

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

Agenda Item No

meeting date: THURSDAY, 12 FEBRUARY 2015  
 title: PLANNING APPLICATIONS  
 submitted by: DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY SERVICES

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

APPLICATION NO: 3/2014/0996/P (GRID REF: SD 372988 443572)  
 PROPOSED CHANGE OF USE OF HAIRDRESSERS SHOP TO A ONE BEDROOM GROUND FLOOR FLAT AT 16 SPRING GARDENS, WADDINGTON, BB7 3HH

PARISH COUNCIL: No observations received at the time of preparing this report.

ENVIRONMENT DIRECTORATE (COUNTY SURVEYOR): The proposed development is a change of use from existing hairdressers shop to a one bedroom flat. It is believed that there would be less frequency of the vehicles visiting the site than the previous business and as such there was a highway betterment. It is possible that the occupant's flat may have one vehicles and currently there is no parking restrictions on the road adjacent to the proposed development and as such it is possible to accommodate one vehicle and the site is on the road of the vicinity of this development. No objection to the proposed development on highway grounds.

ENVIRONMENT AGENCY: Originally objects on the grounds of the inadequacy of the Flood Risk Assessment. A revised Flood Risk Assessment has been submitted and as yet there is no reply to the revised strategy. Update to be reported verbally.

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS: No representations received.

### **Proposal**

Permission is sought for a change of use of a former hairdressing salon to a one bedroom flat at 16 Spring Gardens, Waddington. The property is a ground floor unit. There is no parking available within the site and it is situated on the edge of the Conservation Area of Waddington.

### **Site Location**

The property is on the edge of Waddington Conservation Area within the built up area of Waddington and predominantly surrounded by residential properties. It is situated on the main road known as Waddington Road although the property is known as Spring Gardens. The property falls within the settlement boundary of Waddington and is designated a Tier 2 settlement as part of the Adopted Core Strategy.

## **Relevant History**

None.

## **Relevant Policies**

Key Statement DS1 – Development Strategy.

Key Statement H2 – Housing Balance.

Policy DMG2 – Strategic Considerations.

Policy DMG1 – General Considerations.

Policy DMR4 – Retail Outside the Main Settlement.

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

The main issues to consider in relation to this application relate to residential amenity, highway safety, loss of employment use and the Council's Development Strategy in relation to the provision of new housing.

In relation to residential amenity I do not consider that the creation of a ground floor flat would cause harm to residential amenities of adjacent dwellings. The property is surrounded by residential dwellings and this unit forms one of a block of terraced dwellings. There would be some overlooking as a result of the proposal but this is minimised as the most affected window of the adjacent dwelling is obscure glazed.

Having regard to highway implications it is clear that the County Surveyor recognises that the previous use may have resulted in more vehicular activity and although there is no provision for off-street parking there is no objection from Lancashire County Council Highway Authority on this matter.

The property has been marketed and there has been no demand for a hairdressing facility or other type of employment use. Although it is regrettable to lose any facility that serves the local community I do not consider that the loss of this business use would be significant harm to the vitality of the local community.

The key issue that remains to be considered relates to whether or not the provision of an additional residential property, albeit a small one bedroom flat, would be harmful to the Adopted Core Strategy and in particular the settlement hierarchy. Policy DMG2 in relation to Tier 2 villages requires that the development should either:

- be essential to the local economy;
- needed for the purpose forestry agriculture;
- for local needs housing and meets and identified need;
- small-scale tourism or recreation development;
- small-scale uses appropriate to a rural area.

It is evident that over the plan period there are no houses to be allocated for Waddington and as such there is no residual requirement for a market house in this location. So unless the proposal is either local needs housing or has recognised regeneration benefits it should be resisted.

It is accepted that the proposal would create a small flat and by nature of its size would potentially provide provision for a reasonably low priced unit. The SHMA concluded that there is a need for both market and affordable 1 bed units. The applicant has indicated they are not willing to have an affordable units restriction and so this application must be seen as providing a 1 bedroom market dwelling.

The applicant considers that this development would provide regeneration benefits via the construction and introduction of a new household, but it is clear that this would provide limited benefits, I am fully aware that each application is considered on its merits but it is worth noting that an Inspector has given little regard to economic benefits of one dwelling in two recent planning appeals.

### Conclusion

It is accepted that this scheme would not result in any significant visual harm and there is some benefit in providing a 1 bedroom flat as this is identified need and would add to the range of housing provision in the locality and borough.

I am mindful that the Adopted Core Strategy which identifies Waddington as a Tier 2 settlement where there is no requirement for market housing and that it should be limited to local needs and regeneration benefits. I consider that this is an exceptional case as it does not include new build, ensures the vitality of an existing building in a prominent location and would add to the range of house types throughout the borough and also help to meet a local and borough need for 1 bed units.

RECOMMENDATION: That planning permission be GRANTED subject to the following conditions and subject to adverse comments received from the Environment Agency:

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 be carried out in accordance with plan references 4665-01REVB and 4665-03A.

REASON: For the avoidance of doubt.

3. Prior to occupation of the dwelling precise details of the obscure glazing shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. It shall thereafter remain in that matter in perpetuity.

REASON: To safeguard adjacent residential amenity and to comply with Policy DMG1 of the Core Strategy Adopted Version.

APPLICATION NO: 3/2015/0008/P

(GRID REF: SD 374244 441693)

PROPOSED DISMANTLING AND REBUILDING OF HISTORIC PINNACLE FROM THE HOUSES OF PARLIAMENT TO REMOVE CORRODED FERROUS CRAMPS, DOWELS ETC WITH NECESSARY STONE REPAIRS MADE USING CONCEALED STAINLESS STEEL FIXINGS AT ROSE GARDEN, CLITHEROE CASTLE GROUNDS

TOWN COUNCIL:	No objections.
ENGLISH HERITAGE:	<p>Commend the design process which is informed by an understanding of the significance of the structure as well as being specified by people with experience and knowledge of the most appropriate means of repair of a historic structure of this type. This is the potential to be an exemplary scheme if implemented with the same care by an operative experienced in the repair of these types of defects. English Heritage are therefore happy to support the scheme from a development management prospective.</p> <p>English Heritage recommends that the Borough Council addresses the above issues and determines the application in accordance with national and local policy guidance, and on the basis of its specialist conservation advice.</p>
SOCIETY FOR THE PROTECTION OF ANCIENT BUILDINGS:	Defers to the Victorian Society on this occasion.
ANCIENT MONUMENTS SOCIETY:	No adverse comments. Happy to defer to the RVBC Conservation Officer on the detail of the proposals.
COUNCIL FOR BRITISH ARCHAEOLOGY:	No response necessary. No objection. Application suitable to be determined based on the advice of the RVBC Conservation Officer.
20 <sup>TH</sup> CENTURY SOCIETY:	Consulted, no comments received at time of report writing.
VICTORIAN SOCIETY:	Welcomes the proposed conservation of this nationally important and highly characterful monument. It is clear that the pinnacle's stonework is in need of the sensitive repair that this application proposes and the Victorian Society therefore offer it full support.
GARDEN HISTORY SOCIETY:	Consulted, no comments received at time of report writing.
ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS:	Lancashire Gardens Trust – the LGT responds on behalf of the Garden History Society which devolves its cases to the regions. Based on the submitted plans (no site visit) the LGT supports the proposals of repair.

Clitheroe Castle Park is a registered park and garden Grade II, which includes a number of important listed structures notably the Grade I listed Castle Keep, as well as a number of Grade II listed structures, the Stables and Outbuildings, the Old Courthouse, Castle House and the Pinnacle (Turret from the Houses of Parliament).

It is recognised that the eventual scope of some important areas of the work depends on decisions to be taken once dismantling and repair has commenced. This is unavoidable, and it is assumed that the funding will permit the ultimate extent of the work to be completed. In particular the “apparent” lean on the overall structure itself (item SE9) although hopefully minor at 1° is not clarified and depends on further surveys. It is to be hoped that this is not a progressive matter caused by a below ground issue, and that this will be understood at an early stage in the works.

The LGT notes the comprehensive documentation provided and fully supports the project.

## **Proposal**

Listed building consent is sought for the dismantling of the pinnacle, removal of ferrous fixings and rebuilding with stone repairs using concealed stainless steel fixings.

The submitted Heritage Statement identifies that “the main threat to the pinnacle is the corrosion of concealed ferrous cramps within the structure which hold the various pieces of stone together: their deterioration and expansion is likely to cause fractures to the masonry”. The submitted Design and Access Statement also identifies that “previous stone repairs also seemed to have used ferrous dowels which have corroded, shedding the repair and leaving the dowels exposed”.

The Civic Society is not seeking to replace any of the stonework (Heritage Statement) but it may be necessary to insert some new carved stone sections where they are missing completely, if they are deemed to be of structural or weathering significance – namely a couple of drip mouldings at the top of the columns on the South East and South West corners (Design and Access Statement). Also, the submitted Philosophy of Repair allows for the replacement of stones where they are damaged beyond the extent that they can be effectively repaired by either ‘pinning’, indenting or a combination of both. It is confirmed that only essential repairs will be undertaken.

In dealing with iron fixings, the Philosophy of Repair states that Cathodic Protection would not be a practical option.

The schedule of work submitted with the application is based on the visual inspection of the pinnacle. It is hoped that a Ground Penetrating Radar (GPR) Survey can also be undertaken in order to determine as accurately as possible, and prior to dismantling, the extent, location and features of all embedded ferrous fixings.

The originally submitted information proposed cleaning of the worst areas of stone dirt/pollution using water wash/brush down and if deemed necessary, 'poultice' cleaning.

### **Site Location**

The 'Turret from Houses of Parliament in gardens of Clitheroe Castle' is a Grade II listed (30 September 1976) building prominently sited within the Clitheroe Castle Historic Park and Garden (Grade II), Clitheroe Conservation Area and the setting of Clitheroe Castle Keep and Curtain Walls (scheduled monument; Grade I listed) and the Clitheroe Castle Museum buildings (Grade II listed former Stables and Outbuildings, Old Courthouse and Castle House).

The list description for the turret identifies:

*"Used as the centrepiece of pond in rose garden to South of castle. Octagonal stone turret with 4 lions rampant with shields at base. Plinth. Lancet ornament with cusped heads, gargoyles, crocketed finials. Inscription records the presentation of the turret, which originally formed part of the parapet of the Houses of Parliament, erected 1840-54, and was presented to the Borough of Clitheroe by a local MP in 1937, in commemoration of the coronation of George VI".*

The historic park and garden description identifies:

*"A castle mound, used as the grounds of a private residence, with garden terraces laid out in the early C19, the mound and adjacent land being developed for use as a public park in the 1920s (Summary of Historic Interest)*

*... The Castle site and grounds were purchased by public subscription by the then borough council from Lord Montagu of Beaulieu in November 1920, to form a memorial to the 260 soldiers from the town who lost their lives in the war. A total of £15,000 was raised, the balance from the purchase price of £9500 being spent on the laying out of the park.*

*... a formal rose garden, the centrepiece of which is a pinnacle from the Houses of Parliament (listed grade II), presented to the Borough of Clitheroe by the local MP in 1937 to commemorate the coronation of George VI. This scheme replaced a bowling green, formed on a garden terrace constructed in the mid C19, the green being part of the scheme of conversion of the site for public use".*

The Clitheroe Castle Historical Survey for Restoration (Land Use Consultants, 1998) identifies:

*"The Rose Garden ... photographic evidence indicates that the turret was originally free standing within the paved area (aerial photographs 1949) but was subsequently enclosed in a raised pond bed (possibly to deter direct access in view of possible damage). The pond is shown in O.S. 1976 but has been subsequently infilled as a raised rosebed" (7.15; also map regression page 12-18, photograph page 45 and reference to Council Minutes of 28 August 1936 at page 68).*

The submitted Heritage Statement identifies that following the almost total devastation of the Palace of Westminster by fire in 1834, a Royal Commission was set up to oversee its reconstruction. Gothic or Elizabethan style was stipulated. The architect chosen was Charles Barry, who was assisted by Augustus Pugin, and construction began in 1840. The stone chosen was the magnesian limestone quarried at Anston in the West Riding of Yorkshire. However, it was soon found that it was very susceptible to the polluted environment of London, and there

was rapid deterioration of the masonry, to the extent that by the 1920s there was a clear risk of parts falling from overhead, so a programme of replacement was begun in 1930, using Clipsham limestone from Rutland. Some of the decayed stonework was sold off, including the pinnacle which now stands at Clitheroe (paragraph 2.1-2.2). All details are typically early Victorian Gothic revival (paragraph 3.2).

The pinnacle and Castle Gardens are in the ownership of the Borough Council.

### **Relevant History**

3/2005/0187 - Dismantle stone turret and move to new location in park, re-assemble, undertake restoration work as required. Associated curtilage work. Walls, railings and copings. LBC granted 18 August 2005

### **Relevant Policies**

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.  
National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).  
National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG) .  
Historic Environment Planning Practice Guide (HEPPG).

*Ribble Valley Core Strategy (Adopted Version)*  
Policy DME4 – Protecting Heritage Assets.  
Clitheroe Conservation Area Appraisal.

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

The main consideration in the determination of the listed building consent application is the preservation ('keeping free from harm') of the listed building, its setting (and the setting of the scheduled monument and other listed buildings) and its features of special architectural and historic interest.

Section 16(2) (relating to listed building consents) and 66(1) (the 'General duty as respects listed buildings in exercise of planning functions') of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 require that *special regard* be given to the desirability of preserving a listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. A number of recent legal cases have examined the weighting of this consideration in the 'planning balance'. The Governance and Legal Director of English Heritage ('Legal Developments' Conservation Bulletin Issue 73: Winter 2014) states in respect to (any level of) harm to a listed building:

*"The Lyveden case reaffirmed that this means the conservation of a listed building should be afforded 'considerable weight and importance' ... with the 'great weight' of paragraph 132 and you should appreciate that minor harm does not mean merely a minor concern ... Any harm is to be given 'great weight' whether it is serious, substantial, moderate, minor or less than substantial ... every decision should acknowledge the general priority afforded to heritage conservation in comparison to other planning objectives or public benefits ... Minor harm to a heritage asset can add up to major and irreversible damage. It is obviously right that planning decisions reflect on this threat each and every time".*

**Guidance and advice** suggests that the repair of a listed building should be approached carefully. 'Like-for-like' repair may not be appropriate where the original form of construction is not durable.

'The Historic Environment Planning Practice Guide' (HEPPG) states:

*"Repairing by re-using materials to match the original in substance, texture, quality and colour, helps maintain authenticity, ensures the repair is technically and visually compatible, minimises the use of new resources and reduces waste. However, **alternative approaches may be appropriate if it can be demonstrated that the technique will not cause long-term damage to the asset and results in less overall loss of original fabric and significance** ... Repairs to a listed building may require consent. One would expect that the loss of historic fabric following repairs, and alteration, would be proportionate to the nature of the works"* (Paragraph 149).

*"Even when undertaking repair, care is needed to maintain the integrity of the asset. Some repair techniques ... will affect the integrity of the existing building and cause permanent damage to the historic fabric, as well as being visually unsympathetic"* (Paragraph 150).

*"Features such as tool marks ... smoke blackening ... are always damaged by sand-blasting and sometimes by ... other cleaning ... Such treatments are unlikely to be considered as repairs and would normally require listed building consent"* (Paragraph 151).

'Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance for the Sustainable Management of the Historic Environment' (English Heritage, April 2008) states:

*"Repair necessary to sustain the heritage values of a significant place is normally desirable if:*

- a. there is sufficient information comprehensively to understand the impacts of the proposals on the significance of the place; and*
- b. the long term consequences of the proposals can, from experience, be demonstrated to be benign, or the proposals are designed not to prejudice alternative solutions in the future"* (Paragraph 117).

*"It is important to look beyond the immediate need for action, to understand the reasons for the need for repair and plan for the long-term consequences of inevitable change and decay. While sufficient work should be undertaken to achieve a lasting repair, the extent of the repair should normally be limited to what is reasonably necessary to make failing elements sound and capable of continuing to fulfil their intended functions"* (Paragraph 118).

*"The use of materials or techniques with a lifespan that is predictable from past performance, and which are close matches for those being repaired or replaced, tends to carry a low risk of future harm or premature failure. By contrast, the longer term effects of using materials or techniques that are innovative and relatively untested are much less certain. **Not all historic building materials or techniques were durable – iron cramps in masonry, or un-galvanised steel windows, for example, are both subject to corrosion. Some structural failures are the inevitable, if slowly developing, consequences of the original method of construction. Once failure occurs, stabilising the structure depends on addressing the underlying causes of the problem, not perpetuating inherent faults**"* (Paragraph 119).



*“Evidential value, historical values and some aesthetic values, especially artistic ones, are dependent upon a place retaining (to varying degrees) the actual fabric that has been handed down from the past; but authenticity lies in whatever most truthfully reflects and embodies the values attached to the place (Principle 4.3). It can therefore relate to, for example, design or function, as well as fabric. Design values, particularly those associated with landscapes or buildings, may be harmed by losses resulting from disaster or physical decay, or through ill-considered alteration or accretion” (Paragraph 91).*

‘Masonry Decay: Dealing with the Erosion of Sandstone’ (Historic Scotland, 2005) states:

*“Four main considerations need to be borne in mind when deciding to replace masonry. These are:*

- Authenticity: Would retention of original stone preserve the building’s integrity and character?*
- Aesthetic: Does the appearance of the building depend on architectural completeness, or on revealing the marks of time?*
- Structural: Is there real concern about safety, collapse or serious failure?*
- Functional: Is the building performing in the way it was designed?*

*... as a general rule the selective replacement of eroded stones should be all that is required. Each wall-face should be structurally sound and effective in stopping concentrations of water from getting into the building. The primary consideration should be to replace eroded stones that were originally designed to throw water off the face of buildings, but no longer do so. That way, the maximum benefit for the costs involved will be achieved.*

*... problems can emerge unless replacement stone accurately matches the properties of the original. These can include changes in colour and performance, localised erosion, and difficulties in trying to copy the original appearance left by the mason’s tools”.*

Strategic Stone Study: A Building Stone Atlas of West and South Yorkshire (English Heritage, 2012) states:

*“Cadeby limestone was extensively quarried at North Anston in south Yorkshire, and the limestone used to build the present Houses of Parliament (Lott & Richardson 1997) ... the dolomitization process can also cause a significant redistribution of the porosity within the limestone fabric. Consequently, this diagenetic process is important in determining the physical properties of these limestones and must be fully considered when selecting replacement stones for use in conservation work” (page 18-19).*

The Clitheroe Conservation Area Management Guidance (The Conservation Studio consultants; subject to public consultation) states:

*“Stone cleaning: All stone cleaning techniques have an inherent risk of damaging the stone and must be selected and executed with care.*

*Cleaning may sometimes be desirable to prevent the harm caused by corrosive dirt or to reveal where problems are hidden by encrustations. However, cleaning is less justifiable for aesthetic reasons alone, and consideration must be given to its impact on the historic character of the building (e.g. loss of ‘the patina of age’).*

... *Cleaning with water and bristle brushes is the simplest method, although water cleaning can lead to saturation of the walls.*

... *Prior to cleaning, a sample panel(s) in an unobtrusive location should be prepared to ascertain the suitability of the technique and the effect on the fabric, character and appearance of the building.*"

The Conservation, Repair and Management of War Memorials (English Heritage/War Memorials Trust, 2014) states:

*"Reasons for cleaning - Cleaning is a complex issue. It involves both aesthetic and technical considerations and should be viewed as a major intervention ... As a general rule, memorials should be cleaned primarily for technical reasons – for example to remove soiling which is causing damage to the historic material or to allow further treatment to be carried out. The aim of cleaning is not to return the memorial to a 'like new' appearance, but to safely remove particulate deposits, staining and biological growths ... However, even quite gentle regular cleaning of stonework can result in increased exposure of the surface pores of the stone; this provides a suitable location for pollutants to collect and biological growth to take root. As a result, the memorial gets dirtier more quickly and a more frequent cycle of cleaning can become established*

... *Mortars - Lime mortar is generally the best for all types of stone because it is flexible, permeable and has characteristics that can be varied to ensure compatibility with the stone".*

'The Cathodic Protection of Iron and Steel' Farrell D, Davies K, and McCaig I in The Building Conservation Directory 2001 states:

*"Metal dowels and cramps were often built into traditional masonry structures to secure stones which might otherwise be prone to movement or displacement ... In 18th and 19th century buildings, dowels and cramps were usually made from wrought iron which is susceptible to corrosion if exposed to air and moisture ... The expanding rust eventually exerts such pressure on the stone that the stone cracks or spalls. The conventional remedy involves major surgery to remove the cramps, replace them with non-corroding phosphor bronze or stainless steel and then repair the damaged stonework ... conventional treatments can be highly invasive involving large-scale opening up to expose and treat the affected components. Cathodic protection offers an alternative approach to the treatment of rusting iron and steelwork buried in masonry and stone ... CP systems work on the principle that corrosion is an electrochemical reaction in which one part of a piece of iron or steel acts as an anode while adjacent metal acts as a cathode".*

The agent has confirmed that cathodic protection has been considered and discounted because of questions as to the: efficacy of such a high-tech approach in this situation; accommodation of generating and/or battery storage equipment; physical and aesthetic issues arising from securing and embedding the electrodes to the relatively fragile magnesium limestone, installation maintenance and whether it is now too late to consider just arresting the corrosion of the ferrous fixings.

It is also confirmed that:

- (i) there is no intention to conduct a general clean of the masonry surfaces and cleaning is to be non-destructive for the removal of existing mortar from masonry faces; and

(ii) the sourcing of replacement stone is ongoing.

In my opinion and having regard to the significance and values of the pinnacle (NPPF paragraph 129 and 131; English Heritage 'Conservation Principles') and the comments received from English Heritage, the historic amenity societies and the agent, the proposed works are limited to what is reasonably necessary to ensure the proper preservation of the listed building. Therefore, whilst the dismantling of the pinnacle may result in loss of archaeological evidence and risks some damage to stonework (minimised by Ground Penetrating Radar Survey) the proposed works are justified and appropriate.

In my opinion, the proposed works have an acceptable impact upon Clitheroe Conservation Area (character and appearance), Clitheroe Castle Historic Park and Garden and the setting of the scheduled monument and other listed buildings.

I am mindful of the comments of the Lancashire Gardens Trust in respect to possible below ground conditions and would suggest a condition in this regard.

In giving considerable importance and weight to the duties at section 16, 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and 'great weight' to the conservation of the designated heritage assets (NPPF paragraph 132), I would recommend that listed building consent be granted conditionally.

**RECOMMENDATION:** That listed building consent be granted subject to the following conditions:

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

**REASON:** Required to be imposed pursuant to Section 18 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

2. Precise specifications and samples of lime mortar pointing, new stone, stone indent repairs, stone tooling, stone cleaning and any consolidation of small decorative elements shall have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority before their use in the proposed works.

**REASON:** In order to safeguard the special architectural and historic interest and significance of the listed buildings and the character, appearance and significance of Clitheroe Conservation Area.

3. Precise details of the storage (including location) of dismantled pinnacle elements shall have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority before the commencement of proposed works.

**REASON:** In order to safeguard the special architectural and historic interest and significance of the listed buildings and the character, appearance and significance of Clitheroe Conservation Area.

4. The reconstruction of the pinnacle shall be undertaken within twelve months of the commencement of its dismantling.

REASON: In order to safeguard the special architectural and historic interest and significance of the listed buildings and the character, appearance and significance of Clitheroe Conservation Area.

5. Precise specifications of any proposed below ground work shall have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority before its implementation.

REASON: In order to safeguard the special architectural and historic interest and significance of the listed buildings and the character, appearance and significance of Clitheroe Conservation Area.

6. This consent shall be implemented in accordance with the proposal as amended by letter received on the 28 January 2015 confirming the extent of stone cleaning.

REASON: For the avoidance of doubt since the proposal was subject of agreement amendments.

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

<b><u>Plan No</u></b>	<b><u>Proposal</u></b>	<b><u>Location</u></b>
3/2014/0633/P	Modify access and layout of existing car park	Stydd Nursery Stoneygate Lane, Ribchester
3/2014/0661/P	Discharge of conditions nos. 4-Materials agricultural building, 5-materials barn conversions, 6 - building record, 7 - visibility splays, 8 - details and construction specification new manure store, 9 - site access improvement onto Heights Lane, 10 - improvement of site access onto Elmridge Lane, 11 - landscaping of farmstead development relating to planning approval 3/2013/0691/P	Elmridge Farm Elmridge Lane Chipping
3/2014/0839/P	Construction of pedestrian bridge over West Bradford Brook to link garden area to nearby land.	Brook House Clitheroe Road West Bradford
3/2014/0902/P	Two storey extension to side and rear to provide additional living accommodation, new detached garage, covered courtyard and new driveway	Eatough's Farm Fleet Street Lane Ribchester
3/2014/0934/P	Two storey extension to the rear	Stonyhurst, Salthill Gardens Clitheroe
3/2014/0941/P	Extension to second floor living accommodation	Lee Carter House Castle Gate, Clitheroe
3/2014/0964/P	Single storey side extension and alterations	Sands Cottage 34 The Sands, Whalley
3/2014/0965/P		
3/2014/0968/P	Conversion of an existing building into a granny annex.	Marl Hill Byre Easington Road, Cow Ark
3/2014/0969/P	Conversion of an existing building into a granny annex	Marl Hill Byre Easington Road, Cow Ark
3/2014/0983/P	Replacement single storey extension and internal alterations	11 Hollies Road, Wilpshire
3/2014/0984/P	Conversion of existing integral garage into art studio for personal use. Proposed timber garage, car port and garden store.	Moss Hall Higher Road Longridge
3/2014/0986/P	Proposed conversion of an agricultural building to a camping bunk barn with pedestrian access from public right of way (footpath 43)	Hill House Farm Sawley Road, Grindleton

<b><u>Plan No</u></b>	<b><u>Proposal</u></b>	<b><u>Location</u></b>
3/2014/0987/P	Demolition of existing conservatory and construction of rear storey extension	14 Waters Edge Whalley
3/2014/0988/P	Kitchen extension	Willow House Slaidburn Road, Waddington
3/2014/1005/P	Single storey extension	1 Scott Avenue Simonstone
3/2014/1006/P	Two storey extension above existing room to rear	65 Pimlico Road Clitheroe
3/2014/1029/P	Conversion of existing integral garage to form new habitable room and erection of new double garage	8 Hazel Grove Longridge
3/2014/1033/P	Proposed two storey extension to rear	27 Woodlands Park Whalley
3/2014/1037/P	Demolition of conservatory and erection of single storey rear extension 6.5m long, 4m high to the ridge and 2.5m to the eaves.	22 The Hazels Wilpshire
3/2014/1015/P	Removal of condition 8 of planning approval 3/2014/0610 to allow the use of upvc doors and windows	Land adjacent to The Barn George Lane Read
3/2014/1041/P	Erection of timber stables and garages for private use	Dean Slack Head Grindleton Road, Slaidburn
3/2014/1052/P	Application for discharge of condition no. 1 (commencement of development) and condition no. 4 (relating to building recording and analysis) of planning approval 3/2012/0639/P	Windy Hills Farm Chipping
3/2014/1054/P	Single storey side extension to form bedroom and en-suite	Beck Top Clough Lane, Simonstone
3/2014/1058/P	Provision of new external door to the flat from Whittingham Road for exclusive use of the occupants of the flat. Some additional work with an internal partition wall will also be necessary to accommodate these changes	Kendal House Clinics 11 Whittingham Road Longridge
3/2014/1068/P	Demolition of existing garage, erection of two storey extension to side and rear, roof repairs and alterations to existing rear dormer, internal alterations and levelling of ground at rear	17 Brungerley Avenue Clitheroe
3/2014/1072/P	Single storey rear extension 4.93m long, 3.95m high to ridge, 2.62m high to eaves	Highfield, Tunstead Avenue Simonstone
3/2014/1074/P	Non-material amendment to development approved on appeal (APP/T/2350/A/12/2186164) to amend the position of the dwelling and garage, the shape of the garage and the location of internal stairs	Kemple Barn Whalley Road Pendleton
3/2014/1075/P	Structural restoration works to existing dwelling to prevent building falling into further disrepair	Church Style Farm Church Street Slaidburn

<b><u>Plan No</u></b>	<b><u>Proposal</u></b>	<b><u>Location</u></b>
3/2014/1081/P	Variation of condition 8 of planning consent 3/2005/0587/P to allow the sale and display of any A1 non-food goods by catalogue showroom retailer for up to 185m <sup>2</sup> of the existing sales area	Homebase Clitheroe
3/2014/1084/P	Discharge of condition no 10 (Archaeological Record) of planning permission 3/2011/0625/P	Hubbersty Fold Farm Balderstone
3/2014/1103/P	Single storey rear extension 8m long, 4m high to the ridge, 2.8m high to the eaves	17 Calfcote Lane Longridge
3/2014/1105/P	Discharge of condition 4 (construction method statement), 6 (landscaping details) and 8 (signage scheme) of planning consent 3/2013/0549 which was for demolition of building and car park	Back York Street Clitheroe
3/2014/1106/P	Discharge of condition 4 (demolition and construction method) of planning consent 3/2013/0543 which was Conservation Area consent for demolition of a building	Central Garage Back York Street Clitheroe
3/2014/1109/P	Proposed war memorial, stone and plaque measuring approximately 1.2m high x 2m long and 0.4m wide and gravel hard standing	Land west of Trough Road and south of Langden Drive Dunsop Bridge

#### 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>
3/2014/0409/P	Proposed change of use from barn to dwelling-house and erection of detached garage	Eatough's Farm Fleet Street Lane Ribchester	NPPF; Key Statements DS1 and DS2; and Policies DMG1, DMG2, DMH3 and DMH4 – isolated unsustainable location contrary to the Council's Adopted Development Strategy.
3/2014/0967/P	Two storey extension to the side with garage at ground floor and bedroom at first floor, rear conservatory altered with addition of slate roof and conversion of existing attached garage to play room	8 Chatburn Avenue Clitheroe	DMG1 and DMH5 – Disproportionate additions to the dwelling subsuming the host dwelling and causing harm to the street scene.
3/2014/0976/P	Class MB Application for Prior Approval - Change of Use of Agricultural Building to Dwellinghouse (C3 Use	Dewhurst Farm Longsight Road Langho	Does not accord with MB.1. (a), (b), (c), (f), (g), (h), (i) and (l), and is contrary to Class MB.2
Cont/			

<u>Plan No</u>	<u>Proposal</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Reasons for Refusal</u>
Cont...	Class) with no associated operational development		(1) (d) and (e)
3/2014/0985/P	New extension	1 Higher Standen Whalley Road Pendleton	An unsympathetic addition which would detract significantly from the simple and uncluttered character of the original building and the visual amenities of the locality - contrary to RVDLP policies G1, ENV3 and H17 and Core Strategy policies DMG1, EN2, DME2 and DMH5

CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS FOR A PROPOSED USE OR DEVELOPMENT

<u>Plan No</u>	<u>Proposal</u>	<u>Location</u>
3/2014/1057/P	Application for a Lawful Development Certificate for the use of the existing building as a dwelling within the meaning of Class C3 of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended) without restricted occupancy	Robin Hill Talbot Bridge Bashall Eaves

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>
3/2015/0034/P	Extension to existing building to house slurry handling equipment/ farm machinery	Mason House Farm, Bashall Eaves, BB7 3DD

AGRICULTURAL BUILDING TO DWELLING PRIOR NOTIFICATION APPLICATION (CLASS MB) - APPROVED

<u>Plan No</u>	<u>Proposal</u>	<u>Location</u>
3/2014/0811/P	Class MB application for prior approval for the change of use of an agricultural building to a dwellinghouse (resubmission of refused prior notification application 3/2014/0525/P) at an agricultural building adjoining the farmhouse	Shuttleworth Hall Burnley Road Gisburn

APPLICATIONS WITHDRAWN

<u>Plan No</u>	<u>Proposal</u>	<u>Location</u>
3/2013/0816/P	Proposed siting of 1 x 30m high (hub) endurance wind turbine with a tip height of 45.071m	Horton Pasture Farm Skipton



<b><u>Plan No</u></b>	<b><u>Proposal</u></b>	<b><u>Location</u></b>
3/2014/0843/P	Proposed studio/live work unit	Primrose House Primrose Road Clitheroe

#### SECTION 106 APPLICATIONS

<b><u>Plan No</u></b>	<b><u>Location</u></b>	<b><u>Date to Committee</u></b>	<b><u>Number of Dwellings</u></b>	<b><u>Progress</u></b>
3/2012/0785	Clitheroe Hospital Chatburn Road Clitheroe	6/12/12	57	With Applicants Solicitor
3/2013/0981	Land at Chatburn Road Clitheroe	13/2/14 18/12/14	23	With LCC
3/2014/0666	15 Parker Avenue Clitheroe	18/9/14	15	With Applicants Solicitor
3/2014/0597	Land off Waddington Road, Clitheroe	16/10/14 15/1/15	275	With LCC
3/2014/0779	Land off Dale View Billington	16/10/14	18	With LCC
3/2014/0188	Victoria Mill Watt Street, Sabden	13/11/14	40	With Planning
3/2014/0742	Land off Pimlico Road Clitheroe	15/1/15	19	With Planning
<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

#### APPEALS UPDATE

<b><u>Application No</u></b>	<b><u>Date Received</u></b>	<b><u>Applicant Proposal/Site</u></b>	<b><u>Type of Appeal</u></b>	<b><u>Date of Inquiry/Hearing</u></b>	<b><u>Progress</u></b>
3/2013/0722 U	16/05/14	Englands Head Farm, Paythorne	WR		Awaiting decision
3/2014/0394 R	23/07/14	Stoneroyd, Haugh Ave Simonstone	HH		Awaiting decision
3/2014/0235 R	29/07/14	20 Chapel Hill Longridge	HH		Awaiting decision
3/2014/0258 R	01/08/14	1 Main Street Bolton by Bowland	HH		Awaiting decision
3/2014/0298 R	11/08/14	Rose Cottage Main Street Grindleton	HH		Awaiting decision
3/2013/1023 U	29/08/14	Land off Kingsmill Avenue, Whalley	WR		Awaiting decision
3/2014/0537 R	29/09/14	Pinfold Cottage Tosside	WR		Appeal dismissed 08/01/15

<u>Application No</u>	<u>Date Received</u>	<u>Applicant Proposal/Site</u>	<u>Type of Appeal</u>	<u>Date of Inquiry/Hearing</u>	<u>Progress</u>
3/2014/0075 R	24/09/14	Sheepfold Farm Balderstone	WR		Appeal dismissed 26/01/15
3/2014/0550	01/10/14	Bradyll House Franklin Hill Old Langho	WR		Awaiting decision
3/2014/0501 R	07/10/14	Land at Longsight Road Copster Green	WR		Appeal dismissed 30/12/14
3/2014/0151 Cond	08/10/14	Lower Abbott House Farm Mellor	WR		Appeal allowed 30/12/14
3/2014/0605 R	09/10/14	Land off Pendle Street East Sabden	WR		Appeal dismissed 13/01/15
3/2014/0462 R	10/10/14	Land adj Glen View, Longridge	WR		Appeal dismissed 13/01/15
3/2014/0535 R	10/10/14	Oaklands Longsight Rd Clayton le Dale	WR		Appeal dismissed 13/01/15
3/2014/0143 R	10/10/14	Land adj 52 Chapel Hill Longridge	WR		Appeal dismissed 13/01/15
3/2014/0692 R	20/10/14	11 The Old Stables, Mitton Road, Whalley	HH		Appeal allowed 04/12/15
3/2014/0419 R	04/11/14	7 Whins Lane Simonstone	WR		Appeal dismissed 23/01/15
3/2013/0442 R	05/11/14	Woodfield Farm Longsight Road Clayton le Dale	WR		Awaiting decision
3/2014/0804 R	11/11/14	22 Wellgate Cllitheroe	WR		Appeal dismissed 20/01/15
3/2014/0711 R	18/11/14	5 Cowper Place Sawley	WR		Appeal dismissed 23/01/15
3/2014/0705 R	06/01/15	Meadows Farm Worston	HH		Awaiting decision
3/2014/0793 R	21/01/15	Talbot Fold Barn Talbot Bridge Bashall Eaves	WR		Questionnaire sent 26/01/15 Statement due 25/02/15
3/2014/0592 R	14/01/15	The Moorcock Slaidburn Rd Waddington	WR		Questionnaire sent 20/01/15 Statement due 18/02/15
3/2014/0634 R	24/12/14	11 Lower Lane Longridge	HH		Awaiting decision
3/2014/0838 R	22/01/15	Beech House Alston Lane Alston	HH		Awaiting decision

<u>Application No</u>	<u>Date Received</u>	<u>Applicant Proposal/Site</u>	<u>Type of Appeal</u>	<u>Date of Inquiry/Hearing</u>	<u>Progress</u>
3/2014/0438 R	16/01/15 but extension given until 6/02/15	Land east of Chipping Lane Longridge	Inquiry		
3/2014/0517 R	Awaiting validation by PINS	Land to the north of Dilworth Lane Longridge	Inquiry		
3/2014/0827 R	Awaiting validation by PINS	39 Clitheroe Rd Whalley			
3/2014/0464 R	Awaiting validation by PINS	60 Taylor Street Clitheroe			