewhite Road Longridge
3/2014/0098/P	Extension on rear elevation to create a dining room and wine cellar	Dene Farm Hurst Green, Clitheroe
3/2014/0099/P (PA) & 3/2014/0100/P (LBC)	Extension to first floor to form bedrooms	Spread Eagle Hotel Sawley Road Sawley
3/2014/0107/P	Erection of new two-storey house with a basement on land to the rear	Bolton Fold Cottage at Bolton Fold Cottage Alston Lane, Alston
3/2014/0108/P	Removal of existing dormer and replacement with extended version	West Winds, Salthill Road Clitheroe
3/2014/0109/P	Demolition of rear conservatory and construction of single storey rear extension	4 Shaw Gardens Chatburn
3/2014/0112/P	Single storey extension to the rear to form annex	Veepings Farm Bungalow Holden Lane Bolton by Bowland
3/2014/0113/P	Installation of two 0.3m transmission dishes on existing mass	Forty Acre Farm Jeffrey Hill, Longridge
3/2014/0114/P	Proposed two-storey extension to the rear	7 Limefield Avenue Whalley
3/2014/0117/P	Demolish existing garage and erect two-storey side extension	25 Kenilworth Drive Clitheroe
3/2014/0118/P	Proposed first floor side extension over the attached double garage (resubmission of 3/2013/0878)	11 Holme Hill Clitheroe
3/2014/0121/P	Proposed extension to rear and new pitched roof to existing garage	Stanley House, Lower Lane Longridge
3/2014/0123/P	Single storey extension to rear. Addition of second dormer to front and alteration of existing dormer to add pitched roof. Replacement of existing flat roof to the side of the property with pitched roof. Alterations to access and creation of two parking spaces in front of the existing garage	4 Broadtree Close Mellor
3/2014/0128/P	Proposed two storey side extension	6 Brooklyn Road Wilpshire
3/2014/0131/P	Replacement dwelling (amendment to approved plans 3/2013/0734/P)	Brookfield, Stoneygate Lane Ribchester

<b><u>Plan No</u></b>	<b><u>Proposal</u></b>	<b><u>Location</u></b>
3/2014/0133/P	Proposed two-storey extension to form showroom and office	Dick Leigh Chainsaw Specialists Ashleigh, Clitheroe Road Barrow
3/2014/0134/P	Proposed front extension	7 Wheatley Drive Longridge
3/2014/0137/P	Single storey rear extension and external landscaping including changing levels within the garden area	Hammond Field Hammond Drive Read
3/2014/0144/P	Non material amendment to planning application 3/2010/0989/P for the erection of a 10kw wind turbine with hub height of 18m diameter of 7.28m	Mason House Farm Clitheroe Road Bashall Eaves
3/2014/0149/P	Single storey extension to rear	18 Whinney Lane Langho
3/2014/0173/P	Discharge of condition 3 (materials) and 8 (boundary details) of planning permission 3/2013/0004/P	Abbey Farm Nethertown Close, Whalley
3/2014/0185/P	Discharge of condition 5 (description and images of proposed walling/roofing materials); condition 9 (building recording programming – confirmation that this condition does not need to be discharged); and condition 10 (proposed drainage layout) of planning permission 3/2013/0887/P	Bay Gate Barn Bolton-by-Bowland

#### APPLICATIONS REFUSED

<b><u>Plan No</u></b>	<b><u>Proposal</u></b>	<b><u>Location</u></b>	<b><u>Reasons for Refusal</u></b>
3/2013/1033/P	Proposed single storey extension to existing dwelling to form sun-lounge	Cowgill House Gisburn Road Sawley	Contrary to Local Plan Policies and Supplementary Planning Guidance: House Extensions.
3/2013/1048/P	Demolition of existing garage and erection of new garage with accommodation over and extension to existing annex	Holmes Cottage Woone Lane Clitheroe	Contrary to G1, H10, ENV16, SPG – Extensions and Alterations to dwellings, DMG1, DME4 and DMH5 of CS and Section 12 of NPPF.
3/2013/1054/P (PA) & 3/2013/1055/P (LBC) Cont/	Create new entrance off car park to rear of building and relocate existing fire escape staircase. Internal refurbishment at	The White Bull Hotel Main Street Gisburn	Harmful to character and significance of the listed building because of the loss and alteration of important historic fabric

<u>Plan No</u>	<u>Proposal</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Reasons for Refusal</u>
Cont...			and plan form from works to interior and a new entrance. Contrary to NPPF paragraph 17, 131 and 132, ENV20 and CSReg.22 SD PSR DME4.
3/2013/1059/P	Change of Use from Sui Generis Shop to Hot Food Takeaway (Class A5)	59 King Street Whalley	DWLP - G1, ENV16, S10, SPG / Core Strategy DMG1, DME4 – Detrimental to residential amenity (noise and odour) and highway safety.
3/2013/1060/P	Construction of a part two storey, part single storey side extension for residential accommodation	70a Downham Rd Chatburn	Contrary to Policy G1 of DWLP and DMG1 of CS and SPG on Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings.
3/2013/1076/P	Proposed new dwelling	Holmes Cottage Woone Lane Clitheroe	Contrary to Policies G1, ENV16 & ENV19 of DWLP. Policies DMG1 and DME4 of CS and Section 12 of NPPF.
3/2014/0010/P	Erection of single storey extension to side and rear	26 Holden Street Clitheroe	Contrary to Policies G1, H10, T7 of DWLP and adopted SPG Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings and Policies DMG1, DMG3 and DMH5 of CS.
3/2014/0067/P	Single storey rear and side extensions including alterations to main house roof raising the ridge by 1m	44 Waddow Grove Waddington	G1, H10, SPG – harmful to visual amenities of street scene
3/2014/0074/P	Variation of condition 3 of planning permission 3/2012/1099/P to allow holiday let to be used as a dwelling at Garage adjacent to	1 Swinglehurst Cottage Garstang Road Chipping	Policies G5, H2, DMG2, DMH3 and NPPF – The proposal represents the unjustified formation of a residential unit in the open countryside and would result in the loss of a unit of holiday
Cont/			

<u>Plan No</u>	<u>Proposal</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Reasons for Refusal</u>
Cont....			accommodation to the detriment of the local rural economy.
3/2014/0075/P	Proposed conversion of two traditional farm buildings into two full open market dwellings and the demolition and re-building of an existing farmhouse. Resubmission of 3/2012/1048	Sheepfold Farm Balderstone Hall Lane Balderstone	<p>Policies G1, G5, H2, DMG1, DMG2, DMH3 - isolated location of the site outside any settlement and distance from any services, does not represent sustainable development and would therefore form an unjustified dwelling within the open countryside.</p> <p>Policies ENV3, H12, H14 DME2 and DMH5— replacement dwelling: significant – detrimental to visual amenity.</p> <p>Policies G1, ENV3, H17, DMG1, DME2, DMH4 – barn conversion: detrimental impact on the original character of this traditional building and visual amenity.</p> <p>Policies G1, ENV3, H12, H15 and H17 DWLP, Policies EN2, DME2, DME4, DMG1, DMH3, DMH4 – barn conversion: residential curtilages and parking areas (garages) – domestication of open countryside.</p>
3/2014/0122/P	Replacement of three existing windows with two second-hand stone mullion windows	Wilkinsons Farmhouse Simonstone	Harmful to character and significance of the listed building and the setting and significance of nearby listed buildings (loss of agricultural identity to bay 3 and the
Cont/			

<u>Plan No</u>	<u>Proposal</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Reasons for Refusal</u>
Cont...			introduction of overtly domestic windows of historical design). NPPF Paragraph 17, 131 and 132; Local Plan Policies ENV20 and ENV19 and Core Strategy Policy DME4.
3/2014/0124/P	Proposed two storey side extension, rear conservatory and two roof lights	5 The Crescent Dunsop Bridge Clitheroe	G1, ENV1, H10, SPG, DMG1, EN2, DMH5 – terracing detrimental to visual amenity and overlooking of neighbouring property.
3/2014/0126/P	Alterations to rear dormer replacing flat roof with slated pitched roof	Lower Stony Bank Slaidburn	G1, ENV1, ENV3, H10, SPG, DMG1, EN2, DMH5 – Detrimental to existing house and visual amenity.

PROPOSED LARGER HOME EXTENSION NOTIFICATION WHERE PRIOR APPROVAL WILL NOT BE NECESSARY.

<u>Plan No</u>	<u>Proposal</u>	<u>Location</u>
3/2014/0079/P	Single Storey mono pitch garden room to rear measuring 4.68m (projection) x 3.5m (Maximum Height) x 2.25m (eaves Height)	300 Pleckgate Road Blackburn
3/2014/0093/P	Single storey rear extension. Projecting 6m from the rear wall of the original dwelling, built to a maximum height of 3.29m and eaves height of 2.4m	1 The Crescent Clitheroe

OBSERVATIONS TO ANOTHER LOCAL AUTHORITY

<u>Plan No</u>	<u>Proposal</u>	<u>Location</u>
3/2014/0085/P	Consultation on request for screening opinion	land at Parsonage Road Wilpshire

CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS FOR A PROPOSED USE OR DEVELOPMENT

<u>Plan No</u>	<u>Proposal</u>	<u>Location</u>
3/2014/0110/P	Certificate of Lawfulness application for the proposed removal of existing conservatory and replacement with single storey rear extension	37 Abbots Croft Whalley



REFUSAL OF CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS FOR A PROPOSED USE OR DEVELOPMENT

<u>Plan No</u>	<u>Proposal</u>	<u>Location</u>
3/2014/0160/P	Certificate of Lawfulness for a proposed use for a conservatory to the rear of the property	1 Kayfold Lodge Ramsgreave

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (GENERAL PERMITTED DEVELOPMENT) ORDER 1995 PARTS 6 & 7 PRIOR NOTIFICATION OF AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY BUILDINGS AND ROADS PRIOR APPROVAL **NOT** REQUIRED

<u>Plan No</u>	<u>Proposal</u>	<u>Location</u>
3/2013/1073/P	Prior Approval of proposed change of use of agricultural building to use class C1: Guest House at barn	Higher Flass Farm Settle Road Bolton-by-Bowland

SECTION 106 APPLICATIONS

<u>Plan No</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Date to Committee</u>	<u>Number of Dwellings</u>	<u>Progress</u>
3/2012/0379	Primrose Mill Woone Lane Clitheroe	16/8/12	14	Deed of Variation Applicants solicitor to be signed
3/2012/0785	Clitheroe Hospital Chatburn Road Clitheroe	6/12/12	57	Ongoing correspondence
3/2013/0161	Strawberry Fields Main Street, Gisburn	7/11/13	11	With Agent
3/2013/0747	Land at Whalley Road Billington	7/11/13	56	Awaiting decision notice
3/2012/0942	Land at Higher Standen Farm & part Littlemoor Farm, Clitheroe	12/12/13	1040	With LCC
3/2013/0737	Hansons Garden Centre Whalley Road, Barrow	13/2/14	43	With LCC
3/2013/0771	Land off Middle Lodge Road Barrow	13/2/14	102	With LCC
3/2014/0981	Land at Chatburn Road Clitheroe	13/2/14	23	With LCC
3/2013/0691	Elmridge Farm Elmridge Lane, Chipping	13/2/14	4	With Agent
<b><u>Non Housing</u></b>				
3/2011/0649P	Calder Vale Park Simonstone	15/3/12		Subject to departure procedures, draft 106 received from LCC

<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>
3/2013/0711	Land off Henthorn Road, Clitheroe	7/11/13	16 weeks	140	Decision 24/2/14
3/2012/0964	Land north of Whalley Road Hurst Green	14/3/13	1	30	Decision 25/3/14

RECOMMENDATION FOR PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE  
**DEFER AND DELEGATE TO THE DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY SERVICES**

APPLICATION NO: 3/2013/0440

GRID REF: SD 377818 437230

OUTLINE APPLICATION FOR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OF LAND FOR 14 HOUSES, 3 BUNGALOWS AND A NEW ACCESS ROAD AT LAND TO REAR OF PENDLE STREET EAST, SABDEN

PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL: Sabden Parish Council objects to the application of the following grounds:

1. The access will add to and exacerbate existing congestion issues in the area.
2. Traffic generation and increased volumes of traffic and the cumulative impact with already approved developments within the area.
3. The proposal will alter the natural drainage of the site resulting in potential flooding.
4. The development will be both visually intrusive and of detriment to the visual amenity of the Forest of Bowland AONB and the immediate landscape.
5. The proposal will be of detriment to the conservation area.
6. Additional light pollution in the area.
7. Pressures on existing infrastructure.
8. No employment in Sabden resulting in potential residents having to travel out of the area.
9. The development site is Greenfield.
10. The cumulative effect of the proposal taking into account existing permissions granted within the area.

ENVIRONMENT  
DIRECTORATE  
(COUNTY SURVEYOR):

LCC Highways have raised no objection to the proposal subject to relevant planning conditions being attached in the event of consent being granted. It has been additionally requested that a pedestrian/cycle link be provided to link to Bridle Way No. 76 to facilitate permeability and journeys by foot.

## LCC CONTRIBUTIONS

LCC Contributions team have requested a financial contribution in respect of Primary School places for the area. Members are referred to the file for full details which can be summarised as follows:

Primary Places:

= £11,880.45 per place x 3 places  
= £35,641

## ENVIRONMENT AGENCY:

No representations received.

## UNITED UTILITIES:

No objection subject to relevant planning conditions being attached should consent be granted.

## ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS:

59 letters of objection and a petition with 620 signatures has been received. Members are referred to the file for full details which can be summarised as follows:

1. Sabden has experienced too much development.
2. Additional vehicles as a result of the proposal.
3. Proposed access inadequate in relation to existing parking problems in the area.
4. No demand for such housing within the area.
5. Development is on a Greenfield site.
6. Proximity of the proposed dwellings to existing houses.
7. The scale of the bungalow shown on the submitted plans.
8. The proposal is over-development.
9. The proposal will be of detriment to the Conservation Area.
10. The proposal will be of detriment to the landscape and the Forest of Bowland AONB.
11. The proposed access is frequently blocked at weekends with parked vehicles associated with the Bowling Green and football pitch.
12. Loss of wildlife & habitat.
13. Trees have been felled prior to the submission of the application.

14. Loss of existing parking has not been considered.
15. The applicant has attempted to mislead the Local Planning Authority.

### **Proposal**

The application seeks outline consent with all matters reserved save that of access and scale for a residential development for 14 houses, 3 bungalows and a new access road at Land to rear of Pendle Street East, Sabden. Members will therefore note that whilst the applicant has submitted an indicative layout and elevations these should be considered as illustrative only.

Access to the development site is proposed between numbers 29 and 27 Pendle Street East, with the submitted indicative layout taking the form of a cul-de-sac arrangement with the turning head terminated at the southern extents of the site. 14 of the proposed dwellings are to be two-storey and semi detached in nature, with 3 bungalows also proposed. The semi-detached dwellings are orientated to back on to the eastern, southern and western boundaries of the site, additionally two bungalows also back on to the western boundary with a remaining larger bungalow being located behind numbers 1 and 3 Pendleside close to the east.

The majority of parking is being shown as accommodated on-plot in the form of side driveways with the larger bungalow having both on-plot parking and a detached garage.

### **Site Location**

The proposal site is located to the rear of 23 – 35 Pendle Street East and the rear of 1 – 7 Pendleside Close. The proposal site comprises of an area of previously undeveloped open land and an element of domestic curtilage as owned by number 27 Pendle Street East which currently accommodates garaging, garden area and a storage building/shed.

The land directly to the east (football ground) and west (allotments) of the site is identified as essential open space and identified as within the settlement boundary of Sabden as defined in the District Wide Local Plan, the site also falls within the defined Forest of Bowland AONB and located adjacent the Sabden Conservation Area. The topography of the site increases in height to the south where it adjoins Bridle way no.76.

### **Relevant History**

There is no relevant planning history associated with the proposed development site.

### **Relevant Policies**

*Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan:*

Policy G1 - Development Control.

Policy G5 - Settlement Strategy.

Policy H20 – Affordable Housing – Villages & Countryside

Policy ENV13 - Landscape Protection.

*Core Strategy 2008 – 2082 – a Local Plan for Ribble Valley Regulation 22 Consultation Draft:*

Policy DMG1 – General Considerations.

Policy DMG2 – Strategic Considerations.

Policy DME2 – Landscape and Townscape Protection.  
Policy DME3 – Site and Species Protection and Conservation.  
Policy DMH1 – Affordable Housing Criteria

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

### **Environmental, AONB, Human Rights and Other Issues**

The matters to be considered in the determination of this application relate to the principle of the development in policy terms; the potential impact of the development in visual terms; any potential effects upon ecology and trees; the potential impact on neighbouring residential amenities; highway safety; the mechanism by which a financial contribution in lieu of affordable housing on-site is secured; and the matter of any financial contributions requested by Lancashire County Council.

### **Principle of Development**

In assessing the proposal it is imperative to establish whether, in principle, the development would be considered acceptable in light of current and emerging policy considerations whilst considering the proposal against the aims and objective of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

In assessing the proposal I am mindful of the development site being within the defined Forest of Bowland AONB and that the site is located within the defined settlement boundary for Sabden as set out in the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan, however it should be noted that the current settlement boundaries of the District Wide Local Plan (DWLP) are out of date and as yet no replacement boundaries are in place.

Given the proposals proximity to the existing settlement it would be difficult to consider such a development as isolated and therefore would not directly contradict paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

In terms of five-year land supply, the most recent published position at the time of writing is the Council's Housing Land Availability Schedule dated December 2013. This indicates at the time of writing, that the latest housing land supply position based on a Core Strategy requirement of 250dpa, Sedgfield methodology and 20% buffer is **4.72**. This is based on sites with permission and does not include any contribution from Standen or sites without permission (e.g. SHLAA sites) or those granted at appeal since the last calculation.

Equally sites may be deemed to fall out of the five year supply as they lapse or evidence comes forward to demonstrate they will not be deliverable within the 5yr period.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) places a clear emphasis that Local Planning Authorities should not resist proposals unless there are any adverse impacts which significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits associated with any such proposal.

Further to the Planning & Development Committee meeting of 16th January 2014 the Local Planning Authority have commissioned independent landscape advice regarding the potential visual impact of the development which concludes that there would not be sufficient harm from the proposal to robustly defend a refusal on visual impact in line with the original officer recommendation. Whilst it is recognised that any form of development, to some degree, will

have an impact particularly in visual/landscape terms, it is not considered the impacts as a result of the development to be overtly or demonstrably harmful to the immediate or wider context.

In taking into account the above considerations I do not consider there would be sufficient relevant grounds on which to resist the application in principle or in terms of harmful visual impact.

### **Affordable Housing Provision**

In discussion with the Council's Strategic Housing Officer it has been established that there is no demand for affordable housing provision within the Sabden area due to a potential current oversupply when taking into account previous consents issued in the area.

Therefore it has been agreed that a financial contribution in lieu of on site provision will be required, it is envisaged that this will be secured via a Section 106 agreement that will require the sum to be paid prior to the commencement of the development and for the calculation of the commuted sum to be undertaken at the reserved matters stage when the housing mix/number of bedrooms has been fully established.

### **Highways safety**

LCC Highways have raised no objection in principle to the application or the nature of the access proposed subject to relevant planning conditions being attached should consent be granted.

It has been requested that a pedestrian/cycle link be provided to bridle way No.76 to the south/east, amended plans received detail the provision of a link at the eastern extents of the site. It is expected that the nature and detailed design of this link will be established and negotiated at any reserved matters stage.

Further to the Planning & Development Committee meeting of 16th January 2014, the County Surveyor has met with both local residents and Councillor Newmark on the 21 January and has summarised the outcome of the meeting and further comments in relation to the highways implication of the proposal by way of a briefing note which can be summarised as follows:

1. Parking issues. The residents advised that an active and popular bowling club is located opposite the junction to the proposed estate road with Pendle Street East. Also there is a football pitch to the east of the development site. This is accessed by proceeding along Pendle Street East around the sharp bend and then along the southern arm of this road to the end where it becomes a track (bridleway BW76). When matches occur at these venues, visitors and members park on Pendle Street East, Pendleside, the bridleway and any where nearby. The result is the roads are full of parked cars, some of which park half way across the footway. This makes it difficult for residents to come and go and there is no where for the residents to park if they should return home during a match. The residents consider that the proposed 17 dwelling development will make this situation worse. My own comment, which I made known to the residents, was that the new estate road will provide additional parking opportunities for the periods when matches are occurring. This should help to ease the local parking problems, rather than make them worse. The residents of this new development are unlikely to add to the parking problems because all dwellings should have provision for on-site parking. In addition I understand that the developer is proposing some

parking bays in a proposed open area off the estate road near to the back street. This will be available for visitors and existing local residents.

2. The residents thought that the junction of the new estate road and Pendle Street East would not allow for the turning of large vehicles such as refuse trucks and delivery vehicles. My own evaluation of the junction whilst on site was that the junction should not adversely affect large vehicles turning in and out of the estate road, even if a vehicle was parked in Pendle Street East just west of the junction. This was subsequently confirmed by Russell Edwards, who produced a tracking diagram and drawing of the area.
3. There were suggestions by residents that during the peak traffic periods (ie. during the two peak traffic hours which, for residential development, would be when the majority of journeys to work are undertaken) the Watt Street / Whalley Road junction was congested with long queues in Watt Street. I understood that the congestion was worse between 7:30 and 8:00 in the morning . I visited Sabden earlier in the day on 21 January specifically to observe the traffic conditions at this junction. I recorded queue lengths in Watt Street for every 5 minute interval until 8:15am. The longest queue length recorded was 11 vehicles between 8:05 and 8:10 and this quickly dissipated. The traffic conditions here are affected by the construction activity taking place in Sabden at present. This matter was not discussed with residents in any detail. I therefore do not consider that Watt Street and the Whalley Road junction was particularly congested.
4. Consideration by LCC Highways of other new and planned residential developments in the area (Victoria Mill and Cobden Mill, both on Watt Street near Whalley Road). This appeared to be a major issue, with residents critical of LCC Highways for apparently not considering the effects of these new developments on Pendle Street East. I explained that Highways is concerned with the effects of traffic generated on routes that would be used when most traffic is generated by a development (ie. during the two peak traffic hours which, for residential development, would be when the majority of journeys to and from work are undertaken). Traffic from the two developments on Watt Street would be unlikely to use Pendle Street East as part of a journey to work because it is a cul de sac. Traffic from these developments would drive from Watt Street directly onto Whalley Road. With this in mind, there is no need to consider the effects of these developments on Pendle Street East. The residents then suggested that the traffic from the new 17 dwelling development should be added into the traffic generated by the two developments on Watt Street, as the 17 dwelling development would increase the congestion on Watt Street and the junction with Whalley Road. However I pointed out that the tried and tested models used by traffic engineers indicate that about 0.5 vehicles per dwelling could be expected to be generated during the peak periods. For 17 dwellings this would equate to perhaps 10 vehicles during the peak hour or 1 vehicle every 5 or 6 minutes. This would not have a material impact on the traffic conditions in Watt Street

Following concerns raised by residents and objectors to the proposal the applicant has submitted an amended indicative layout which includes the provision of 4 'visitor' parking bays at the northern extents of the site. It is the intention that these bays will be available for use by both visitors to the development or existing residents in the area.

It is therefore considered that the level of development, as proposed, would not be of significant detriment to the operation or safety of the immediate or wider highways network.



## **Residential Amenity**

Given the application is for outline consent with matters of layout to be considered at the reserved matters stage, limited weight can be given to the assessment of the indicative layout in terms of its potential impact upon residential amenity, however based on the proposed layout I do not consider that the proposal would be of significant detriment to the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers and consider the separation distances shown to be adequate.

## **Layout**

Given the submitted site layout is indicative only limited weight can be given in relation to its assessment as part of this application. However, I am satisfied that in principle the general design approach would be satisfactory, although I would expect that matters relating to the orientation of a number of the properties, the detailed layout and streetscape would require further negotiation at reserved matters stage.

## **Appearance & Visual Amenity**

Whilst the applicant has submitted indicative house types, only matters of scale in relation to these are a valid consideration in relation to the current application. The applicant has put forward height parameters as follows:

- Two storey dwellings: ridge height 7.6m and an eaves height of 5.2m.  
Footprint: Approximately 5.5m x 9.6m
- Bungalows: ridge height 4.9m and an eaves height of 2.6m  
Footprint: Approximately 11m x 7.3m

In light of the above parameters I consider the overall height/scale of the proposed dwellings to be appropriate given the immediate context and do not consider that the proposal would be of detriment to the visual amenity of the area.

In terms of the visual appearance of the indicative house types, given the elevations are largely illustrative, I do not consider them to be of any specific architectural merit and I would consider that further extensive negotiation would be undertaken at any reserved matters stage to secure a detailed design that would respond to and enhance the immediate context and character of the area.

## **Ecology**

The applicant has submitted a Phase 1 Ecological Survey Report in support of the application. The survey concludes that there will be no significant impact in respect of habitat or protected species with the development largely having the most significant impact upon an area identified as improved grassland and semi-improved grassland. A number of mitigation measures have been suggested in respect of potential impact upon birds and bats (where applicable) and it is envisaged that these matters will be dealt with through planning condition should outline consent be granted.

## **Financial Contributions Requested by LCC**

LCC Contributions team have requested a financial contribution of £35,641 in respect of 3 primary school places in relation to the application. The applicant has indicated a willingness to pay the requested amount which will be secured via a Section 106 agreement, the details of which are currently being negotiated with the Local planning Authority.

## **Other Matters**

There are a number of points raised by objectors that do not sit easily within the headings given to consider the main issues associated with this scheme. These issues are addressed below:

Concerns have been raised in relation to the presence of electrical infrastructure on site, the applicant has confirmed that discussions have been undertaken with Electricity Northwest regarding all cabling to be accommodated/moved underground.

A number of objections/representations have been received in relation to the proposal relating to issues of highway safety and increased traffic as a result of the development, members will note that the County Surveyor has indicated that he has no objection to the nature and location of the junction off Pendle Street East and has provided a briefing note, contained earlier in this report in relation to detailed discussion with residents.

The issue of cumulative development has also been raised by numerous objectors, it is imperative that each application is considered on its own merits, however it is important to consider the Borough's current Housing Supply. In terms of five-year land supply, the most recent published position at the time of writing indicates that the latest housing land supply position based on a Core Strategy requirement of 250dpa, Sedgfield methodology and 20% buffer is **4.72** years at 31 December 2013. This is based on sites with permission and does not include any contribution from Standen or sites without permission (eg SHLAA sites).

A number of representations have been received that raise concerns over the development being of detriment to the Forest of Bowland AONB and the immediate landscape character. Given the proposed development is within close proximity to existing built form I do not consider that any visual impact would be significantly harmful and consider that it would be visually read as part of the existing settlement pattern. Although detailed design is not for consideration at this stage I do consider that a more sympathetic form and layout of development could be secured through extensive negotiation at reserved matters stage, which could potentially further minimise any perceived visual impact and allow it to respond further to the existing settlement pattern and urban grain.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) puts a clear emphasis on the need for Local Planning Authorities to consider the planning balance in assessing proposals and clearly states that in relation to sustainable development, applications should only be refused if impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.

The proposal as presented clearly has a number of benefits in terms of economic development, with construction jobs likely to be created by the development and it is widely accepted that the Housing industry has a critical role to play in terms of the national economic recovery. This has been extensively reported through ministerial statements and the Government's Growth Agenda; Plan for Growth (3/11); Housing Strategy for England (11/11); Housing and Growth (9/12); and Growth and Infrastructure Act (4/13).

Therefore, having carefully considered all of the above matters, and taking account of the planning balance, consider that in this case the benefits associated with the development clearly outweigh any harm associated with the development.

RECOMMENDATION: That the application be DEFERRED and DELEGATED to the Director of Community Services for approval following the satisfactory completion of a Legal Agreement within 3 months from the date of this Committee Meeting and subject to the following conditions:

1. Application for approval of reserved matters must be made not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission and the development must be begun not later than whichever is the later of the following dates.

(a) The expiration of three years from the date of this permission; or

(b) The expiration of two years from the final approval of the reserved matters or, in the case of approval on different dates, the final approval of the last such matter to be approved.

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

2. The submission of Reserved Matters in respect of scale and building height shall be carried out in substantial accordance with the eaves/ridge heights and footprint parameters contained within the approved Design & Access Statement (As amended June 2013).

REASON: For the avoidance of doubt to ensure there is no ambiguity in the decision notice over the scale of development that has been approved. In accordance with Policies G1, ENV3 and ENV13 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan and Policies DMG1, EN2 and DME3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy Regulation 22 Submission Draft ensuring a satisfactory standard of appearance and scale given its location.

3. No more than 17 dwellings (Use Class C3) are hereby permitted within the application site.

REASON: For the avoidance of doubt to ensure there is no ambiguity in the decision notice over what amount of development has been approved. In accordance with Policies G1, ENV3 and ENV13 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan and Policies DMG1, EN2 and DME3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy Regulation 22 Submission Draft ensuring a satisfactory standard of appearance and scale given its location

4. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 there shall not at any time in connection with the development hereby permitted be erected or planted or allowed to remain upon the land hereinafter defined any building, wall, fence, hedge tree, shrub or other device.

The visibility splay to be the subject of this condition shall be at the junction of the new estate road and Pendle Street East, and shall be that land in front of the visibility splays shown on drawing number 07B, and shall be constructed and maintained at footway/verge level in accordance with a scheme to be agreed by the Local Planning Authority in conjunction with the Highways Authority.

REASON: To ensure adequate visibility splays at the street junction or site access. In accordance with Policy T1 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan and Policies DMG1 and DMG3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy Regulation 22 Submission Draft.

5. The new estate road shall be constructed in accordance with the Lancashire County Council specification for Construction of Estate Roads to at least base course level before any other construction work takes place within the site.

REASON: To ensure satisfactory access is provided to the site before the construction of the development hereby permitted commences. In accordance with Policy T1 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan and Policies DMG1 and DMG3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy Regulation 22 Submission Draft.

6. Before construction work commences facilities shall be provided within the site by which means of the wheels of vehicle may be cleaned before leaving the site.

REASON: To avoid the possibility of the public highway being affected by the deposit of mud and/or loose materials thus creating a potential hazard to road users. In accordance with Policy T1 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan and Policies DMG1 and DMG3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy Regulation 22 Submission Draft.

7. No development shall take place until a Construction Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved Statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period and shall provide for:

- The parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;
- Loading and unloading of plant material;
- Storage of plant materials used in the construction of development;
- The erection and maintenance of security hoardings;
- Wheel washing facilities;
- A management plan to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction identifying suitable mitigation measures;
- A scheme for protecting trees;
- Routes into and out of the site to be utilised by construction traffic
- A scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from construction work; and
- A scheme to control noise during the construction phase.

REASON: In the interests of protecting residential amenity from noise and disturbance during the construction phase of the development in accordance with Policy G1 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan and Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy (Regulation 22 Submission Draft).

8. No building shall be erected within three metres of any public sewer unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: To protect existing surface infrastructure. In accordance with Policies ENV7, ENV9 and ENV13 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan and Policies EN2, EN4, DME2 and DME3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy Regulation 22 Submission Draft.

9. Notwithstanding any indication on the approved plans, no development approved by this permission shall commence until a scheme for the disposal of foul and surface waters has been submitted to an approved in writing by the Local planning Authority. For the avoidance of doubt, surface water must drain separate from the foul and no surface water will be permitted to discharge directly or indirectly into existing foul or combined sewerage systems. Any surface water draining to the public surface water sewer must be restricted to a maximum pass forward flow of 5l/s. The development shall be completed, maintained and managed in accordance with the approved details.

REASON: To ensure a satisfactory form of development and to prevent an undue increase in surface water run off and to reduce the risk of flooding. In accordance with Policies ENV7, ENV9 and ENV13 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan and Policies EN2, EN4, DME2 and DME3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy Regulation 22 Submission Draft.

10. No part of the development hereby approved shall commence until a scheme for the construction of the site access has been submitted to and approved by the planning authority in consultation with the highway authority.

REASON: To ensure adequate visibility splays are maintained at all times and to ensure the proposed Highways works are acceptable prior to the commencement of the development. In accordance with Policy T1 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan and Policies DMG1 and DMG3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy Regulation 22 Submission Draft.

11. Prior to the commencement of development, a revised Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey & Baseline Ecological Impact Assessment shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority, for the avoidance of doubt, the survey shall include mitigation measures and timing of works and the development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the survey.

REASON: To ensure that the development does not pose a threat or undermine the potential ecological value of the site. In accordance with Policies ENV7, ENV9 and ENV13 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan and Policies EN2, EN4, DME2 and DME3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy Regulation 22 Submission Draft

12. The submission of Reserved Matters in respect of layout shall include the provision for 4 visitor parking bays as indicated on Site Plan & Street Elevation Drawing 010-223 Rev: B as amended 20 February 2014

REASON: To ensure the proposed development does not lead to additional on street parking within the vicinity. In accordance with Policy T1 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan and Policies DMG1 and DMG3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy Regulation 22 Submission Draft.

# RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL REPORT TO PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Agenda Item No.

meeting date: 10 APRIL 2014  
title: FOREST OF BOWLAND AONB MANAGEMENT PLAN 2014-2019  
submitted by: DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY SERVICES  
principal author: DAVID HEWITT – COUNTRYSIDE OFFICER

## 1 PURPOSE

1.1 The purpose of this report is for Committee to agree the adoption of the Forest of Bowland AONB 2014-2019 Management Plan.

1.2 Relevance to the Council's ambitions and priorities:

- Community Objectives – The management plan makes the important connection between people and nature
- Corporate Priorities - The local planning authority has a duty to have regard to the conservation and enhancement of natural beauty as defined by and appropriate management of the Forest of Bowland AONB.
- Other Considerations - None

## 2 BACKGROUND

2.1 The Forest of Bowland was formerly designated an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty by Government on 10 February 1964. The area was designated as a landscape of national significance due to a variety of factors including:

- Grandeur and isolation of the upland core
- Undulating lowlands
- Serenity and tranquillity of the area
- Wildlife of the area
- Historic landscape and cultural associations

2.2 The AONB is managed by a partnership of landowners, farmers, voluntary organisations, wildlife groups, recreation groups, local councils and government agencies. Representatives from these groups sit on the Forest of Bowland AONB Joint Advisory Committee (JAC).

2.3 The AONB unit is guided by the JAC. This is a partnership organisation made up of local authorities, national environmental agencies and local representatives from landowning and recreation interest groups.

2.4 The JAC is supported by a number of themed working groups that in turn assist in the delivery of the AONB Management Plan:

- landscape and biodiversity

- landscape management
- access and recreation
- climate change
- education
- sustainable tourism.

2.5 The Forest of Bowland AONB Management Plan describes the special qualities of the area that contributes to the national significance of the landscape. It identifies the major trends and opportunities for the area and presents a vision for the Forest of Bowland AONB 2014-2019.

2.6 The document provides a policy framework and identifies a five-year programme of objectives to help guide the work of the AONB partnership organisation towards achieving the purpose of the plan. The objectives identify ways of working with:

- Landscape
- Biodiversity
- Geodiversity
- Planning and development

all of the objectives are designed to conserve and enhance an unspoilt and unique landscape of the highest quality.

### 3 ISSUES

3.1 The key issues affecting the AONB are climate change, development pressure, pursuit of economic growth, demands for recreation and changes in agricultural practices.

3.2 The Council has a duty to cooperate with strategic partners including the Forest of Bowland AONB, elected Members and technical officers group as well as national and regional organisations and agencies, including Natural England and the RSPB for example to address these issues.

3.3 The objectives of the AONB Management Plan referred to in paragraph 2.6 are compliant with environmental protection and enhancement policies of the Council's Core Strategy and the government's NPPF planning policy documents.

### 4 CONCLUSION

4.1 The objectives and actions of the AONB Management Plan need to be guided by a long term goal or vision and the Management Plan demonstrates how the AONB Partnerships will continue to protect some of the finest landscapes in the northwest, cherished by residents and visitors alike.

### 5 RISK ASSESSMENT

5.1 The approval of this report may have the following implications:

- Resources – The Council's countryside service will continue to play a role in the delivery of objectives included in the management plan

- Technical, Environmental and Legal – No implications identified.
- Political - No implications identified.
- Reputation – The Council’s reputation for protecting and enhancing the existing environmental quality for the area will be maintained.
- Equality & Diversity – No implications identified.

## 6 **RECOMMENDED THAT COMMITTEE**

6.1 Approve the Forest of Bowland AONB Management Plan [2014 – 2019].

DAVID HEWITT  
COUNTRYSIDE OFFICER

JOHN HEAP  
DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY SERVICES

### BACKGROUND PAPERS

Forest of Bowland AONB Management Plan 2014-2019 (final draft) or to download the final draft AONB management plan go to:

[www.forestofbowland.com/mgmtplanreview](http://www.forestofbowland.com/mgmtplanreview)

or for further information please ask for David Hewitt, extension 4505.

100414/P&D/DH/EL



# RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL REPORT TO PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Agenda Item No.

meeting date: Thursday 10<sup>th</sup> April 2014  
title: Consultation responses to other Local Planning Authorities Local Plan work  
submitted by: Director of Community Services  
principal author: Diane Neville – Senior Planning Officer (Policy)

## 1 PURPOSE

1.1 To inform Members of the various consultation responses which Ribble Valley have recently made to surrounding Local Planning Authorities on their Local Plan work.

1.2 Relevance to the Council's ambitions and priorities

- Community Objectives - Ensuring the Council is aware of progress and work being undertaken in neighbouring authorities and to ensure cross boundary, and Duty to Co-operate issues are fully understood.
- Corporate Priorities – On-going co-operation with surrounding LPAs allows for cross boundary issues to be considered in the Ribble Valley Local Plan work.
- Other Considerations – None.

## 2 BACKGROUND

2.1 Legislation requires that consultation must take place on evidence base documents that inform Local Plan work, as well as the actual Local Plan documents such as the Core Strategy. Ribble Valley continues to consult with surrounding Local Planning Authorities to ensure that any cross boundary issues are picked up and also to ensure that the Duty-to-Co-operate requirement is met. Equally, surrounding LPAs consult with Ribble Valley on their Local Plan work for the same reasons.

## 3 CONSULTATIONS

3.1 With this in mind, Ribble Valley has recently been consulted on Pendle Borough Council's Core Strategy Further Options report. Pendle had originally consulted on their preferred option report in late 2012 but following analysis of all the representations arising from this consultation, they felt that it prudent to update a number of evidence base documents. As a result, the housing requirement for Pendle has been revised and now equates to 290 units per annum. In addition 56.6ha of employment land will need to be identified and two strategic sites are being identified for development (Trough Laithe Farm, near Barrowford and Lomeshaye Industrial Estate). The deadline for comments on Pendle's Core Strategy work closed on 21<sup>st</sup> February 2014. It is not considered that there are any issues of concern with the proposals in the Pendle Core Strategy document for Ribble Valley.

2.3 In addition to the Pendle Core Strategy, Ribble Valley have also recently been consulted on the Fylde Coast Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA), which has been

produced for Fylde Council, Blackpool Council and Wyre Council collectively. This document assesses the housing considerations for the Fylde coast and considers matters such as housing market areas and the level of affordable housing requirement. The deadline for comments on this document was 20<sup>th</sup> February and Ribble Valley responded within the consultation period. It is not considered that the range of housing requirements in the Fylde Coast SHMA will affect the housing requirements in Ribble Valley. A point of clarity was raised in relation to the Ribble Valley figures used, though this was not felt to be significant.

- 2.4 In addition to the consultation response work outlined above, Hyndburn Borough Council is also progressing work on their Gypsy and traveller Assessment (GTAA) work. As part of this Ribble Valley officers have taken part in the telephone interview process required by surrounding authorities. This is the same process that was undertaken when Ribble Valley's GTAA was being completed and co-operation on this issue assists with fulfilling the Duty-to-Co-operate requirement.
- 2.5 Rossendale Borough Council have also recently invited Ribble Valley to attend a workshop on their emerging Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA). In this instance, officers were unable to attend due to the significant workload surrounding the Ribble Valley Core Strategy Examination in Public, however, it has been made clear to Rossendale officers that Ribble Valley wish to be kept informed on progress on this document and consulted on any emerging work. A subsequent consultation response by Ribble Valley in the form of a completed questionnaire has therefore been made on the SHMA consultation document.
- 2.6 Blackburn with Darwen Borough Council have also recently undertaken an Employment Land review on which they have consulted Ribble Valley. Blackburn with Darwen is seeking confirmation that Ribble Valley do not intend to attribute any of its employment land requirements to the Whitebirk Strategic Employment Site, which is located at Junction 6 of the M65 within Hyndburn Borough and abuts Blackburn's urban area. Ribble Valley have responded to this consultation and provided the confirmation sought on this matter.
- 2.7 In addition, Blackburn with Darwen have also requested comments on their 'Local Plan Part 2: Site Allocations and Development Management Policies' document. This document is the publication stage version of the document and comments made during the six-week consultation period will effectively feed into the submission version of the document. Work has been undertaken by the forward planning team on assessing this document to ensure that the site allocations and DM policies being proposed are acceptable in terms of any cross-boundary issues. The document did not raise any significant issues for Ribble Valley and a formal response was made to Blackburn with Darwen within the consultation period, ensuring this element of Ribble Valley's duty to co-operate was met.
- 2.8 Finally, Burnley Borough Council is starting to prepare their Local Plan and has therefore completed the first stage of this process, the Issues and Options document. As a key partner, Ribble Valley was invited to attend an event to discuss the detail contained in this document, however due to workloads involved with the post EiP Hearings work on the Core Strategy, it was not possible for a representative from the Forward Planning team at Ribble Valley to attend this session. We will however continue to stay involved in the process as Burnley progress their Local Plan.

4 CONCLUSION

- 4.1 Work on responding to consultations is on going and will continue to ensure that the Duty-to-Co-operate is met and Ribble Valley can take account of any potential cross boundary issues arising from work by surrounding LPAs, which may impact on Ribble Valley's own Local Plan work

5 RECOMMENDED THAT Committee

- 5.1 Note the contents of this report.

Diane Neville  
Senior Planning Officer

John Heap  
DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY SERVICES

BACKGROUND PAPERS

1. Pendle Borough Council Core Strategy Further Options Report (January 2014)
2. Draft Fylde Coast Strategic Housing Market Assessment (December 2013)
3. Blackburn with Darwen Employment Land review (2013)
4. Blackburn with Darwen Local Plan Part 2: Site Allocations and Development Management Policies' document (January 2014)

For further information please ask for Diane Neville, extension 4491

# RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL REPORT TO PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Agenda Item No.

meeting date: THURSDAY, 10 APRIL 2014  
title: LISTED BUILDING AT RISK – DOG KENNELS, GISBURNE PARK  
submitted by: DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY SERVICES  
principal author: ADRIAN DOWD – PRINCIPAL PLANNING OFFICER  
(DESIGN AND CONSERVATION)

## 1 PURPOSE

1.1 To inform Members of the urgent need for repair works to the eighteenth century Grade II listed Dog Kennels within Gisburne Park Historic Park and Garden (Grade II).

1.2 Relevance to the Council's ambitions and priorities

- Council Ambitions – To protect and enhance the existing environmental quality of our area.
- Community Objectives – The Ribble Valley Sustainable Community Strategy 2007-2013 has three relevant strategic objectives – maintain, protect and enhance all natural and built features that contribute to the quality of the environment. Ensure that the design of buildings respects local character and enhances local distinctiveness. Sustainably manage and protect industrial and historical sites.
- Corporate Priorities - Objective 3.3 of the Corporate Plan commits us to maintaining and improving the environmental quality of the Ribble Valley. Objective 3.8 of the corporate plan commits us to conserving and enhancing the local distinctiveness and character of our towns, villages and countryside when considering development proposals.
- Other Considerations – None.

## 2 BACKGROUND

2.1 The 'Dog Kennels by River Ribble, approximately 90m north east of Gisburne Bridge, Gisburn Park' was listed by the Secretary of State on 30 January 1981. The list description identifies it as '*probably late 18<sup>th</sup> century. Limestone rubble with sandstone dressings and brick inner walls. A sham castle with two round towers, flanking a lower central section of square plan*'. At the date of listing the historic building was described as 'derelict' and some roof coverings were missing.

2.2 In February 1996 planning permission (3/95/0631) and listed building consent (3/95/0632) was granted for 'restoration and conversion to domestic use'. The Committee report of 6 February 1996 identified the building to be '*unique ... as an individual construction and as part of the overall formally designed parkscape*' (Lancashire County Council, Archaeology), '*interesting and picturesque building in an extreme state of decay*' (Ancient Monuments Society), '*extremely attractive building*

*situated in a particularly beautiful setting* (The Georgian Group) and *'a very interesting building'* (English Heritage).

The detailed proposals, including substantial extension were of concern to the Georgian Group, the Ancient Monuments Society and English Heritage. However, officers noted that *'the building is now in an advanced state of dereliction. Areas of stone work have collapsed and large amounts of vegetation are growing out of the structure. Portions of the roof and the castellations around the turrets have disappeared altogether'*. It was considered that *'the space is really not sufficient or a practical proposition for any restoration ... it is not felt that the extension will dominate the existing ... generally the best way of securing the upkeep of historic buildings and areas is to keep them in active use. For the great majority this must mean economically viable uses if they are to survive ... it requires balancing the economic viability of possible uses against the effect of any changes'*.

- 2.3 Site inspection in October 2013 was prompted by the marketing of the site. The listed building is now in an extreme state of disrepair (see attached photographs).
- 2.4 The 'Gisburne Historic Landscape Management Plan' (Parklands Consortium Limited, October 2010), Gazetteer of Historic Landscape Features (1.3.9), identifies the kennels to be *'very significant: Fundamental to the design concept or to the historic interest of park'* and its condition to be *'Derelict: a ruin or badly damaged/incomplete'*. Alarming, it is concluded that the ***'Dog kennels ... require consolidation before they are lost'*** (page 119).
- 2.5 In December 2011 'Gisburne Park, north of Gisburn' was added to English Heritage's Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest in England at Grade II. The description states:

*This C18 formal garden and deer park, overlain by a landscaped park is designated at Grade II for the following principal reasons: \* Historic interest: the integrity of the early C18 formal garden and deer park phase is preserved and is highly visible \* Historic interest: despite some loss of character in parts, it is a good example of a mid and later C18 landscaped park in the English natural style, and sufficient of its original landscaping survives to reflect its original design \* Design influence: some elements of the landscaping appear to reflect the influence of a proposed early C18 design by Lord Robert Petre on subsequent generations of the Lister family \* Group value: it has strong group value with a number of listed buildings including the Grade II\* gate lodges and the Grade I Gisburne Hall \* Tree nursery: the presence of the 'Great Nursery' on Coppy Hill is a striking and unusual feature.*

The description also states *"A set of dog kennels (listed Grade II), in the form of a mock castle with two round towers, is situated above the River Ribble to the north-west of the walled garden. Views of these on the approach from the north and particularly from Gisburn Bridge are now obscured by tree growth"*.

- 2.6 National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph 126 states:

*'Local Planning Authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, **including heritage assets most at risk through neglect, decay or other threats**. In doing so, they should*

*recognise that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and conserve them in a manner appropriate to their significance’.*

2.7 The National Planning Policy Guidance (6 March 2014) states:

*“Heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and effective conservation delivers wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits.*

*the risks of neglect and decay of heritage assets are best addressed through ensuring that they remain in active use that is consistent with their conservation”.*

2.8 The Listing Selection Guide: Garden and Park Structures (English Heritage, 2011) states:

*“Kennels (always an element of high status complexes, and provided expressly for foxhounds as fox hunting became fashionable in the earlier eighteenth century) were sometimes ornamental; elaborate or complete examples, especially pre-dating 1840, will be listable”.*

2.9 The Setting of Heritage Assets (English Heritage, October 2011) states:

*“Many heritage assets have settings that have been designed to enhance their presence and visual interest or to create experiences of drama or surprise. Views and vistas, or their deliberate screening, are key features of these designed settings, providing design axes and establishing their scale, structure, layout and character. These designed settings may also be regarded as heritage assets in their own rights, which, themselves, have a wider setting: a park may form the immediate setting for a great house, while having its own setting that includes lines-of-sight to more distant heritage assets or natural features beyond the park boundary” (2.5).*

2.10 Stopping the Rot: A Guide to Enforcement Action To Save Historic Buildings (English Heritage, 2011) states:

*Keeping historic buildings in good repair and, where possible, in use, is the key to their preservation. Sometimes, however, they become redundant, vacant and neglected. Without timely action they can be at risk of permanent loss, both to their own historic fabric and to the character of the localities of which they are irreplaceable components. **Owners of listed buildings are under no statutory obligation to maintain their property in a good state of repair, although it is in their interests to do so. Local authorities can, however, take action to secure repair when it becomes evident that a building is being allowed to deteriorate.** Urgent Works Notices, Repairs Notices and Section 215 Notices can be very effective tools to help secure the preservation of historic buildings.*

*The powers escalate as the problem escalates.*

- *Section 215 Notice – a relatively straightforward power to require the owner or occupier to carry out works to improve the external condition of a building or land if its neglect is adversely affecting the surrounding area.*

- *Urgent Works Notice – a power that allows a local authority to directly carry out works that are required urgently to make an unoccupied listed building weathertight and thus prevent further deterioration.*
- *Repairs Notice – a power that allows a local authority to specify to the owner works it considers reasonably necessary to secure the future of a listed building. If the repairs are not carried out, the power can lead to compulsory purchase of the building.*
- *Compulsory Purchase Order – when all other measures fail, the local authority's last resort is to compulsorily acquire a listed building in order either to repair it itself or more usually to sell it on to be restored by a buildings preservation trust or other new owner.*

*English Heritage runs a grants scheme to help local authorities take statutory action either by underwriting Urgent Works Notices and Repairs Notices or assisting in the costs of acquisition.*

The Introduction to Stopping the Rot by John Penrose, MP, Minister for Tourism and Heritage states:

*Historic buildings matter. As well as connecting us to our shared past they add character to our villages, streets, towns and cities. On the whole they are well-cared for by their owners and continue to provide us with places to live, work, learn, visit and enjoy ourselves. They add uniqueness, character and a sense of place to our lives.*

*Occasionally, however, things go wrong and they become empty and neglected; blots on the urban landscape or the village street. When this happens they not only become wasting assets in their own right, but they degrade the quality of the surrounding environment too. We all know what they look like; we can all point to examples in our own neighbourhoods. And above all we know the great harm they can do to the economic and social vibrancy of their surrounding communities.*

*Just one stubbornly derelict boarded-up property can be an eyesore as well as a major source of economic blight and a disincentive to much-needed investment. In most cases, dialogue between the owner and the local authority can unlock a solution. Local authorities and English Heritage can work with owners to develop a viable use for a building or development to provide an economic future for a site that retains its historic character. Building preservation trusts can use their practical experience to restore neglected buildings back to productive use. And grants are available to help our most important buildings at risk. But sometimes positive support is simply not enough.*

*In these exceptional circumstances local planning authority officers have no option than to draw upon a range of statutory enforcement measures. These powers are underused and this enhanced and updated edition of Stopping the Rot aims to help local authorities make better use of them. Timely enforcement can prevent buildings deteriorating and the costs escalating beyond the point where they are economic to repair. These powers, used in an incremental and proportional way, can play an invaluable role in bringing neglected historic buildings back to useful life.*

*This nation's historic buildings are a shared legacy; once lost they are lost forever. So saving England's neglected heritage is a challenge for us all. It will only be overcome so long as government, private owners and the voluntary sector work together to breathe new life into these irreplaceable but sometimes neglected places.*

2.11 'Urgent Works to Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas' (EH website) states:

***An urgent works notice is a direct way of securing repairs urgently necessary for the preservation of a building. This is distinct from a repairs notice which is concerned with long-term conservation and is a pre-cursor to possible compulsory acquisition.***

*An urgent works notice may be served where works are urgently necessary for the preservation of a listed building. It is advisable for the local authority to notify the owner that it is considering serving an urgent works notice. The owner may then decide to undertake the necessary works. If the owner declines to do so or is otherwise unresponsive then the law allows the local authority (and English Heritage in Greater London) to execute any works which appear to them to be urgently necessary for the preservation of any listed building within their area. The Secretary of State may also authorise English Heritage to carry out such works elsewhere in England.*

*The owner must be given a minimum of seven days written notice of the local authority's intention to carry out the works and the notice must describe the proposed works.*

*An urgent works notice should generally be restricted to urgent repairs to keep a building wind and weather-proof and safe from collapse, or action to prevent vandalism or theft. The steps taken should be consistent with achieving this objective.*

*The cost of carrying out the works may be recovered by the local authority or English Heritage (as appropriate) from the owner. Such cost may include the continuing expense of providing temporary support or shelter of the building.*

*The owner may challenge the cost claimed by writing to the Secretary of State. The grounds of challenge may be that:*

1. *Some or all of the works were unnecessary for the preservation of the building.*
2. *Temporary support and shelter measures have continued for an unreasonable length of time.*
3. *The amount reclaimed is unreasonable.*
4. *Recovery of the amount claimed would cause the owner hardship.*

*The Secretary of State will determine to what extent the representations are justified when determining the amount recoverable.*

*Listed building consent is not required for works carried out by the local authority pursuant to a valid notice. Listed building consent may be required by the owner if they are to carry out the works themselves. The usual rules will apply.*

### 3 ISSUES

3.1 On 30 October 2013 the Principal Planning Officer (Design and Conservation) wrote to the owner of the Dog kennels and advised:



*“In order to prevent further deterioration to the designated heritage assets and the need for more extensive and expensive works in the future, I would therefore be grateful for your early consideration to a programme of urgently required repair work to stabilise building condition. Such work may need to be informed by a structural survey and may require listed building consent; I can advise further in respect to these matters”.*

A number of reminder letters have been sent and on 4 March 2014 the building owner advised of the commissioning of a conservation architect ‘to advise on the best course of action’.

- 3.2 Site inspection and the prescient comment in the Gisburne Historic Landscape Management Plan would suggest that prolonged delay in stabilising building condition could result in the loss of this listed building and its important contribution to the designated historic park and garden and the setting of a number of listed buildings (including Gisburne Park, Grade I). Officers will therefore monitor the situation carefully, give early consideration to the next stage in ensuring the proper preservation of the building (the authorisation of Committee will be sought in respect to Urgent Works Notice service should this be required) and invite English Heritage comment on the matter.
- 3.3 The priority is to stabilise building condition and prevent further decay. Following this, officers will provide all necessary support and advice to the building owner in achieving the optimum viable use of the building.

#### 4 RISK ASSESSMENT

4.1 The approval of this report may have the following implications:

- Resources – No implications identified.
- Technical, Environmental and Legal – No implications identified.
- Political – No implications identified.
- Reputation – No implications identified.
- Equality and Diversity - No implications identified.

#### 5 CONCLUSION

5.1 Members are asked to consider the contents of the report and the state of repair of the Dog kennels at Gisburne Park.

ADRIAN DOWD  
PRINCIPAL PLANNING OFFICER  
(DESIGN AND CONSERVATION)

JOHN HEAP  
DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY SERVICES

#### BACKGROUND PAPERS

Are referenced in the report.

For further information please ask for Adrian Dowd, extension 4513.

# RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL REPORT TO PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Agenda Item No.

meeting date: 10 APRIL 2014  
title: CORE STRATEGY UPDATE  
submitted by: CHIEF EXECUTIVE  
principal author: COLIN HIRST

## 1 PURPOSE

1.1 To receive a progress update on the Core Strategy.

1.2 Relevance to the Council's ambitions and priorities

- Community Objectives – the Core Strategy is the central strategy of the Local Development Framework (LDF). It will help in the delivery of housing, employment and the protection and enhancement of the environment, ultimately presenting the delivery strategy for implementing the vision for the Ribble Valley for the next 20 years. As a tool for delivering spatial policy, the Core Strategy identifies how a range of issues relating to the objectives of a sustainable economy, thriving market towns and housing provision will be addressed through the planning system.
- Corporate Priorities – the core Strategy is the central document of the LDF and sets the overall vision and approach to future planning policy which will aid performance and consistency.
- Other Considerations – the Council has a duty to prepare spatial policy under the LDF system.

## 2 INFORMATION

2.1 Members will be aware that the Council has been progressing the Core Strategy through its Examination stage since the Council's plan was formally submitted in September 2012 and an Inspector appointed to hold the Examination. On 14 January 2014, the Inspector commenced the formal hearings which sat for 5½ days. The hearings took the form of structured discussion around a published list of matters arising from the Inspector's scrutiny of the plan and relevant representations from the development industry, landowners, local community and private and public sector organisations.

2.2 As a result of the hearings, amendments to wording to provide further clarification and explanation of the Plan explored during the discussions were identified, together with a request from the Inspector for additional information and matters to support his consideration of the Plan in relation to a number of topics. The Inspector indicated on closing the hearings that these matters would need to be drawn together and would also need to be published for public consultation in due course.

2.3 On 31 January 2014, the Inspector issued an interim letter stating his view that the Council needed to make a modification to address his concern following the hearings that the proposed housing requirement was too low, and that the settlement strategy

needed to identify from within the second tier of 'other settlements' those more sustainable settlements where growth could be directed. The Inspector also raised as an issue that the distribution of the adjustment made in the housing distribution model relative to Longridge needed to be focused towards the remaining larger settlements or the more sustainable settlements rather than distributed across the borough.

- 2.4 Work in relation to these matters has been ongoing in conjunction with the Committee's Core Strategy Working Group. The outcome of this work will be presented for consideration by Members most likely at a special meeting of the Planning and Development Committee when the outstanding matters from the hearings can be consolidated and reviewed.
- 2.5 Members have previously received reports relating to the costs of the LDF and within that, the costs of the Core Strategy, as well as receiving updates on relevant budget and specific costs for pieces of work as the process has been undertaken. Given the Council is now moving towards the end of the Examination stage, a cost summary is attached at Appendix A for information. This includes annual costs (table 1) and a breakdown against key stages (table 2).
- 2.6 It should be borne in mind that some costs reflect pieces of work undertaken that are shared across a number of functions and service areas including economic development and strategic housing and will not just be in support of the Core Strategy. Similarly, some staffing costs included the figures will reflect staff who work on other areas than the Core Strategy.
- 2.7 The breakdown in table 2 shows the following three key stages:
  - Start of work to submission
  - Submission to the Inspector's publication of his list of matters to be examined and notice of hearings
  - Notice of hearings to current date
- 2.8 This breakdown provides the figures for the work required to take the Council to the point of submission of the Plan formally to the Secretary of State, which is the start of the Examination period. The second stage reflects the period from formal submission to the point at which the Inspector confirms he is happy to move to the hearing stage within the Examination and the dates and matters to be examined are formally published. This period includes the suspension period when the Inspector asked for updated evidence to be provided. Members will recall that following submission in September 2012, the Inspector wrote in January 2013 confirming to the Council he would suspend the Examination for six months to allow evidence to be updated. He later wrote and confirmed to suspend the Examination to September 2013.
- 2.9 In November 2013 the Inspector published his list of matters and confirmed the dates for the hearings with sitting days to commence on 14 January 2014. The hearings closed formally on 22 January 2014, and the Council is still in the Examination phase.
- 2.10 In response to the Inspector it was indicated that the necessary work following the hearings would be undertaken with a view to enabling Members to consider the proposed modifications by the end of April/early May, with the aim of commencing the

six week consultation stage by the later part of May concluding at the end of June. The Inspector has so far indicated that he is content with that timeframe.

- 2.11 It is anticipated that the responses to the consultation would be passed directly to the Inspector to inform his Examination of the Plan. Whilst it was indicated at the close of the sitting days by the Inspector that matters would be dealt with most likely through the written representations process, it cannot be ruled out that the consultation process may raise matters where the Inspector considers that further hearing days are needed. However, if matters can be dealt with through written procedures and there are no substantive issues going forward, it is possible that the Inspector could issue his report to the Council and conclude the Examination by the end of July at the earliest depending upon his workloads and commitments.
- 2.12 Once the Council has received the report and its findings are favourable, the Council will be able to move into the adoption process. The Council will need to formally consider the Inspector's report, endorse any modifications and following recent legislation changes, consult and then confirm the adoption of the Plan.

COLIN HIRST  
HEAD OF REGENERATION AND HOUSING

MARSHAL SCOTT  
CHIEF EXECUTIVE

#### BACKGROUND PAPERS

Office files.

For further information please ask for Colin Hirst, extension 4503.

REF: CH/EL/P&D/100414

APPENDIX 1

Table 1 – Core Strategy Costs by Key Stage

Start To Submission Up to 28 Sept 2012 £	Submission to Notice of Hearing 1st Oct 2012 to 31 Oct 2013 £	Notice of Hearing to Present 1st Nov 2013 to 28 Mar 2014 £	Total Cost £
1,255.25			1,255.25
19,607.49			19,607.49
32,082.97			32,082.97
33,687.24			33,687.24
70,237.36			70,237.36
56,481.65			56,481.65
34,516.97			34,516.97
67,545.61			67,545.61
24,940.92	25,160.33		50,101.25
	63,332.39	14,518.21	77,850.60

Table 2 – Core Strategy Costs by Year

	£	£
2004/05	1,255.25	
2005/06	19,607.49	
2006/07	32,082.97	
2007/08	33,687.24	
2008/09	70,237.36	
2009/10	56,481.65	
2010/11	34,516.97	
2011/12	67,545.61	
2012/13	50,101.25	
2013/14	77,850.60	
<b>Total @ 28 March 2014</b>		<b>443,366.39</b>

(f) Appeals Budget Monitoring Report

The tables below shows a breakdown of recent appeal costs and consultant costs on major planning application as well as a Judicial Review case.

Members will be aware that a Planning Reserve Fund was established to meet these and other costs associated with Planning.

The majority of the costs relate to Barrister fees representing and advising the Council at Appeal. There has also been the need to employ expert witnesses mainly to deal with landscaping and highways issues.

Members should also note that there have been some costs awards on planning appeals with one award of approximately £17,000 and 3 outstanding cases with amounts either not yet requested or agreed.

## ANNEX

SUMMARY OF APPEALS / CONSULTANTS COSTS - 2008/09 To 2013/14

Application	Planning Application Numbers	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	Total
Primrose Rd, Clitheroe		£4,900.00						£4,900.00
Calderstone Park, Pendle Drive, Whalley			£1,440.00					£1,440.00
Glebe House, Bolton - By-Bowland	3/2010/0116x			£4,162.50	£600.00			£4,762.50
Riddings Lane, Whalley	3/2010/0820				£14,050.00			£14,050.00
Henthorn Road, Clitheroe	3/2010/0719				£54,412.31			£54,412.31
Whalley New Road, Billington	3/2010/078				£1,425.00	£17,139.50		£18,564.50
Land East of Clitheroe Rd, Whalley (Lawsonsteads)	3/2012/0327				£780.00	£6,817.28		£7,597.28
Land Woone Lane, Clitheroe					£2,600.00			£2,600.00
Mitton Rd, Whalley	3/2012/0637					£3,597.50	£38,014.46	£41,611.96
Land off Chatburn Old Rd, Chatburn	3/2011/0025					£48,314.27		£48,314.27
Barrow Lands (Land SW of Barrow & W of Whalley Rd, Barrow)	3/2012/0630					£2,200.00	£36,230.70	£38,430.70
Site off Milton Ave, Clitheroe	3/2011/0892					£1,750.00		£1,750.00
Barrowlands (2)	3/2013/0190						£12,231.00	£12,231.00
Waddow View, Clitheroe	3/2012/0854						£15,650.00	£15,650.00
Land at Higher Standen and Littlemoor Farm, Clitheroe	3/3012/0942						£1,125.00	£1,125.00
Hansons Nursery							£770.00	£770.00
Land adjacent to Dudland Croft, Gisburn Rd, Sawley							£6,263.01	£6,263.01
Miscellaneous			£4,026.50				£550.00	£4,576.50
<b>Total Expenditure</b>		<b>£4,900.00</b>	<b>£5,466.50</b>	<b>£4,162.50</b>	<b>£73,867.31</b>	<b>£79,818.55</b>	<b>£110,834.17</b>	<b>£279,049.03</b>

## PLANNING RESERVE FUND @ 28 MARCH 2014

Detail	Revised Estimate		Current Position	
	£	£	£	£
<b>Balance Brought Forward 01.04.13</b>		-309,071.45		-309,071.45
<b>Contribution towards Expenditure</b>				
- Planning Consultants / Appeal Costs (Net of budget provision)	141,910.00		102,744.17	
- Contribution to Staffing Costs	50,980.00		45,019.00	
		192,890.00		147,763.17
<b>Balance Carried Forward 28.03.14</b>		<b>-116,181.45</b>		<b>-161,308.28</b>