

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

Agenda Item No

meeting date: THURSDAY, 4 FEBRUARY 2010  
 title: PLANNING APPLICATIONS  
 submitted by: DIRECTOR OF DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

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

APPLICATION NO: 3/2009/0721/P (GRID REF: SD 369989 433163)  
 PROPOSED INFILL AND LINK EXTENSIONS INCLUDING SIX PLANTING TUNNELS TO REAR OF EXISTING GARDEN CENTRE BUILDING AND CREATION OF ACCESSIBLE ACCESS RAMPS TO PROVIDE FULLY ACCESSIBLE ROUTE TO ALL AREAS FROM EXISTING GARDEN CENTRE BUILDING AT CARR HALL, WHALLEY ROAD, LANGHO

PARISH COUNCIL: The Parish Council objected to a proposed pond (shown on the originally submitted plans) as they did not feel that it would sit comfortably with the landscape.

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

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS: A letter has been received from a nearby resident who makes the following comments.

1. There is reference in the application documents to an existing garden centre. There is no existing garden centre and never has been.
2. If the site is to be used as a garden centre, there would be a high volume of traffic turning on to and off the site to the detriment of highway safety.
3. As there are five existing garden centres in the area, do we need any more?
4. I was under the impression that Carr Hall is agricultural land.

### **Proposal**

In 1991, permission was granted for the conversion of the dwelling and agricultural buildings at Carr Hall into a garden craft centre including a café and manager's flat (3/1991/0584/P). Precise details of the conversion works were approved under a separate application in 1993 (3/1993/0196/P). Works were commenced on the permissions in the form of the construction of the entrance and access road. Those works kept the permissions extant. Permission was then sought for the re-development of the site and buildings as a garden/garden crafts centre as an amendment to the extant permissions.

Rather than converting the existing buildings, that later application (3/2004/1020/P) proposed their demolition and replacement by two buildings with external materials of stone and steel cladding to the walls and steel roofing sheets linked by a lower and recessed glazed structure. The larger buildings were to be used for the retail elements of the proposed use with the glazed link providing access to the main buildings and toilets at ground floor level with a café within the link at first floor level. The plans showed a parking area in front of the building with staff parking and display gardens at the rear.

Permission was granted in respect of application 3/2004/1020/P subject to a number of conditions plus a Section 106 Agreement containing the following restrictions:

1. Not to allow any retail use from the said land and property other than the sale of garden and craft related products.
2. Not to allow the café/craft centre to be implemented other than in conjunction with the garden centre development.
3. Not to allow the freehold of the café/craft centre to be sold separately from the garden centre development.

The building has been constructed and the hard surfaced areas provided, but, as yet, there has been no use of the site for the purposes of a garden/garden craft centre. The applicant does, however, intend to complete the development and to operate such a business from the site. It is stated in the Design and Access Statement submitted with this current application, however, that on reflection, it was decided additional storage and retail floor space would be required to ensure that the business has enough space to run efficiently.

Permission is now therefore sought for an infill and link extension and six associated planting polytunnels at the rear of the existing building.

Running along the whole 49m length of the rear elevation of the building, there would be an 8m extension with an eaves height of 4m and a maximum height of 5.5m. Projecting outwards from the centre of the rear elevation of the existing building for a distance of 30m would be a 7m wide extension with an eaves height of 5.5m and a ridge height of 7m. Together, the proposed extensions would form a 'T' shape. They would have external materials of wall and roof cladding to match the existing building. On either side of this central extension would be three galvanised steel framed open-sided planting tunnels each measuring 22m x 10.6m with curved roofs with a maximum height of 5.8m. It is stated on the plans that the roofs would have a white flame retardant fabric covering. Four of the tunnels would be immediately at the rear of the existing building with one bay projecting beyond each of the side elevations.

Permission is also sought for eleven 4.5m high black painted lighting columns, six on one side of the access drive and five on the other side.

A pond and landscaping details shown on the originally submitted plans, however, have been deleted from the proposal.

### **Site Location**

The site is located on the south side of Whalley Road midway between the settlements of Langho and Wilshire. The site is accessed by a track from Whalley Road of approximately a

quarter of a mile in length and comprises the building and hard surfaced areas that were approved by 3/2004/1020/P. The site is immediately adjoined to the east by the applicant's dwelling, Carr Hall and is surrounded on all sides by farmland and woodland that is also in the applicant's ownership.

The site is within the greenbelt.

### **Relevant History**

3/1991/0584/P – Use of buildings and land as a garden craft centre. Approved subject to a Section 106 Agreement and conditions.

3/1993/0196/P – Detailed scheme of conversion of existing buildings to discharge condition 5 on planning permission 3/1991/0584/P. Approved.

3/2004/1020/P – Re-development of existing site/buildings for garden/garden crafts centre as an amendment of permission 3/1993/0196/P. Approved subject to a Section 106 Agreement and conditions.

3/2009/0210/P – Agricultural livestock building. Refused.

3/2009/0569/P – Eleven lighting columns to driveway. Refused.

### **Relevant Policies**

Policy G1 - Development Control.

Policy G5 - Settlement Strategy.

Policy ENV4 - Green Belt.

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

The site is within the greenbelt, but the principal of a garden centre use within a building on the site was originally given careful consideration and found to be acceptable in 1991. That original decision was endorsed in 2005 when planning permission was granted for the building that now occupies the site.

The considerations to be made in respect of this current application therefore relate to the effects of the additional buildings/structures on the openness of the greenbelt and visual amenity, and any effects on highway safety as a result of the expansion of the business from what was approved in 2005.

The proposed T shaped extension and the planting tunnels are all located at the rear of the building (although the planting tunnels project beyond its side elevations). These extensions and tunnels are lower than the main building, and at the rear, the site is adjoined by an upward sloping woodland. By virtue of their position behind the building, their size/height relative to the main building and the screening effect of the adjoining land/woodland, I do not consider that the extensions would have any seriously detrimental effects upon the openness of the greenbelt.

As the permanent extensions would have external materials to match the existing building, I do not consider that these would have any detrimental effects upon the general visual amenities of the locality. The open sided planting tunnels, although shown to have white roofs could, I am

advised by the agents, be an alternative darker colour. I consider that, in the event of permission being granted, a condition should be imposed to require the roof colour of the planting tunnels to be agreed by the Local Planning Authority before this particular element of the permission is implemented. Subject to such a condition I do not consider that the tunnels would detract from the appearance of the locality. It is also worth noting that the tunnels will be on a part of the site originally approved as display gardens, and it is quite normal at garden centres for such gardens/growing areas to be under cover.

The proposed development, as explained in the Design and Access Statement, is to enable the business to operate more efficiently. As such, I do not consider that the proposal would result in any potential increase in vehicular movements that would justify any reason for refusal of the application relating to highway safety. The County Surveyor has also expressed no objections to the application on highway safety grounds.

A previous retrospective application (3/2009/0569/P) for the retention of eleven 6m high galvanised steel lighting columns, six on one side of the access driveway and five on the other side, was refused for the reason that, due to their number and their unnecessarily excessive height, the proposed eleven lighting columns form incongruous features that have an unnecessarily detrimental effect upon the character and appearance of this open countryside locality contrary to Policies G1 and ENV3 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan.

As part of this current application, permission is again sought for eleven lighting columns but reduced in height to 4.5m and painted black. I consider that the alterations to the height and colour of the columns satisfactorily addresses the reason for refusal of the previous application. I therefore consider this aspect of the current application to be acceptable with regards to the effects on the visual amenities of the locality.

The Parish Council has objected to a proposed pond on the land between the building and Whalley Road that was shown on the originally submitted plans as part of a comprehensive landscaping scheme for the site. The landscaping proposals however, were far too formal in appearance and would have detracted from the natural landscape of the locality. The landscaping, including the pond, has therefore been deleted from the application. In the event of planning permission being granted, a landscaping condition will be imposed that will require the submission for approval and subsequent implementation of a much less intensive and more natural scheme of landscaping.

The conditions and the contents of the Section 106 Agreement relating to permission 3/2004/1020/P concerning the nature of the business, the goods to be sold etc will continue to apply.

Overall, for the reasons given in the report, I can see no sustainable objections to the proposed development.

#### SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR APPROVAL

The proposed development will not have any seriously detrimental effects upon the openness of the greenbelt, the visual amenities of the locality, the amenities of any nearby residents or highway safety.

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

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

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

2. This permission shall relate to the development as amended by the 1:2500 scale site location plan and drawing No 3365/87E both received on 19 January 2010, and also drawing No's 3365/86 and 3365/88.

REASON: For the avoidance of doubt since the proposal has been the subject of agreed amendments in the form of the deletion of a landscaping scheme that has also resulted in a slight reduction in the size of the application site.

3. The development hereby permitted shall not be commenced until details of the landscaping of the site, including wherever possible the retention of existing trees, have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall indicate, as appropriate, the types and numbers of trees and shrubs, their distribution on site, those areas to be seeded, turfed, paved or hard landscaped, including details of any changes of level or landform and the types and details of all fencing and screening.

The approved landscaping scheme shall be implemented in the first planting season following occupation or use of the development, whether in whole or part 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 which 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.

4. Precise details of the colour of the roofs of the planting tunnels hereby permitted shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the planting tunnels being erected on the site.

REASON: In the interests of visual amenity as the white roof materials stated on the submitted plans would form an over prominent and visually discordant feature in the local landscape, contrary to Policy G1 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan.

5. Prior to the first use of the development hereby permitted, whether in whole or in part, the existing eleven lighting columns along the access road into the site shall be reduced in height to 4.5m and shall be painted black, all to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: In the interests of visual amenity as the lighting columns at their existing height and in their existing colour detract from the appearance of the locality contrary to Policy G1 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan.

APPLICATION NO: 3/2009/0850/P

(GRID REF: SD 364097 436173)

APPLICATION FOR THE VARIATION OF CONDITION NO. 10 OF PLANNING CONSENT 3/2008/0916/P TO ALLOW THE MEETING ROOM TO BE USED FOR 10 MONTHS OF THE YEAR BETWEEN 1 MARCH AND 31 DECEMBER AT DALE HEY FARM, PRESTON ROAD, RIBCHESTER

PARISH COUNCIL:

The Parish Council object to this proposal and raise the following points;

- There is genuine concern that the applicant seeks to override the requirements of the Borough Council as this is the second application received to discharge/vary conditions attached to an earlier consent,
- Conditions are imposed for good reason, as they impose a measure of constraint in situations where unrestrained development may cause disturbance to local amenity,
- No evidence has been presented of any work being undertaken to insulate the meeting room thus far, and an unacceptable level of noise was observed on October 10<sup>th</sup> 2009, and
- Previous conditions of applications not adhered to.

LCC TRAFFIC &  
DEVELOPMENT ENGINEER:

No objections to this proposal in principle on highway safety grounds.

ADDITIONAL  
REPRESENTATIONS:

One letter has been received in regards to this application raising the following points of objection,

- Object on the grounds of the continuing noise from the meeting room,
- The reasons given for the extension of the use are just an excuse to continue what is happening at the moment,
- We have written to the Environmental Health Department to complain about continuing noise from the site, and feel if approved, the situation will not get any better.

### **Proposal**

This application seeks permission to vary an existing condition imposed on the planning consent, ref. no. 3/2008/0916/P, in relation to the recently approved use of agricultural land for 16 no. hard standings at Dale Hey Farm, Preston Road, Ribchester. The existing condition currently limits the use of the meeting room in accordance with that permission to between the 1 March and the 31 October in any calendar year, and it is this period of opening that the Applicant is wishing to vary. The Applicant seeks to extend the use of the meeting room to a period of ten months from the existing eight months, and in doing so change the dates to between the 1 March and the 31 December. This is mainly to provide a location for Christmas social events for Caravan owners on site, but also to enable the meeting room to hold an annual, private function for the Applicant towards the end of the year.

## **Site Location**

The site is located to the north west of Ribchester off Preston Road, on land designated as open countryside within the Districtwide Local Plan.

## **Relevant History**

3/2009/0849/P - Application for the discharge of conditions no.3 (landscaping), no.4 (insulation), no.6 (visibility splay), no.7 (access width), no.8 (construction of access and highway improvements), no.12 (foul drainage scheme) and no.13 (painting of the lean-to), of planning consent 3/2008/0916P – Approved.

3/2009/0313/P - Modification of condition no.9 of planning consent 3/2008/0916/P to allow use of the hardstandings between the dates of 1 December to 30 September (10 months) – Approved.

3/2008/0916/P - Proposed use of agricultural land for 16 no. hard standings for touring caravans (incorporating access roads and car parking areas). Proposed change of use of part of existing workshop to toilet block. Proposed use of agricultural building as meeting room. Proposed lean-to vehicle store – Granted Conditionally.

3/2003/1040/P – Convert existing outbuilding to granny annexe plus septic tank – Refused.

## **Relevant Policies**

Policy G1 - Development Control.

Policy G5 - Settlement Strategy.

Policy ENV3 - Development in Open Countryside.

Policy RT1 - General Recreation and Tourism Policy.

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

This application seeks permission to vary an existing condition imposed on the planning consent, ref. no. 3/2008/0916/P, in relation to the recently approved use of agricultural land for 16 no. hard standings at Dale Hey Farm, Preston Road, Ribchester. The existing condition currently limits the use of the meeting room in accordance with that permission to between the 1 March and the 31 October in any calendar year, and it is this period of opening that the Applicant is wishing to vary. The Applicant seeks to extend the use of the meeting room to a period of ten months from the existing eight months, and in doing so change the dates to between the 1 March and the 31 December. This is mainly to provide a location for Christmas social events for Caravan owners on site, but also to enable the meeting room to hold an annual, private function for the Applicant towards the end of the year. The Applicant was previously successful in extending the period of opening for the hard standings to between the dates of the 1 December to the 30 September with none of the hard standings being occupied outside these dates.

When permission was granted for the use of the building as a meeting room, to be used in conjunction with the approved 16 hardstandings at the site, consideration was taken in regards to the impact on the amenity of the nearby neighbouring properties. At that time, given the distance in-between the nearby properties and the proposed hard standings, and the boundary treatments proposed, it was considered to have an acceptable impact. As such, the question is

whether the increase in the potential use of the meeting room for an additional two months a year would cause a more significant impact on the amenity of the nearby neighbours.

With regards to the concerns of impact on amenity, I am aware of a complaint made to the Environmental Health Department in October 2009, which was made in respect of excessive noise from the site. I am also mindful of the concern made in regards to the meeting room not being insulated in accordance with Condition 4 of the previously approved scheme. However, given that the details of the proposed, and now inserted, insulation for the meeting room were submitted and approved to the satisfaction of both the Planning Department and the Environmental Health Department last year via a discharge of conditions application, I consider that the use of the meeting room will have no significant detrimental impact on the amenity of the occupiers of the adjacent dwelling due to the building now being suitably insulated. I therefore cannot find any extenuating circumstances that would not allow the proposed variation of the condition, and I recommend accordingly.

#### SUMMARY REASONS FOR APPROVAL

The original proposal represents an appropriate form of development and the variation of Condition No. 10 will not lead to conditions that would be to the detriment of the amenity of nearby neighbouring properties.

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

Ribble Valley Borough Council in pursuance of its planning powers, hereby varies Condition No. 10 of planning permission Ref. No. 3/2008/0916/P:

#### REVISED CONDITIONS AND REASONS:

10. The use of the proposed meeting room in accordance with this permission shall be restricted to between the dates of 1 March to 31 December in any calendar year, and to the hours between 0900 to 2200 Monday to Thursday, and between 0900 to 2300 hours Friday and Saturday and between 1000 to 2200 hours on Sundays and Bank Holidays, and shall only be used in conjunction with the site activities and not made available for general public use. There shall be no movement of caravans off and on the site between the hours of 2300 and 0700 hours.

REASON: In order to comply with Policy G1 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan. The use of the premises outside these hours could prove injurious to the character of the area and in order to safeguard residential amenities.

APPLICATION NO: 3/2009/0855/P (LBC) & 3/2009/0854 (PA) (GRID REF: SD 371001 452668)  
PROPOSED REFURBISHMENT OF THE EXISTING HOUSE AND SERVICE WING.  
CONSTRUCTION OF NEW SWIMMING POOL TO WEST OF MAIN HOUSE WITH  
ASSOCIATED DEMOLITION OF OUTBUILDINGS. RELOCATION OF EXISTING GLASS  
HOUSE INTO WALLED GARDEN AT TOWNHEAD, SLAIDBURN

PARISH COUNCIL: Slaidburn and Easington Parish Council have no objections.

LANCASHIRE COUNTY  
COUNCIL (ARCHAEOLOGY):

No archaeological comments. Have been informed of the commissioning of an archaeological building record.

THE GEORGIAN GROUP:

Welcome the restoration of the house as a single private dwelling – this is long overdue, highly desirable and represents optimal use.

However serious doubts about the appropriateness of the glazed link and swimming pool. One benign consequence of the long abandonment of Townhead has been the relative absence of intrusive ancillary development. Although efforts have been made to screen the swimming pool and make it visually discreet, inevitably its introduction will compromise the setting of the house. Glazed links in particular, although intended to be low key and light in touch, tend in reality to draw attention to themselves by their reflectiveness and by the characteristic tendency of any vitreous material to read as an opaque mass rather than something transparent.

The Georgian Group ask that a condition is attached to any planning consent requiring the use of lime mortar. Quality of detailing of this kind will be important in determining whether the scheme is ultimately successful.

ANCIENT MONUMENTS  
SOCIETY:

Townhead has been a problem building for many years; welcome the very positive proposals to bring the house back into the sort of residential use for which it is so admirably suited. Defer to RVBC expert advice, and that of English Heritage, on the details of the scheme, especially the extent of the necessary structural repair.

Note that the proposals include the demolition of outbuildings to make way for a new swimming pool. While the buildings to be lost are not of great intrinsic interest, they do represent an appropriate architectural hierarchy in the house and its service buildings. Also note (hope that it is a drafting error) that the adjacent barn which appears on the “as existing” plan does not appear on the “as proposed” plan. Wonder if it would be possible to provide swimming pool in the barn, so giving it a use and avoiding the demolition of the ancillary buildings.

ENGLISH HERITAGE:

Townhead has been vacant for several decades with an underinvestment in maintenance resulting in it having been included on the Register of Buildings at Risk for a number of years. English Heritage is pleased that the recent sale of Townhead has led to its acquisition by a new owner who seems dedicated to the building’s sympathetic renovation and return to a family dwelling:

- i) English Heritage has been closely involved in pre-application discussions with the owners and their

architects. In general, highly supportive of the conservation-led approach being taken to the renovation of the main house and outbuildings. Considerable effort has been invested in seeking specialist advice with particular regard to the proposed treatment of timbers and decorative plasterwork.

- ii) Have reservations about the proposed glazed link between the main house and swimming pool extension. While it is understood that the structure would provide a clean and highly legible division between the historic house and new build, such a high proportion of reflective glass in a location where historically there has been predominantly stone may appear visually intrusive. Suggest that alternatives involving a lower degree of glazing (eg a rolled lead roof) are explored.
- iii) Accept the principle of the removal of the outbuildings to the west of the main house. These outbuildings do not appear to be contemporary with the main house but represent later, possibly 19<sup>th</sup> century additions. It is unlikely that any future use of Townhead would require such extensive provision of outhouses. At the same time the return of the main building to a high specification country house brings with it certain modern expectations such as on-site leisure facilities and suggests that the proposed location for the swimming pool represents the visually least intrusive option.
- iv) Agree that the introduction of a swimming pool in the location of the outbuildings would necessitate the dismantling of the existing screen wall and therefore accept the principle of it being recorded, dismantled and rebuilt.
- v) Concerns about the proposed design of the south wall swimming pool. The character of the existing structure is an informal, almost agricultural, screen wall much altered over time but predominantly stone with some inserted windows/doors. The current scheme, which contains a high proportion of fenestration, would alter the balance of window to stone and thereby not maintain the existing character of the structure. The formal nature of the fenestration changes the character of the wall from informal to formal and challenges the relationship of this highly visible element of the complex with the main house.
- vi) As advised during pre-application discussion, full (RCHME level 3) recording of all buildings to be

affected by the proposal should be undertaken in accordance with advice from the Lancashire County Archaeology Service.

- vii) Note that paint analysis is being undertaken to inform the interior decoration scheme and welcome this move.

ENVIRONMENT AGENCY:

No objection in principle but the application as submitted does not include details for the disposal of foul sewage. Discharging the effluent of swimming pool water into a septic tank or treatment plant would not be acceptable; therefore to ensure that the development does not pose a risk of pollution to controlled waters, recommended that any subsequent planning approval be conditioned. Informatives also suggested.

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS:

Lancashire Gardens Trust

The parkland setting of the house will now be in divided ownership. Surviving parkland, trees and woodland belts are over-mature and likely to fail in future years. As with most of the estate there has been little or no tree planting or woodland management in recent years (is there no Management Plan?).

The architect's report refers to removal of self seeded trees with approval (confusion over species identification? – surely Sycamore not Lime?). Any new/replacement tree planting could/should relate to the whole parkland, perhaps as a joint venture with the estate? Similarly management of parkland grass by grazing (rather than the frequent mowing) is necessary to retain visual unity.

The major change proposed which will alter the visual character of the site involves the new indoor pool. The proposal to replace the existing vernacular wall running north-west from the main house with a single storey windowed façade, imitating the style of the main house, will surely confuse the actual history of the place? The redoubtable widow, the last Mrs Wigglesworth, did not build a conservatory and if she had it is unlikely that she would have chosen a "classicalish" design rather than a more flamboyant glass and iron design?

Any such extensions, significantly increases the mass of the house, nor will modern high performance stonework easily match the weathered stone of the house. Would not simple glazed openings in coursed vernacular stonework be more honest? Is the safety of the existing wall intrinsic or affected by the major excavations required by the pool? This side of the house is visible from a well-used footpath in the village, especially in winter.

Lancashire Gardens Trust, ask whether, if granted, RVBC will require detailed landscape proposals for restoration and management of the historic design layout as a condition (albeit based on the architects statement of intent).

RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL (COUNTRYSIDE OFFICER): Suggests the imposition of conditions in regard to site landscaping and the protection of bats.

### **Proposal**

Listed building consent and planning permission is sought to refurbish the main block and service wing, construct a new swimming pool/glazed link extension to the west of the service wing with associated demolition of historic outbuildings, and relocate a historic glass house from the south front to the walled garden.

A conservation plan has been submitted with the application. This recognises that Townhead is an important part of the Slaidburn Village scene and is highly visible being situated on rising ground to the north of the village. It suggests that, rather than being demolished, the 1630's house forms the core of the current building. It is proposed to put the house back to the use for which it was originally designed, a gentleman's country estate. Areas of particular concern are:

- i) timber treatment – the most urgent requirement is the treatment and the eradication of the dry and wet rot which is evident within the structural and other timbers as well as within wall and ceiling plaster. There is major dry rot in the ancillary buildings around the kitchen and this has extended into the northeast corner of the main house. Where possible the approach will be to conserve in situ and repair all historic timbers and plasterwork;
- ii) structural repairs – including bulging walls, rotten beams to floors, fractured timber bracing and roof trusses which have dropped. Proposed works will also deal with the inherent design flaw of the existing roof design of the 18th century which was inadequate. The hip beams were of insufficient strength and although braced by convoluted propped dragon beams, sinking of these structures primarily to the north-east and south-east corners of the building have led to the distortion of the floors all the way through the building. This is also being exacerbated by major alterations carried out in the 1850's. These alterations were to the spine wall where a substantial archway was cut into the wall of the north-east room or morning room leaving only a small column of rubble stonework to support the floor beams. This has caused the whole structure to slide and bulge, again causing sinking of the floors above. A minimal intervention approach is to be adopted to repairs. Sloping floors and walls, which are out of plumb, are to be

retained as existing characteristics wherever possible, where this does not affect the structural stability of the house.

Existing knowledge refers to internal and external walls containing an apparently random mixture of poor quality brick and stone with large horizontal timber members. This can be seen to support the theory that the existing building incorporates the house built in the 1630's. This would have involved both reduction of the existing house as well as selective demolition. A number of the current structural problems relate to the lack of proper bonding between the new walls built onto the existing and re-use of existing timbers from the earlier house is random throughout the new buildings. Many of the cracks in the wall and ceiling plaster are due to a lack of bonding between the materials and from differential settlement as a result of the failure of the structural spine. Where dry rot has rotted the ends of major beams along the north elevation, these beams have been left hanging and pivoting on the spine wall, therefore pressuring the internal walls above causing movement and pressure cracking. Much of these structural problems will be resolved by repairs to the beam ends or by replacement if the dry rot damage proves too extensive;

- iii) services – the necessity to carry out a full repairs works programme and the intrusive nature of the works required to expose and repair the building affords the opportunity to integrate modern services within the building. The majority of the service requirements can be accommodated through lifting the floorboards.

The conservation plan also suggests that the design proposals for the refurbishment of Townhead are to retain all main block room spaces without alteration accepting the second floor where some later partitions are proposed to be moved. However, there is intrusive work within the service wing where the existing kitchens will be refurbished and added to with a bedroom suite to the first floor; it is also proposed to remove the link block staircase; a self contained guest suite will be created. The application design and access statement refers to the proposals being required to bring the house up to a 21<sup>st</sup> century usage. It is proposed to reduce the number of bedrooms to six (from 15) with three principal suites comprising bedrooms, sitting rooms and bathrooms, with a further three bedrooms and en-suite bathrooms. On the ground floor the main house is to be retained as existing with the principal rooms used as a substantial sitting room, a dining room, library and cloakrooms. The ancillary rooms will be used as a substantial farmhouse kitchen with breakfast area and sunroom. The sunroom forms an alteration from the existing structure by creating a glazed atrium space. Some outbuildings to the west of the kitchen block will be demolished behind the screen wall to create an enclosed swimming pool. As part of the application the whole building complex of Townhead will be restored to its former grandeur. The main buildings are to be re-roofed, windows refurbished and stone work re-pointed with all interior decoration treated and carefully repaired. Derelict outbuildings are to be rebuilt and the remainder re-roofed and re-pointed as required.

The applicant's desire is to use the majority of the outbuildings for garaging and storage of gardening and farm machinery. It is important to work with the history of the house. The ground floor has two substantial panelled rooms with the natural pine panelled room proposed as a dining room and the large painted panelled room as a drawing room. Two other principal rooms will be used as a library and cloakrooms. The key objective of the applicant is to preserve and enhance the existing building. The proposals involve no alteration to the ground floor layout of the existing building other than the allowance of some cloakroom toilets within the existing butler's pantry where the proposed design involves some alteration to the existing fabric.

It is proposed to rebuild the demolished archway which divided the ancillary buildings from the space in front of the north elevation. This let out from the north east corner of the kitchen wing. The design of the arch, although somewhat formal, was also unique and quirky with the main archway supported by dummy arches with exaggerated crenulations, urns and stone walls to either side. The original arch can just be made out from a photograph at the turn of the century. The owner is endeavouring to obtain some of the original lost stonework above the archway although if this proves unsuccessful, the archway and the stone features will be designed to mirror the original design as closely as possible.

It is also proposed to widen the drive in front of the north elevation. New proposals cut approximately 6m in the earth bank facing the north elevation pushing this back in a sweeping curve. This bank will be retained by gabions and then faced in stone. This will help create more space in front of the building to emphasise a sense of entrance but also to allow vehicles to manoeuvre much more easily in front of the building. This creates the opportunity for a formal landscaped square with potentially a sculpture or specimen tree in the centre to offset the austere frontage of the building. This space is completely shrouded by trees and undergrowth and being set into the hillside will not be visible. However, additional space to the north is essential to allow both vehicular movements for cars and waste trucks, horse boxes and farm vehicles.

Landscaping Proposals – the design and access statement suggests that infrastructure for the setting of the country house is well established although the planting has long gone. The house is raised up on the hill above Slaidburn and has a two level terrace wrapping around the building which the applicant will reinstate and plant. The majority of the gardens are contained further up within the walled garden section of the complex and our client is repairing the walled garden in order to re-establish the orchards and tennis court and bowling court that were within this large walled enclosure. The house, being set up on a steep hill, ensures that the majority of the surrounding landscape is steeply banked with a selection of specimen trees. Recently, with the agreement of the Council's Countryside Officer, various self seeded lime trees have been removed in order to aid the restoration works and to prevent future damage to the property.

At present the applicant is undertaking clearance works to reinstate the lost gardens, paths and walls in order to restore the 19<sup>th</sup> century scheme.

The conservation plan contains a statement of design philosophy for the demolitions associated with the proposed swimming pool. These structures are the stone screen wall that runs east west in line with the south elevation of the main house, buildings constructed against the stone screen wall, and a lean-to extension to the service wing outshot. It is suggested that structures other than the screen wall may date from the time of major alterations to the main house in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century. It is not certain what their original use would have been but it is likely that they were dry stores associated with the kitchen and service wing. The buildings are stone built with generally mono pitched slate roofs abutting the screen wall and have suffered from neglect, particularly at the western end where the roof and western wall have partially collapsed. It is suggested that until the infill of the early 19<sup>th</sup> century, the screen wall would have been distinct from the main house with a definite gap between the two rather than appearing as a continuation of the south wall as it does today. It is constructed from random rubble with a simple stone slab coping. It has been added to and repaired on numerous occasions. Structural movement becomes more apparent in the wall on its western section with vertical settlement cracks around the reclaimed doorway above which there appears to have been a poorly repaired collapse. It is suggested that even if the swimming pool was not built behind the wall, the poor structural condition would require it to be taken down and rebuilt anyway.

The submitted plans propose a swimming pool and glazed link immediately to the west of the main block and service wing of Townhead having a maximum length of 28m, maximum width of 8m and height varying from 4.7m (wall parapet) to 6.3m (glazed roof light). The south wall of the proposed swimming pool is shown to be in line with the south front of the main block; it is proposed to incorporate six 18<sup>th</sup> century style glazing bar sash windows to match the main house, two of which are paired, again to match the use of this device in the main house. Classically styled columns and cornicing details are proposed. Random rubble facing stone is shown to the south wall; the north and west walls and roof are glazed.

### **Site Location**

Townhead is a Grade II\* listed country house which is prominently sited on an escarpment above Croasdale Brook and Slaidburn Village, and is within the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Whilst only a riparian element of the site is within Slaidburn Conservation Area, there is a strong inter-visibility between Townhead and the Conservation Area. The site does not encompass all of Townhead's historic landscape but does importantly, incorporate the house's ancillary buildings, walled garden and home farm.

In April 2004, English Heritage produced a historic buildings report on Townhead mindful of its deteriorating condition and its vacancy for much of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. This suggested that the house, the historic residence of the Wigglesworths, was built in the 1730's and replaced a 17<sup>th</sup> century house on the site of which a fragment survives. It is built on a terrace overlooking the village, comprises a compact, rectangular double-pile block 5 bays wide to the south front, and 3 storeys high with a part basement. A 2 storey service wing on the west side is attached to the house by a 2 storey link block. The house is constructed of squared, water shot limestone rubble, with sandstone ashlar dressings including quoining to each corner. The principal south and east elevations are treated as symmetrical compositions, and are finished to a higher standard than the north and west elevations, with a classically-detailed door case in the centre of the south elevation. The windows in the north and west elevations reuse window surrounds from the earlier house.

The principal entrance is in the north elevation, opening into an entrance hall; the south entrance opens from a terrace into the stair hall. There are two main reception rooms, containing panelling, on the ground floor, with a smaller room, perhaps a library or morning room, and a housekeepers room in the north-west corner beyond the back staircase. The main staircase rises only to the first floor, though the upper part of the highly decorative stair hall rises through the third storey; the back stair rises to the attic. The first floor has 5 heated bedrooms, 4 with dressing rooms or small closets. The south east room is fully panelled, and all the rooms retain their original fire surrounds, though some have lost their overmantels. On the second floor, reached by the back staircase, were the servants bedrooms and possibly some children's rooms; of the 6 original rooms only 2 are heated. The small basement is incorporated from the earlier house, having 17<sup>th</sup> century windows. The service wing has 2 kitchens with pantries, a scullery and 3 first floor rooms.

In the early 19<sup>th</sup> century various alterations were made. Some of the ground floor windows in the south and east elevations were remodelled as pairs. A doorway was inserted in the east elevation, the north doorway was given an enclosed porch, the second doorway in the north elevation was converted into a window and replaced by a doorway in the north wall of the link block. Inside, a bathroom was inserted in the stairwell of the back staircase at a mezzanine level between ground and first floors, with the consequent reorganisation of the circulation route for the servants.

## **Relevant History**

79/0795 – Placing of a mobile home in garden adjoining Townhead for use while the property is restored and modernised. Planning permission granted 6 August 1979.

B0734 – Placing above ground of electric lines. Consent granted 15 December 1961.

## **Relevant Policies**

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Policy ENV20 - Proposals Involving Partial Demolition/Alteration of Listed Buildings.

Policy ENV19 - Listed Buildings (Setting).

Policy ENV16 - Development Within Conservation Areas.

Policy G1 - Development Control.

Policy ENV1 - Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

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

The main consideration in the determination of both the listed building consent and planning application is the duty imposed at Section 16(2) and 66(1) respectively, of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. Planning Policy Guidance Note 15 “Planning and the Historic Environment” also suggests (paragraph 3.5) that the extent to which the proposed works would bring substantial benefits to the community, in particular by contributing to the economic regeneration of the area or the enhancement of its environment (including other listed buildings), to be relevant to listed building consent consideration. The impact of views into and out of Slaidburn Conservation Area (with regard to the duty at Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area), is also a significant consideration in the determination of the planning application.

PPG15, Paragraph 3.8 states that: *“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, and new, and even continuing, uses will often necessitate some degree of adaption. The range and acceptability of possible uses must therefore usually be a major consideration when the future of listed buildings or buildings in conservation areas is in question”.*

PPG15, Paragraph 3.10 states that: *“The best use will very often be the use for which the building was originally designed, and the continuation or reinstatement of that use should certainly be the first option when the future of a building is considered ...”.*

PPG15, Paragraph 3.16, Demolitions, states that: *“While it is an objective of Government policy to secure the preservation of historic buildings, there will very occasionally be cases where demolition is unavoidable ...”.*

PPG15, Paragraph 3.19 suggests that: Where proposed works would result in the total or substantial demolition of a listed building, the Secretary of State would expect the authority to also consider:-

- i. the condition of the building, the cost of repairing and maintaining it in relation to its importance and to the value derived from its continued use;
- ii. the adequacy of efforts made to retain the building in use; and
- iii. the merits of alternative proposals for the site ... there may exceptionally be cases where the proposed works would bring substantial benefits for the community which has to be weighed against the arguments in favour of preservation.

PPG15, Paragraph 3.12, Alterations and Extensions, states that: “... *in judging the effect of any alteration or extension it is essential to have assessed the elements that make up the special interest of the building in question ...*”.

PPG15, Paragraph C.5 states that: “*Subsequent additions to historic buildings, including minor accretions such as conservatories, porches, balconies, verandas, door dressings, barge boards or chimneys, do not necessarily detract from the quality of a building. They are often of interest in their own right as part of the building’s organic history. Generally, later features of interest should not be removed merely to restore a building to an earlier form.*”

PPG15, Paragraph C.7 states that: “*Modern extensions should not dominate the existing building in either scale, material or situation. There will always be some historic buildings where any extensions would be damaging and should not be permitted. Successful extensions require the application of an intimate knowledge of the building type that is being extended together with a sensitive handling of scale and detail.*”

PPG15, Paragraph C.8, Walls, states that: “*Walls are the main structural fabric of a building. Alterations to wall surfaces are usually the most damaging that can be made to the overall appearance of a historic building. Alterations or repairs to external elevations should respect the existing fabric and match it in materials, texture, quality and colour ...*”

PPG15, Paragraph C.9, Openings, states that: “*Door and window openings establish the character of an elevation; they should not generally be altered in their proportions or details, especially where they are a conspicuous element of the design ...*”

PPG15, Paragraphs 2.16 and 2.17 state that: “... *the setting is often an essential part of the (listed) building’s character, especially if a garden or grounds have been laid out to compliment its design or function. Also, the economic viability as well as the character of historic buildings may suffer and they can be robbed of much of their interest and of the contribution they make to townscape or the countryside, if they become isolated from their surroundings, eg by new traffic routes, car parks, or other development.*”

“... the setting of individual listed buildings very often owes its character to the harmony produced by a particular grouping of buildings (not necessarily all of great individual merit) and to the quality of the spaces created between them. Such areas require careful appraisal when proposals for development are under consideration ...”

PPG15, Paragraph 4.14 (Conservation Areas) states that: “... *the desirability of preserving or enhancing the area should also, in the Secretary of State’s view, be a material consideration in the planning authority’s handling of development proposals which are outside the conservation area but would affect its setting, or views into or out of the area ...*”

Further to the receipt of the submitted conservation plan, my officers have been made aware of further significant structural stability issues associated with the main block of Townhead. English Heritage advised on the 15 October 2009 that, following inspection by its structural engineer and its architect, the main spine wall was about to collapse and required immediate careful demolition and appropriate rebuilding to avoid loss of a substantial part of the building. Similar advice was also offered in respect of walling adjacent the ground floor stairwell.

In my opinion, the scheme in general is to be welcomed as a well considered, thorough and sympathetic refurbishment of this Grade II\* listed (“... of particularly great importance to the nation’s built heritage”, PPG15, Paragraph 3.6) building which has appeared on English Heritage’s Buildings at Risk Register for a decade.

I would agree with the comments of English Heritage, the Georgian Group and Lancashire Gardens Trust in respect of the treatment of the south wall of the proposed swimming pool. In my opinion, also expressed at pre-application stage, this wall treatment closely mimicks that of the immediately adjacent house south façade and as a result undermines the impact of the imposing symmetrically designed house front. This is of harm to an element at the core of the building’s special interest. The intrinsically innocuous historic screening wall will be replaced by an elevation dominating the listed building in scale, material and situation.

I would also agree with the comments and suggestions of the Ancient Monuments Society in respect of the impact of proposed development upon the architectural hierarchy of buildings on the site and the consideration of existing barn re-use. In my opinion, and mindful of PPG15, Paragraphs 2.16 – 2.17, the layout and plan form of the mostly vernacular and functional estate and farm buildings and spaces in close juxta position to the house is an interesting survival and an important element of listed building character and setting. I am therefore concerned that the imposition of the “politely” designed swimming pool amongst this building assemblage would be incongruous and disruptive to setting and site integrity.

The above concerns have been discussed with the agent. He advises that his client loves this building and is keen to progress with repair of the building’s severe structural problems, but is unwilling to commit funds until planning permission is received. He notes the adaptations and modifications already made to the outbuildings and screen wall in response to the changing needs of each occupier and emphasises that houses such as Townhead are not static or preserved in aspic. He also states that his clients have been easily persuaded of the merits of minimal impact on the existing fabric of the building, even agreeing to move a proposed kitchen to reduce the impact on one of the panelled rooms. However, the former swimming pool south elevation is an expectation on which they do not want to compromise.

The agent has also responded to the specific concerns of English Heritage, the Georgian Group, the Ancient Monument Society and Lancashire Gardens Trust. In respect of the glazed link, the agent states that his client requires a glazed conservatory within the “family” area of the house and it is considered that this is the best location to accommodate this. He notes that historically, the service wing was much more distinct from the main house than at present and it is considered that a glazed link would help reinforce the distinction between the two. He suggests that the conservatory is not unreasonable for the size and status of this building.

In respect of the replacement screen wall/swimming pool south elevation the agent notes that the existing eastern end is quite formal with paired stone windows that mimic those in the house. He also suggests that this is the one area of the house that has always responded to change in needs over time and that, following development, the balance of the wall will still be

predominantly stone. He believes that the inclusion of a swimming pool linked to the family accommodation is not unreasonable given the nature of the house and to support a viable future for Townhead as a single-family dwelling. He reiterates that his client is not willing to compromise on his preferred layout.

In respect to retention of the existing barns the agent confirms that it is not the intention to demolish the range of barns running to the west of the house. In respect to barn use as a swimming pool, it is suggested that it does not seem reasonable to expect pool users to have to exit the house to enter a separate building; providing a pool in the barns would also be difficult given the gradient of the slope up to the west and would present a major risk to the stability of the existing structure.

In my opinion the shortcomings of the scheme, albeit significant, do not outweigh the very substantial public and community benefit of rescuing this nationally important historic building from otherwise inevitable total decline. I would therefore recommend that listed building consent and planning permission be granted.

I am mindful of the suggestions of the Lancashire Gardens Trust in respect of the historic designed landscape and its management. The Borough Council's Countryside Officer has advised on arboricultural proposals for the site from an early stage and would suggest the imposition of a landscaping condition in respect to proposed works. However, the site is not included on English Heritage's Register of Historic Parks and Gardens and I do not believe an insistence on the production of a management plan can be justified.

I would confirm that should Members wish to grant listed building consent that such a proposed decision will first require referral to the Secretary of State (Government Office North West).

#### SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR APPROVAL

The proposal has an acceptable impact upon the character and setting of the listed building.

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. No works can begin until a copy of the approved Natural England Licence (EPSM/2009/1232/B) has been submitted to the Local Planning Authority, all mitigation measures identified in the licence shall be supervised by a person, the identify of whom has been previously agreed in writing by the Natural England species protection licensing officer and the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: To ensure that no species/habitat protected by the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 are destroyed in accordance with Policies G1, ENV7 and ENV8 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan.

3. The development hereby permitted shall not be commenced until details of the landscaping of the site, including the retention of existing trees, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The landscaping scheme submitted shall reflect both the existing and historical landscape character and therefore indicate, as appropriate, the types and numbers of trees and shrubs, their distribution on site, those areas to be seeded, turfed, paved or laid landscaped, including details of any changes of level or landform and the types and details of all fencing and screening.

The approved landscaping scheme shall be implemented in the first planting season following occupation or use of the development, whether in whole or part 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 the replacement of any tree or shrub which 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.

4. No development approved by this permission shall be commenced until a scheme for the disposal of foul and surface waters has been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such a scheme shall be constructed and completed in accordance with the approved plans.

REASON: To ensure a satisfactory means of drainage.

5. No works shall take place on the site until the applicant, or their agent or successors in title, has secured the implementation of a programme of building recording and analysis. This must be carried out in accordance with a written scheme of investigation, which shall first have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: To ensure and safeguard the recording and inspection of matters of archaeological/historical importance associated with the building in accordance with Policies G1, ENV14 and ENV15 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan.

6. Precise specifications and samples of walling, roofing and other materials to be used shall have first been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority before their use in the proposed works.

REASON: In order to safeguard the character of the listed building.

7. Precise specifications for the repair and restoration of historic fabric 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 character of the listed building.

8. New window frames shall be painted within one month of their insertion and retained as such in perpetuity.

REASON: In order to safeguard the character of the listed building.

RECOMMENDATION: That the granting of listed building consent be delegated to the Director of Development Services following referral to the Secretary of State, in accordance with 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. No works can begin until a copy of the approved Natural England Licence (EPSM/2009/1232/B) has been submitted to the Local Planning Authority, all mitigation measures identified in the licence shall be supervised by a person, the identify of whom has been previously agreed in writing by the Natural England species protection licensing officer and the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: To ensure that no species/habitat protected by the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 are destroyed in accordance with Policies G1, ENV7 and ENV8 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan.

3. The development hereby permitted shall not be commenced until details of the landscaping of the site, including the retention of existing trees, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The landscaping scheme submitted shall reflect both the existing and historical landscape character and therefore indicate, as appropriate, the types and numbers of trees and shrubs, their distribution on site, those areas to be seeded, turfed, paved or lard landscaped, including details of any changes of level or landform and the types and details of all fencing and screening.

The approved landscaping scheme shall be implemented in the first planting season following occupation or use of the development, whether in whole or part 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 the replacement of any tree or shrub which 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.

4. No works shall take place on the site until the applicant, or their agent or successors in title, has secured the implementation of a programme of building recording and analysis. This must be carried out in accordance with a written scheme of investigation, which shall first have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: To ensure and safeguard the recording and inspection of matters of archaeological/historical importance associated with the building in accordance with Policies G1, ENV14 and ENV15 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan.

5. Precise specifications and samples of walling, roofing and other materials to be used shall have first been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority before their use in the proposed works.

REASON: In order to safeguard the character of the listed building.

6. Precise specifications for the repair and restoration of historic fabric 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 character of the listed building.

7. New window frames shall be painted within one month of their insertion and retained as such in perpetuity.

REASON: In order to safeguard the character of the listed building.

APPLICATION NO: 3/2009/1009/P (GRID REF: SD 360197 437496)  
ALTERATION OF ROOF PROFILE TO ACCOMMODATE THE CREATION OF 4 NO. SELF-CONTAINED OFFICE UNITS AT FIRST FLOOR AT ENTERPRISE HOUSE, WARWICK STREET, LONGRIDGE, LANCASHIRE, PR3 3EB

LONGRIDGE TOWN No objection.  
COUNCIL:

LCC COUNTY SURVEYOR: No objections in principle to this application on highway safety grounds.

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS: Two letters of objection have been received from a nearby business who wish to raise the following points of objection;

1. Whilst there are no objections to the development, there are concerns regarding parking and traffic flow which have been underestimated and brushed over in this application,
2. How can the 7 designated spaces serve the new offices AND the existing ground floor shop/unit?
3. The application does not consider the potential number of staff working at the new offices, if this is more than 7, where do they park?
4. Currently 3 businesses running from the site, which could rise to 8 if you include land to the rear, which will surely lead to an increase in vehicles/parking issues,
5. We feel the site could easily be over developed and compound existing traffic problems, and we suggest that the planning committee have a site meeting to discuss traffic at peak time.

### **Proposal**

The application seeks permission for the alteration of the roof profile of Enterprise House on Warwick Street, Longridge, in order to accommodate the creation of 4 no. self-contained office

units at first floor. The ground floor of the building previously contained Longridge Hire Centre, however it is currently vacant. At present, there are already two offices at first floor with the rest of the floor space used for storage however because of the existing sloping roof, access is difficult. The proposed roof profile alteration will allow the formation of four larger office spaces, a large storage room and the creation of new men's and ladies WCs. The materials to be used in its construction (white rendered finish and a goose wing grey profiled roof) are considered suitable and appropriate for a unit of this nature.

### **Site Location**

The site in question is located on the edge of Longridge town centre and also on the edge of the new Conservation Area as defined by the Local Plan. The area currently comprises of a number of close-knit commercial/industrial units of various sizes and designs, and the site is historically an industrial/commercial site. There are neighbouring dwellings surrounding the site, with the nearest properties opposite at a distance of approx. 11m away.

### **Relevant History**

There have been a number of historical applications on this site, with the most recent proposal being:

3/1991/0667/P – Extension to provide new heated spray booth – Approved with conditions.

### **Relevant Policies**

Policy G1 - Development Control.

Policy ENV16 - Development Within Conservation Areas.

Policy EMP7 - Extensions/Expansions of Existing Firms.

Policy RDF2 of the Regional Spatial Strategy 2008.

PPS4 – Planning for Prosperous Economies.

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

The main issues to consider with regards to this proposed development are the principle of the development, the potential impact on residential and visual amenity and the impact of the scheme on highway safety.

#### **PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT**

The site lies on the edge of the town centre of Longridge, and has an existing industrial/commercial mix of uses on the other sections of the site. As such, it is considered that the principle of developing the site for a further commercial use is considered acceptable subject to compliance with other Policies within the Local Plan. Policy EMP7 states that "The expansion of existing firms within the main settlement will be allowed on land within or adjacent to their existing sites, provided no significant environmental problems are caused and the extension conforms to the other policies of this plan". Whilst the proposed development is not strictly an expansion of an existing firm, it is considered that the same principles must apply for development on this site.

## RESIDENTIAL AND VISUAL AMENITY

The existing building is a two-storey building with a sloping, mono-pitch roof that's slopes from east to west on the elevation facing Warwick Street, and is very much out of keeping with other buildings in the nearby vicinity. The proposed roof profile alteration to a very shallow pitched roof, constructed by raising one side of the building by approx. 1.5m, will allow sufficient space within the new area for the formation of four larger office spaces, a large storage room and the creation of new men's and ladies WCs.

In considering the above, due to the proposed design of the roof alterations the overall visual impact on the streetscene and impact on the amenity of neighbours is kept to a minimum by keeping the height of the altered building to a minimum. In doing so, it reduces the massing of the building in relation to the nearest properties, and due to the change in roof slope will appear less intrusive on site in relation to the other nearby units. In addition, the streetscene view is not significantly altered and therefore has minimal impact on the setting of the adjacent Conservation Area. Finally, the materials to be used in the alterations to the building, including a white rendered finish to the concrete block walls and a goose wing grey profiled roof, are also considered suitable and appropriate for this unit in this particular location.

## IMPACT ON HIGHWAY SAFETY

Despite a number of points of objection to this scheme from a nearby business, the LCC Traffic and Development Engineer raises no objections in principle to this application on highway safety grounds. He notes that the revised plans indicate that there is sufficient parking conveniently located for the proposed office use.

## SPACE FOR HIGHWAYS COMMENTS

In conclusion, whilst I am mindful of the comments from the adjacent business, given the existing uses and level of use on the site and the location of the proposal within the town centre of Longridge, the scheme submitted is not considered to cause a significant detrimental impact on the amenity of the area or on the amenity of the occupiers of nearby dwellings, nor will it have a significant detrimental impact on highway safety through parking issues. The proposal is therefore recommended accordingly.

## SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR APPROVAL

The proposal has no significant detrimental impact on nearby residential amenity, nor would it have an adverse visual impact or be to the detriment of highway safety.

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

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

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

2. This permission shall be implemented in accordance with the proposal as amended by letter and plan received on the 11 January 2010.

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

3. The car parking spaces indicated on the amended plan dated 11 January 2010, drawing No 0701/2 shall be marked out in accordance with this approved plan, before the use of the offices hereby approved become operative.

REASON: To comply with Policy G1 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan and to allow for the effective use of the parking areas.

4. The use of the proposed offices in accordance with this permission shall be restricted to the hours between 0800 to 1800 Monday to Saturday, and there shall be no operation on Sundays or bank holidays.

REASON: To comply with Policy G1 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan. The use of the proposed units outside these hours could prove injurious to the character of the area and in order to safeguard residential amenities.

## **C APPLICATIONS WHICH THE DIRECTOR OF DEVELOPMENT SERVICES RECOMMENDS FOR REFUSAL**

APPLICATION NO: 3/2010/0011/P (CAC) & 3/2009/1078/P (PA) (GRID REF: SD 373391 436156)  
PROPOSED DEMOLITION OF FORMER NURSERY BUILDING (CAC) PROPOSED  
ERECTION OF A NEW RETAIL AND OFFICE BUILDING WITH CAR PARKING (PA) AT  
7 ACCRINGTON ROAD, WHALLEY

PARISH COUNCIL:	No comments received at time of report writing.
ENVIRONMENT DIRECTORATE (COUNTY SURVEYOR):	Consulted, no comments received at the time of report writing.
HISTORIC AMENITY SOCIETIES:	Consulted, no comments received at time of report writing.
RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL (COUNTRYSIDE OFFICER):	Should the granting of planning permission be considered, a condition requiring the carrying out of a bat survey at the optimum time will be required.
ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS:	<p>No comments received at time of report writing. However United Utilities made the following comments on previous applications 3/2009/0046/P and 3/2009/0047/P:</p> <p>No objection to the proposal providing the site must be drained on a separate system, with only foul drainage connected into the foul sewer. Surface water should discharge to the soakaway/watercourse/surface water sewer and may require the consent of the Environment Agency. If surface water is allowed to be discharged to the public surface water sewerage system, United Utilities may require the flow to be attenuated to a maximum discharge rate.</p> <p>A public sewer crosses the proposed car parking area and United Utilities will require 24 hour unrestricted access for maintenance or repair. United Utilities will not permit building over or within the access strip of the public sewer. Deep rooted shrubs and trees should not be planted in the vicinity of the public sewer and overflow systems.</p>

### **Proposal**

Conservation Area Consent is sought for the demolition of two of the site's existing buildings. To the front of the site and adjacent to Accrington Road is a single storey building. It has white painted walls and a blue slate roof and retains much of its former appearance as a residential bungalow. To the rear there is a flat roof building of utilitarian appearance and breezeblock construction. The submitted Design and Access Statement refers to the last use of the site as a children's day nursery; an unfavourable OFSTED report forced the closure of the nursery in 2005/06. The application is unclear as to the proposed intentions for the traditional stone boundary wall, which is incorporated within the site boundary.

Full planning permission is also sought for mixed retail and office development of the site. It is proposed to erect a three-storey block set back 3m from the back edge of the pavement and having a footprint covering most of the site area. The building has a frontage of 14m, a depth of 13.8m and a ridge height of 10.5m. The application form indicates proposed materials to be walls in stone and render, roof in blue slate, windows in plastic and doors in plastic. The ground floor is proposed to be divided between retail space and car parking (undercroft; 4 spaces); the first and second floors are proposed office space. The proposed hours of opening and employment is stated to be unknown. The Design and Access Statement refers to cycle parking and bin storage to be provided at the rear, and the provision of a ground source heat pump and solar panels within the development. It also notes that buildings in the vicinity display a variety of architectural styles and are in various forms. The proposed building is described as a 'modern interpretation of Victorian style'.

### **Site Location**

7 Accrington Road is a prominent site close to the junction with King Street. In April 2007, following public consultation, it was included within the extension of Whalley Conservation Area. A traditional coursed stone wall with triangular copings provides enclosure to the front of the site. A number of nearby buildings are listed or have been identified as Buildings of Townscape Merit in the Whalley Conservation Area Appraisal (The Conservation Studio 2005; adopted by the Borough Council following public consultation April 2007).

### **Relevant History**

3/2009/0047/P – New office development and car parking – planning permission refused 6 March 2009.

3/2009/0046/P – Demolition of former nursery building. Conservation Area Consent refused 6 March 2009.

3/2007/0890/P – Demolition of nursery and erection of office building and car parking. Planning permission refused 17 January 2008.

3/2007/0900/P – Demolition of existing buildings. Conservation Area consent refused 17 January 2008.

3/2005/0824/P – Demolition of children's nursery and erection of offices. Withdrawn.

3/1993/0618/P – Extension to childcare centre. Planning permission granted 22 October 1993.

3/1991/0299/P – Change of use from residential dwelling to private day nursery, approximately 20 places. Planning permission granted 31 July 1991.

3/1990/0826/P – New wing extension to contain two bedrooms and bathroom. Planning permission granted 20 December 1990.

3/1990/0225/P – Change of use of bungalow to a restaurant. Planning permission refused 24 May 1990.

3/1989/0848/P – Conversion of bungalow to restaurant. Planning permission refused 8 March 1990. Decision upheld at appeal 12 October 1990.

6/10/566 – Proposed conversion of builder's offices into bungalow. Planning permission granted 10 July 1957.

### **Relevant Policies**

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

Policy ENV19 - Listed Buildings (Setting).

Policy ENV16 - Development Within Conservation Areas.

Policy ENV18 - Retention of Important Buildings Within Conservation Areas.

Policy G1 - Development Control.

Policy S4 – New Small Scale Shopping Development – Whalley.

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

The main consideration in the determination of both the conservation area consent and planning applications is the duty at Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area.

Planning Policy Guidance Note 15 "Planning and the Historic Environment" paragraph 4.20 provides interpretation of "preserve or enhance" following *South Lakeland DC -v- Secretary of State for the Environment*, (1992) 2 WLR 204. It states that the character and appearance of conservation areas should always be given full weight in planning decisions. However, the objective of preservation can be achieved by development which leaves character and appearance unharmed.

PPG15, paragraph 4.27 (Demolition Proposals) states that: *"The general presumption should be in favour of retaining buildings which make a positive contribution to the character or appearance of a conservation area ... in less clear cut cases – for instance, where a building makes little or no such contribution – the local planning authority will need to have full information about what is proposed for the site after demolition. Consent for demolition should not be given unless there are acceptable and detailed plans for any redevelopment. It has been held that the decision-maker is entitled to consider the merits of any proposed development in determining whether consent should be given for the demolition of an unlisted building in a conservation area"*.

PPG15, paragraph 4.17 (New Development) states that: *"Many conservation areas include gap sites or buildings that make no positive contribution to, or indeed detract from, the character or appearance of the area; their replacement should be a stimulus to imaginative, high quality design, and seen as an opportunity to enhance the area. What is important is not that new buildings should directly imitate earlier styles, but that they should be designed with respect for their context, as part of a larger whole which has a well established character and appearance of its own"*.

PPG15, paragraph 4.16 (New Development) states that *"policies (for conservation areas) will need to be designed to allow the area to remain alive and prosperous, and to avoid unnecessarily detailed controls over businesses and householders, but at the same time to ensure that any new development accords with the area's special architectural and historic interest"*.

The Government's Planning Policy Statement 7 – "Sustainable Development in Rural Areas" states at paragraph 12 that *"Planning Authorities should ensure that development ... contributes to the sense of local identity and regional diversity and be of an appropriate design and scale for its location ..."*.

The Government's Planning Policy Statement 1 states at Key Principle (iv) paragraph 13 that: *"Planning Policy should promote high quality inclusive design in the layout of new developments and individual buildings in terms of function and impact, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development. Design which fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of the area should not be accepted"*.

World Class Places: The Government's Strategy for Improving Quality of Place (HM Government, 2009) acknowledges at paragraph 1.4 that: *"Local Authorities face pressure to approve poor quality schemes partly because of the short-term investment and jobs they will bring ... but it is right and important that we not only encourage development but help ensure that it is of a universally high standard and helps create successful and sustainable places"*.

At paragraph 2.5 it is also stated that: *"Our historic environment is vital to our self understanding, a sense of connectiveness to the past and to the future and is a valuable asset in creating a sense of place. Local people value it as do tourists and investors ...."*

Saved Local Plan Policy ENV16 contains the expectation that new development in conservation areas will respect existing character in terms of scale, size, design and materials.

Whalley Conservation Area Management Guidance (The Conservation Studio, 2006, page 15) suggests that: *"The emphasis in any new development or proposed alteration must always be on the need to provide a high quality of design. Consideration of scale, density, height and massing may be used to set out the basic form of the building ... and, most importantly, the relationship of the new buildings to existing surrounding buildings and to the street"*.

Amongst Management Guidance Key Design Principles is included the advice that "new development should reflect the proportion of solid to void found in the elevations of traditional buildings and should employ robust detailing and avoid fussy or gimmicky use of applied features or detailing".

In Management Guidance, Shop fronts and security grills, it is stated that "the Whalley Conservation Area contains a small number of commercial premises with shop fronts. The appearances of many of these properties has been compromised by badly designed shop fronts... the most common problems are ... bad proportions ...."

The Management Guidance also suggests that the following principles should be followed when considering a new or altered shop front:

1. New shop fronts should be built from timber and painted.
2. The use of uPVC or modern materials will be resisted.

Whalley Conservation Area Appraisal "SWOT" analysis (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats, page 3-4) states there to be three Threats to the Conservation Area:

1. continuing loss of existing front boundaries;

2. continuing loss of original architectural details and use of inappropriate modern materials or details;
3. poor quality shop fronts.

In November 2008, and mindful of two previous proposals for this site which had failed to preserve Whalley Conservation Area, your officers conferred with Design and Heritage Pennine Lancashire (partnership between the Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment, English Heritage, Elevate and RENEW NW) in respect of appropriate guidelines to offer to the site owner in production of a resubmitted scheme. In summary, the CABE Enabler and the Places Matter representative present advised that the varied character of this part of the Conservation Area allowed the designer freedom to produce a bold interesting design, in context (eg using traditional materials), but true to its time. The hipped roofs of the most recent scheme “picked up on the more mediocre buildings in the area and were not what Whalley is about”. I note that this approach echoes PPG15, paragraph 4.17 in suggesting that acceptable design must be considerate of its historic and architectural context but should not slavishly copy it.

Such an approach is advocated by others. In “Managing Change in Conservation Areas” (English Heritage Conservation Bulletin, Spring 2009), Davies (Planning and Development Director (South) English Heritage) suggests that a graduated contextual approach be adopted to new development in conservation areas. In low quality varied townscape the opportunity exists to generate new compositions and points of interest; high quality innovative architecture may be acceptable. In areas of high quality varied townscape (7 Accrington Road?) new development should be integrated more fully into its surroundings based on a proper understanding of the heritage values of a place; good modern design may be acceptable providing it follows these broad parameters – it has led to some outstanding new buildings. In areas of homogenous townscape of particular historic or aesthetic significance scholarly replica buildings might be appropriate, especially if it restores or completes an otherwise coherent composition.

In my opinion the proposed development would harm Whalley Conservation Area. The proposal pays little regard to its historic context which is explicit in the Whalley Conservation Area Appraisal and the Whalley Conservation Management Guidance. In my opinion the double-fronted shop front is significantly out of proportion to building façade and sits very uncomfortably in the street scene. The limited information submitted as to form suggests the shop front to be of generic design without precedence or reference in historic Whalley. In addition shop front width results in a ground floor horizontality which conflicts with the building’s otherwise vertical emphasis. Furthermore the expanse of glazing in the shop front does not respect the characteristic solid to void ratio of buildings in the Conservation Area.

In my opinion the wholesale use of plastic windows and doors (and shop front?) and lack of robust detailing (under-sized quoins and modillions/corbels) does not respect the historic context of Whalley. Therefore, the prominent proposed front elevation and would dilute rather than maintain the character of the Conservation Area.

It is not clear whether the existing stone boundary wall is to remain (not shown on “as existing” or “as proposed” drawings). However, its removal and creation of a significant area of unenclosed space between the back edge of the footpath and building façade would be incongruous with boundary treatments in this part of the Conservation Area (including the immediately adjacent modern building).

In my opinion the existing buildings, whilst not harmful (see Whalley Conservation Area Appraisal), do not make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. However, the buildings are innocuous (and the wall is traditional) and provide a building frontage and enclosure to the site. Policy ENV18 states that: “... *consent to demolish any building in a conservation area will not be granted unless a suitable detailed planning application for the reuse of the site has been approved ...*”. In my opinion neither the proposed redevelopment or the demolition of existing buildings and introduction of a gap site into the Conservation Area would preserve the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.

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

1. The proposed development would be detrimental to the character and appearance of Whalley Conservation Area because of the incongruous design of its shop front, the incorporation of modern and poor quality materials, and the absence of robust detailing. This would be contrary to Policy ENV16 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan.

RECOMMENDATION: That conservation area consent be REFUSED for the following reason(s):

1. The proposed demolition and associated development would be detrimental to the character and appearance of Whalley Conservation Area because of the loss of site enclosure and the proposed building's incongruous shop front design and the harmful incorporation of poor quality materials and insubstantial detailing. This would be contrary to Policies ENV16 and ENV18 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan.

APPLICATION NO: 3/2009/0718/P (GRID REF: SD 366293 435536)  
PROPOSED CHANGE OF USE AND CONVERSION OF THE FORMER HOTEL/RESTAURANT TO SIX DWELLINGS INCLUDING PARTIAL DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BUILDINGS, ALTERATIONS, EXTENSIONS AND ERECTION OF NEW GARAGES AT FORMER DE TABLEY ARMS, RIBCHESTER ROAD, CLAYTON-LE-DALE

PARISH COUNCIL: No comments received.

ENVIRONMENT DIRECTORATE (COUNTY SURVEYOR): No objection on highway safety grounds.

ENVIRONMENT AGENCY: No objection in principle to the proposed development subject to the imposition of conditions.

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS: One letter was received which neither objected or supported the scheme, merely queried the intentions of the applicant regarding the cricket field to the rear of the premises.

## **Proposal**

This application details the proposed change of use of the former De Tabley Arms to six dwellings. The scheme involves the demolition of the enclosed terrace/balcony extension to the front of the main building and demolition of extensions that link the main roadside building to the barn to its rear. The latter would then become a free standing five bedroom dwelling with the main building converted to form five dwellings with internal alterations and rear extensions to accommodate the required living space.

Private garden areas would be formed to the rear of the main roadside building with the erection of new garages to serve the proposed dwellings with a new access track leading from the present car park around the rear of the dwellings to serve the garages. In total three detached garage blocks are shown to the rear of the site which have been reduced in height since the original submission as follows.

The building to serve plot 5 would accommodate double garage and stable/tack room/store with approximate dimensions of 10.8m x 7m x 4.5m to the apex of its pitch. Plot 4 would have a single garage some 3.5m x 7m x 3.5m in height and plots 2 and 3 would share a double garage structure measuring approximately 7m x 7m x 4.5m in height. Construction materials for all these detached buildings would be natural stone walling under slate roofs with timber effect doors. Additional parking spaces would be provided for Units 2 to 5 to the north of the building on part of the former car park. Plots 1 and 6 would have their parking requirements served by the erection of a four bay garage type structure alongside these with approximate dimensions of 11.8m x 7m x 4.8m in height. The structure would have a green oak frame with weather boarding to the walls and timber garage doors with an eaves gap to the slate roof above.

The hard surfaced car park to the north of the site would be taken up and reinstated as either grass land or woodland tree planting.

## **Site Location**

The De Tabley is set to the east of Ribchester Road outside any defined settlement limit within land designated open countryside. To its north and south are dwellings, to its west the River Ribble and to its east, ie rear, a cricket field.

## **Relevant History**

Numerous applications associated with former use with most relevant as follows.

3/09/0119/P – Change of use – land and buildings from restaurant with manager's flat to one dwelling. Approved with conditions 24 June 2009.

3/05/0362/P – Hotel bedroom and function suite extension (Resubmission). Approved with conditions 12 September 2005.

3/05/0174/P – Temporary marquee. Withdrawn.

3/04/1034/P – Hotel bedroom extension, exhibition hall and alterations. Withdrawn.

3/97/0553/P – Change of use fields to cricket ground, construction of additional car parking and landscape moulding. Approved with conditions 7 October 1997.

## **Relevant Policies**

Policy G1 - Development Control.

Policy G5 - Settlement Strategy.

Policy ENV3 - Development in Open Countryside.

Policy H2 - Dwellings in the Open Countryside.

Policy H12 - Curtilage Extensions.

Policy H15 - Building Conversions - Location.

Policy H16 - Building Conversions - Building to be Converted.

Policy H17 - Building Conversions - Design Matters.

Policy EMP11 - Loss of Employment Land.

Affordable Housing of Memorandum of Understanding.

L4 – Regional Housing Provision – Regional Spatial Strategy.

L5 – Affordable Housing – Regional Spatial Strategy.

PPS3 – Housing.

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

Matters for consideration are the principle of development, highway safety, visual and residential amenity.

### **Principle**

In respect of principle this scheme is for the conversion of a building to provide a number of residential units. I am mindful of its commercial history but as Members will note from the relevant history section of this report, consent has been granted previously, although not implemented, for the change of use of the building to a single dwelling. Thus, I am of the opinion that in the first instance, the scheme should be assessed under Policy H16 which concerns itself with the conversion of rural buildings. I am satisfied that the scheme complies with the requirements of that saved plan policy. However, I am aware that as the scheme would provide an additional five dwellings over and above the existing manager's accommodation on site, regard should be had to more recent planning policy as expressed in PPS3, the RSS and the Affordable Housing Memorandum of Understanding which is a material planning consideration having regard to the relevant policies of the RSS and the Council's Strategic Housing Market Assessment.

The RSS supersedes the Districtwide Local Plan in that it provides more up to date policy in line with PPS3 which in turn sets out the underlying objectives of providing affordable housing and the approach to determining applications. Policies L4 and L5 of the RSS also set out the development plan policies to be considered in the determination of this application and their implementation is informed by the Affordable Housing Memorandum of Understanding. The Affordable Housing Memorandum of Understanding is based upon the evidence of the recently adopted Strategic Housing Market Assessment in arriving at the localised thresholds and has been the subject of extensive public consultation. It has been adopted by the Council as its affordable housing policy and adopted by Planning and Development Committee as a material consideration. The applicant has been asked to provide supporting information on the viability of providing affordable housing but has declined to do so. In respect of this development, the threshold of development for requiring a quota of affordable housing is three dwellings or more and the Council would, under the terms of the Affordable Housing Memorandum of Understanding, seek 30% affordable units on site. The scheme in its submitted form does not provide any element of affordable provision.

Therefore, whilst I am mindful of saved policy H16 in the absence of a five year land supply or an up to date Local Development Framework, the relevant national and regional policies give the context of making a decision 'in principle' on any specific planning application. In the absence of any information to support an exception from the provision of affordable housing, I must therefore conclude that the application fails to address the requirements as set out by more recent national and regional policy in respect of the need to balance the housing market.

### Highway

With regard to highway safety the County Surveyor has commented that the use of the existing vehicular access for the six dwellings suggested would not have a detrimental impact on the existing local highway infrastructure or activity in the immediate vicinity of the site. For these reasons he raises no objection to the development.

### Residential Amenity

Turning to potential impact on adjacent residential amenity the dwellings to the north and south of the site are set over 100m away in either direction. I am of the opinion that the conversion of the buildings on site to six units with associated garden areas and garage structures would not have an adverse impact on the amenities which those properties currently enjoy.

### Other Considerations

The remaining consideration, therefore, is visual impact and the scheme has been amended since original submission to reduce the overall height of some of the garage structures, delete a chimney to the rear and revise a window opening on the front elevation. Works to the front of the building, ie its roadside elevation, involve minor revisions to fenestration details and these are not considered to harm the character and appearance of the structure. The majority of alterations to the structure are to its rear and involve the demolition of sections that link the roadside building to the former barn to its rear and provision of projecting two storey gables and single storey lean-tos. In assessing these elements I am mindful of Policies H16 and H17 and, in this particular instance, do not consider that these additions would (when balanced against the miscellany of existing rear extensions) adversely affect the character or appearance of this building. With regard to the detached curtilage buildings, these are sited on land which could be argued to form part of the existing garden area to the De Tabley. The structures are sited so that they run roughly in a line with the eastern gable of the detached barn to be converted to a dwelling. They would be visible in the wider landscape area but, in their revised form, I do not consider that any significant detriment would be caused to the visual amenities of the area. A minor extension of the curtilage to the grounds is proposed in order to facilitate the creation of the rear access track to serve the garages and, again, having regard to the overall development I am of the opinion that an unfavourable recommendation on the basis of a minor encroachment would prove difficult to substantiate on Appeal. I have discussed the options given for the car park treatment with the Council's Countryside Officer, ie grassland or woodland tree planting, and he has stated that he would prefer a woodland as any new broadleaved woodland of an appropriate tree type and species mix has the potential, amongst other things to make a contribution to biodiversity.

Therefore, having very carefully assessed all of the above I am of the opinion that in design terms, highway safety and residential amenity terms the scheme is in accordance with saved plan policy and would not lead to significant detriment in terms of amenity considerations. However, as it does not seek to provide any affordable housing having regard to the most

recent national and regional guidance which supersede the aforementioned saved Local Plan policy, in this instance it should, for this reason, be resisted.

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

1. The proposal is considered contrary to the provisions of PPS3 'Housing', Policies L4 and L5 of the North West of England Plan Regional Spatial Strategy to 2021 and Ribble Valley Borough Council's Affordable Housing Memorandum of Understanding in that the scheme does not deliver a mix of housing both market and affordable. Approval of the scheme in its submitted form would therefore be contrary to the strategic housing and planning for housing policy objectives as set out in PPS3.

**D APPLICATIONS ON WHICH COMMITTEE 'DEFER' THEIR APPROVAL SUBJECT TO WORK 'DELEGATED' TO THE DIRECTOR OF DEVELOPMENT SERVICES BEING SATISFACTORILY COMPLETED**

APPLICATION NO: 3/2009/1011/P (GRID REF: SD 370941 434975)  
OUTLINE APPLICATION TO BUILD 10 NO TWO BED SEMI DETACHED BUNGALOWS, 4 NO SEMI DETACHED AND 2 NO DETACHED THREE BED DORMER BUNGALOWS AND 8 NO THREE BED SEMI DETACHED HOUSES ON LAND ADJACENT TO PETRE HOUSE FARM, WHALLEY ROAD, LANGHO

PARISH COUNCIL: No representations have been received at the time of report preparation.

ENVIRONMENT DIRECTORATE (COUNTY SURVEYOR): I have no objection in principle to this application on highway safety grounds.

The existing vehicular access from Whalley Road has been designed and constructed to an appropriate standard to accommodate the additional traffic generated by this development without any detriment to the existing residents or other users of the immediate local highway network.

The parking provisions indicated are consistent with the size, design and number of residential dwellings being proposed.

The grant of planning permission does not entitle a developer to obstruct a right of way and any proposed stopping up or diversion of a right of way should be the subject of an order under the appropriate act.

ENVIRONMENT DIRECTORATE (COUNTY PLANNING OFFICER): Four letters have been received from different officers in the County Planning Department, the contents of which are summarised as follows:

The Director of Strategic Planning and Transport considers that the proposed development confirms to the North West of England Plan Regional Spatial Strategy to 2021.

It is stated that the development would contribute 100% to the district target for affordable housing. Policy H20 of the Local Plan states that, on sites other than infill sites within the village boundaries, and on land identified as open countryside, planning permission will only be granted for 100% affordable needs housing developments which are intended to meet a proven local need. This development conforms to this policy.

With regards to renewable energy, Policy EM18 of the Regional Spatial Strategy requires that all residential developments of 10 or more units should incorporate renewable energy production to provide at least 10% of the developments predicted energy requirements. It is considered that the 10% target should be met, unless the applicant is able to demonstrate that its achievement is not feasible or viable.

The County Council adopted the Policy Paper 'Planning Obligations in Lancashire' in November 2006 which was updated in 2008. A planning obligation request has arisen from the proposed development but, given that the development is 100% affordable, your Council should consider whether the request for a planning obligation in whole or in part would prejudice the viability of the scheme. If this is the case, the applicant will be required to demonstrate this.

Although there may be a request for a contribution towards sustainable transport measures, the level of such a contribution has not yet been determined.

Education contribution. This development would result in a potential yield of eight primary school places. Although there are presently 26 places in nearby schools, the numbers on roll are forecast to rise in the next few years and there are other developments potentially yielding additional pupils in the vicinity. Therefore, the County Council seeks a full contribution for the yield of eight pupils which amounts to £88,250. Forecasts show that there will be no shortfall of secondary school places in the locality.

Waste management contribution. Since each house wherever it is in the County, has to be provided with the basic service and the Council has to comply with significant new requirements relating to the management of waste, it is considered that the Council is justified in requesting a contribution towards waste management. Based upon the Policy Paper methodology for Waste Management, the request is £11,520.

The County Council Archaeology Service has inspected this application and has no comments to make.

It will be necessary for public footpath No 7 to be diverted if this development is to take place. The development must not commence until all necessary procedures are in place.

ENVIRONMENT AGENCY:

Has no objections in principle to the proposal but makes two comments and recommends the imposition of a condition. The first comment is that there is a culverted watercourse in the vicinity of the site, the precise route of which is not known to the Environment Agency. They therefore point out that responsibility for the maintenance of any watercourse rests with the riparian owner which would be the future owners of the dwellings if the culvert runs through their properties.

The second comment is that surface water run-off from this site should be restricted to existing rates in order that the proposed development does not contribute to an increased risk of flooding. To address this point the recommended condition is that no development shall be commenced until a scheme for the provision and implementation of a surface water regulation system has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority, and that the scheme shall be completed in accordance with the approved details.

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS:

Four letters have been received from nearby residents who object to the application for reasons that are summarised as follows:

1. This is a Greenfield site, not Brownfield as alleged in the application documents. At a Public Inquiry a few years ago relating to a proposed industrial development, it was stated that this was Greenfield land and could not be built on.
2. Highway concerns caused by additional traffic in a dangerous location.
3. The proposal represents an inappropriate form of development within the countryside and in the absence of any special circumstances would, by its inappropriateness, have a harmful impact on the open, rural and undeveloped character of this part of Langho. The new residents of Petre Wood Crescent moved here to be near open fields and countryside. This land would be better used as an open space for generations to come and kept as an asset to the area. It is the open spaces that make the Ribble Valley special. It is now time to look elsewhere for space as Langho has had enough development.
4. The development could affect existing trees and hedgerows to the detriment of the local landscape character.
5. The applicant states that the Housing Needs Survey for Langho and Billington indicated in 2006, that there was a

need for 150 affordable units in the survey area. It is further correctly stated that the development at Petre Wood has provided 45 affordable units. However, these 45 units have not been occupied in accordance with the criteria as set out in Policy H20 of the Local Plan by local people in housing need. In my opinion there are no 'local' residents living on the Petre Wood Crescent/Close. Therefore, the suggestion that there is an unmet need for a further 105 units in this area is totally incorrect. The Petre Wood Crescent/Close development has not been developed for local housing need.

6. The proposal will increase flooding in existing gardens adjoining the site. The Environment Agency's comments about not knowing the exact route of the culvert increases concerns about the future risk of flooding.
7. Loss of privacy as the two storey houses are to be sited on rising land directly behind Petre Wood Crescent and will most certainly have an over bearing effect.
8. The actual building of the development will cause problems to a disabled resident of Petre Wood Crescent whose disability means that she has to sleep during the day.
9. Loss of view.

### **Proposal**

The application seeks outline permission for a development of 24 affordable residential units. Although submitted in outline, full details of all matters except landscaping are submitted for determination as part of this application.

The proposed development comprises 10 two bedroom semi detached bungalows, four semi detached and two detached three bedroomed dormer bungalows and eight three bedroomed two storey houses. All units are to be affordable as defined in the Council's Affordable Housing Memorandum of Understanding and will be affordable homes for sale.

Access into the site is to be through the existing adjoining affordable housing development at Petre Wood Crescent by extending the existing cul de sac of that development on to the adjoining land to the north.

The two storey houses would be on the southern part of the site adjoining the three storey apartments and two storey houses in the existing development. The bungalows and dormer bungalows would be on the northern part of the site adjoining the A59 and the open land to the north and east.

The external materials for all units comprise Marshal's Heritage Walling (artificial stone) and slate grey coloured concrete roof tiles.

Each unit would have two off road parking spaces.

The proposed development would necessitate the diversion of an existing footpath which crosses the site but this would need to be the subject of a separate application for a Footpath Diversion Order.

### **Site Location**

The application relates to approximately 0.5 hectares of open land situated between the recent housing development at Petre Wood Crescent to the south and the A59 to the north.

The western side of the site abuts the steep banking beneath the A59 close to the roundabout, whilst the eastern part of the site is open grazing land.

The banking rises sharply to the roundabout and is planted with trees. The site itself rises from west to east so that on its western side, the land is beneath the level of the A59 but at its northerly edge it is level with that highway at the point where it is crossed by the public footpath.

The site is within the open countryside outside the settlement boundary of Langho.

### **Relevant History**

There have been applications relating to the adjoining former garden centre site culminating in a permission for an affordable housing development on that land in 2007 (3/2007/0555/P). There have, however, been no previous applications on the current application site that are of any relevance of the determination and consideration of this application.

### **Relevant Policies**

Policy G1 - Development Control.

Policy G5 - Settlement Strategy.

Policy H2 - Dwellings in the Open Countryside.

Policy H20 - Affordable Housing - Villages and Countryside.

Policy ENV3 - Development in Open Countryside.

Regional Spatial Strategy - Policy L5 Affordable Housing.

Affordable Housing Memorandum of Understanding.

### **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 location of the development; the impact of the development in visual terms on the character of the open countryside; the impact on neighbouring residential properties; highway safety; the diversion of the public footpath; and the mechanism by which the properties are to be made affordable.

### **Principle/Policy**

Saved Policy G5 of the Local Plan states that outside main settlement boundaries planning permission will only be granted for smallscale developments where they are for local needs housing (subject to Policy H20). Policy H20 sets out the criteria which will be applied to determine which people are eligible to occupy affordable housing. Policy H2 also confirms that

affordable housing is one of the categories of housing which will be acceptable in the open countryside. As the proposal is for 100% affordable housing, it satisfies those relevant policies of the Local Plan and is therefore acceptable in principle.

### Location

The policies referred to above do not stipulate any locational requirements for affordable housing. It is a generally accepted principle, however, that such developments should not be isolated but should be reasonably accessible to services and public transport. This site is approximately 300m from a primary school and a church; Whalley Road is a bus route including services to Clitheroe, Blackburn and Manchester with a bus stop approximately 100m from the site; and the railway station, post office, pharmacy and local shops in Langho are approximately 750m – 800m away from the site.

This same issue was considered in the Committee report for the now existing affordable housing development adjoining the site at Petre Wood Crescent. That proposal was considered to be acceptable in relation to this particular consideration and I can see no reasons why the same conclusion should not be reached in relation to this current application.

### Visual impact

The existing banking and trees provide a screen to both the existing adjoining development and the proposed development when viewed from the A59, although the site is still visible through a gap in the banking.

The layout of the development has been designed to create both an appropriate visual relationship with the properties in the adjoining development whilst also minimising its effects on the wider landscape. This has been achieved by placing the two storey houses on the lower ground adjoining the existing two storey houses and three storey apartments, with the bungalows on the higher ground but still below the crest of the slope which continues to rise to the east. Overall, I consider the proposal to be acceptable with regards to its effects on the visual amenities of the wider locality.

### Residential Amenity

The reasons why the two storey houses have been located at the rear of the existing two storey houses has been explained above. The privacy distance of 20m between directly facing main elevations has been satisfied such that, I do not consider that any reason for refusal of the application on the grounds of loss of privacy to existing adjoining residents would be sustainable. In the event that planning permission is granted, however, I recommend a condition that the finished floor level of all the two storey houses is indicated on site and agreed by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of construction works on those properties. This is to ensure that the dwellings would not be unduly over bearing in relation to the neighbouring properties. Overall, I consider the proposal to be acceptable with regards to its effects on the amenities of neighbouring residents.

### Highway Safety

As stated earlier in the report, the County Surveyor has no objections to the application on highway safety grounds. I have no reason to disagree with the County Surveyor's observations.

## Affordable Housing

This section of the report is based on an internal consultation response received from the Council's Housing Strategy Officer.

In evidencing the current housing need in Langho, the adjacent site developed by Great Places, which provided 45 affordable units, has been taken into account.

The need for the proposed housing types can be clearly evidenced with the information in the Housing Needs Survey for Billington and Langho. The survey has highlighted a need for 14 bungalows/sheltered type accommodation. Importantly, the provision of accommodation suitable for the elderly has also been identified as a strategic housing key priority in terms of any new development for the Council.

The Langho and Billington Housing Needs Survey also indicates that in the next two years there still remains a need for 40 two and three bed properties.

There is no RSL/HA social housing stock existing within Langho and for the small amount of stock that exists in Billington, there are extensive waiting lists with Ribble Valley Homes.

With regard to the tenure proposal of discounted sale, this again can be clearly supported by the Housing Needs Survey as being tenure in most demand, and there has been no development of this tenure type in Langho.

A draft Section 106 Agreement has been submitted with the application which includes the Council's accepted formula for calculating the required percentage discount for each unit. This formula has been used on the basis of properties currently on the market within a 1.5m radius of Langho. The results of these calculations are that a 50% discount would be required for the three bedroom bungalows, 50% for the two bedroom bungalows and 53% for the semi detached houses.

These calculations therefore result in a significant percentage reduction from market value for each property type to make the units affordable in Langho, which the Housing Strategy Officer considers would make the proposal financially viable. She considers that a 40% discount for all units would be appropriate. For clarity, the Housing Strategy Officer suggests that, in the Section 106 Agreement, a fixed percentage discount (probably 49%) should be stated for all property types rather than just a reference to the formula to be used.

The Housing Strategy Officer also considers that, due to the property types proposed, and the clearly identified need for this in the area, first priority for the properties should be for households with a Langho and Billington connection and second priority for households within the Ribble Valley.

## Public Footpath

The submitted plans show a proposed diverted route for a public footpath that crosses the application site. The applicants are aware that this requires the separate submission and approval of an application under the Town and Country Planning Act (Section 257) Rights of Way Diversion Order to enable development with planning permission to be carried out. The applicants are also aware that no works blocking or in any way affecting the existing route of the footpath should be carried out until such an Order has been obtained.

### Financial Contributions

The County Council has suggested that a contribution of £88,250 towards education and £11,520 towards waste management be required through a clause in a Section 106 Agreement. The Director of Strategic Planning and Transport, however, does say that, as the application is for 100% affordable housing, this Council should consider whether the request for a planning obligation in whole or in part would prejudice the viability of the scheme; and that, if this is the case, the applicant will be required to demonstrate this.

The applicants were preparing an assessment on this issue at the time of preparation of this report.

### Protected Tree

There is an Oak tree that is protected by a Tree Preservation Order that could be adversely affected by a turning head and two parking spaces proposed for the dwelling on plot 18 of the development. The precise position of the turning head and the parking spaces might need adjustment in order to ensure adequate and proper protection of the tree, but it is considered that this could be covered by an appropriate condition in the event that planning permission is granted.

### Conclusion

It is considered that, in relation to all relevant considerations and policies, the proposed development is acceptable.

The precise contents of a Section 106 Agreement, however, both in relation to the means of ensuring the affordability of the dwellings, and whether or not there is a requirement for a financial contribution towards education or waste management (and, if so, the amount of that contribution) still need to be finalised.

For these reasons it is appropriate that the decision on the application be deferred and delegated in the terms set out in the recommendation below.

### SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR APPROVAL

The proposal will provide 24 affordable houses without any undue detriment to visual amenity, the amenities of nearby residents or highway safety.

RECOMMENDATION: That Committee be Minded to Approve the application subject to the following conditions and therefore Defer and Delegate to the Director of Development Services to await the satisfactory completion of a Section 106 Agreement in the terms outlined within this report:

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 latter 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: In order that the Local Planning Authority shall be satisfied as to the details and because the application was made for outline permission only and to comply with Policy G1 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan.

- 2. This outline permission shall relate to the proposal as shown on drawing Nos 2007/38/01A, 02E, 08A, 09 and 10.

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

- 3. This outline planning permission should be read in conjunction with the Section 106 Agreement dated ....

REASON: For the avoidance of doubt as the permission is subject to an Agreement.

- 4. Prior to the commencement of development a scheme identifying how a minimum of 10% of the energy requirements generated by the development will be achieved by renewable energy production methods shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall then be provided in accordance with the approved details prior to occupation of the development and thereafter retained.

REASON: In order to encourage renewable energy and to comply with Policy G1 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan.

- 5. No development approved by this permission shall be commenced until a scheme for the provision and implementation of a surface water regulation system has been approved by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be completed in accordance with the approved plans.

REASON: To reduce the risk of flooding in accordance with Policy G1 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan.

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

REASON: In order that the Local Planning Authority may ensure that the materials to be used are appropriate to the locality in accordance with Policy G1 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan.

- 7. Prior to the commencement of any development site works, an arboricultural/tree protection/tree constraints report and plan shall be submitted for the written approval of the Local Planning Authority. The plan shall include details on all the dimensions of retained trees, including crown spread and root protection zones. Details shall also include physical protection methods in accordance with the BS5837 (Trees in Relation to Construction) and a Tree Protection Monitoring Schedule.

REASON: In order to ensure that a tree within the site that is the subject of a Tree Preservation Order is afforded maximum physical protection from any potential adverse effects of development, and to comply with Policies G1 and ENV13 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan.

8. The landscaping details to be submitted in accordance with condition 1 of this outline permission shall include details of the boundary treatments for all dwellings. The boundary treatment shall then be implemented in accordance with the approved details prior to the first occupation of the dwelling to which they relate.

REASON: In the interests of visual amenity and the amenities of adjoining residents, and to comply with Policy G1 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan.

9. Prior to the commencement of any construction works on the two storey houses on plots 1 and 2 and plots 9-14 inclusive, their precise siting and proposed finished floor slab levels shall be marked out/indicated on site to be viewed and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: To ensure compliance with the submitted plans and in the interest of visual amenity and the amenities/privacy of nearby residents, and to comply with Policy G1 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan.

## NOTES

1. The grant of planning permission does not entitle a developer to obstruct a right of way and any proposed stopping up or diversion of a right of way should be the subject of an Order under the appropriate Act.
2. In relation to condition No 7 of this permission, the applicant should note that the adequate protection of the Oak tree that is covered by a Tree Preservation Order might involve alterations to the position and/or means of construction of the cul de sac turning head and the parking spaces proposed for the dwelling on plot 18.

APPLICATION NO: 3/2009/1076/P (GRID REF: SD 370087 436581)  
PROPOSED APPLICATION FOR REMOVAL OF CONDITION 3 RELATED TO SECTION 106 AGREEMENT OF 3/1994/0532 WHICH REQUIRED CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW PUBLIC HIGHWAY BETWEEN THE A59 AND A66 ROUNDABOUT, OLD LANGHO ON THE BASIS OF NUMBERS OF DWELLINGS WITHIN THE SITE AT THE OLD ZOO, BROCKHALL VILLAGE, LANGHO

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

## **Proposal**

This proposal seeks to remove a planning condition that relates one of the original schemes put forward at Brockhall Village. The 1994 application was subject to a condition that related to a Section 106 Agreement which required the creation of a new public highway when a certain level of residential dwellings and employment development had been created on the site.

Subsequent to that permission, a revised application was submitted which removed this requirement and this was approved in 1999 under application 3/1999/0198/P. However, the property known as The Zoo was for some reason excluded within new Section 106 Agreement so for technical reasons it could be argued that it would still be capable that the old agreement would take effect, as permission was granted in 1998 for this single dwelling. This proposal seeks to remove the condition that relates to this requirement and as such, would give the relevant assurance that the new highway could not be instigated.

### **Site Location**

The application building itself is located within the central area of the Brockhall development.

### **Relevant History**

3/1994/0532/P – Re-development to reuse the Brockhall hospital for a mixed use village consisting of employment uses up to a maximum of 900,000m<sup>2</sup> requiring floorspace and residential up to 400 dwellings. Approved with conditions and a Section 106 Agreement.

3/1998/0125/P – New dwelling. Approved with conditions and a Section 106 Agreement.

3/1999/0198/P – Outline application for a development of the remainder of the village with section of sewage treatment plant to provide 261 new houses and 10,500m<sup>2</sup> of employment space. Approved with conditions and a Section 106 Agreement.

### **Relevant Policies**

Policy G1 - Development Control.

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

The issues here relate to a technical requirement on the basis that as the Old Zoo was excluded from the site area of the revised Section 106, it has meant that the original clause of the 1994 Agreement is still compliant which could activate at a later date the requirement for a new road from Brockhall Village to the A59 roundabout. It is clear from a subsequent consent, which has now been partly implemented that the revised Section 106 specifically stated that the new roadway should not be implemented. It is also evident that the County surveyor would not require the implementation of the road in relation to this scheme. On this basis, I am satisfied that it would be appropriate to remove the condition. As such, I recommend the removal of condition 3 which relates to the Section 106 Agreement on 3/94/0532 could be relaxed on the basis that the 1999 Section 106 Agreement is now the appropriate and enforceable document.

### **SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR APPROVAL**

The proposal would cause no harm to residential or visual amenity.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Defer and Delegate to the Director of Development Services to await expiration of consultation period and that no new material issues are raised during this period and that condition 3 of 3/1994/0532/P be removed.

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

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

APPLICATIONS APPROVED

<b><u>Plan No:</u></b>	<b><u>Proposal:</u></b>	<b><u>Location:</u></b>
3/2005/0967/P	Two No new sash windows to first floor to be openable to allow escape in case of fire	White Bull Hotel Main Street, Gisburn
3/2009/0830/P (LBC)	Proposed removal of the existing asbestos roof covering and replace it with a traditional slate roof covering with under parging	Haredon Farmyard Barn Trough Road Dunsop Bridge
3/2009/0849/P	Application for the discharge of conditions no.3 (landscaping), no.4 (insulation), no.6 (visibility splay), no.7 (access width), no.8 (construction of access and highway improvements), no.12 (foul drainage scheme) and no.13 (painting of the lean-to) of planning consent 3/2008/0916/P	Dale Hey Farm Preston Road Ribchester
3/2009/0897/P	Two-storey side extension (with covered carport) and provision of parking on hardstanding to the front of the dwelling	9 Willows Park Lane Longridge
3/2009/0925/P	Proposed open air slurry lagoon (approx 30m x 12m x 3m) with earth bank sides and clay lining with a stock proof fence around the top	Moor Laithe Farm Gisburn
3/2009/0947/P (PA) &	Remove existing front window and door and fit new replacements	10 York Street Clitheroe
3/2009/0948/P (LBC)	Remove existing front window and door and fit new replacements	10 York Street Clitheroe
3/2009/0970/P	Single storey rear extension	32 The Sands, Whalley
3/2009/0971/P	Proposal for the erection of a residential detached garage and the creation of an outdoor ménage and sand paddock/turning area	Lonmore, Ribchester Road Clayton-le-Dale
3/2009/0974/P	New single garage and utility/WC	Brantwood, West Bradford Rd, Waddington
3/2009/0980/P	Application for a non material amendment to planning permission 3/2009/0137/P for the linking of the two rear flat roofed dormers using tile hanging to match existing so as the former single dormer, and for fascias, barge boards and windows to be changed from white UPVC to brown UPVC	16 St Mary's Drive Langho

<b><u>Plan No:</u></b>	<b><u>Proposal:</u></b>	<b><u>Location:</u></b>
3/2009/0985/P	Proposed installation of 3no. 1.3sq.m solar thermal collectors to be located onto the rear inclined roof surface	New Barn Farm, Lane Ends Bolton-by-Bowland
3/2009/0987/P	Replacement of existing tarmac path and raised rockery to front of property with new level flagged patio. Retrospective	Sunnydale, Baldwin Road Clitheroe
3/2009/0989/P	Application for the part-discharge of condition no. 2 (relating to materials) of planning consent 3/2008/1013/P – providing precise specifications of windows including materials.	Ribblesdene Greenside Ribchester
3/2009/0992/P	Proposed extension to the existing garage	18 Clitheroe Road, Whalley
3/2009/1003/P	Proposed mixed-use agricultural building for livestock and storage. Resubmission	Lower Warble Hey Farm Barker Lane, Mellor
3/2009/1006/P	Discharge of condition 2 relating to a schedule of works for demolition	Mount Vale, Lowergate Clitheroe
3/2009/1007/P	Single storey rear extension	32 Wilson Street Clitheroe
3/2009/1025/P	Non-material amendment by addition of small conservatory or lean-to link building in the form of a conservatory at buildings adjacent	Stanley House Mellor
3/2009/1029/P	Application for a non-material amendment to planning consent 3/2009/0651P, being the substitution of a hip-end to the roof in place of the gable-end roof	4 Ennerdale Road Longridge
3/2009/1055/P	Application for the discharge of condition no. 1 (development within three years) and condition no. 3 (programme of archaeological work) of planning consent 3/2008/1013/P	Ribblesdene Greenside Ribchester
3/2009/1068/P	Individual letters attached to stone boundary wall externally illuminated by tube lighting (retrospective)	Manor Court Salesbury Hall Lane Ribchester
3/2009/1072/P	Discharge of materials condition for boundary wall and building and sun room	Angram Green Farm Cottage Worston

#### 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>
3/2009/0811/P	Partially retrospective application for the retention of two stable blocks and tack room and static caravan for occasional use and proposed erection of a new stable block (8 stables) for private use on land adjacent	Mill Hill Farm Slaidburn Road Waddington	Policies G1 and ENV1 – detriment to the visual amenities of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty

<u>Plan No:</u>	<u>Proposal:</u>	<u>Location:</u>	<u>Reasons for Refusal</u>
3/2009/0834/P	Construction of bay windows to rear elevation of the property	2 Corn Mill Mews Whalley Clitheroe	Policy G1 and ENV16 – incongruous feature to the detriment of the property and conservation area, which would create a precedent for similar developments if allowed.
3/2009/0945/P	Install a drop kerb	9 Edisford Road Clitheroe	G1, ENV13 – Potential loss of individual mature tree to the detriment of the visual amenity of the area.

#### SECTION 106 APPLICATIONS

<u>Plan No:</u>	<u>Proposal/Location:</u>	<u>Progress:</u>
	None	

AGRICULTURAL NOTIFICATIONS WHERE PLANNING CONSENT WILL **NOT** BE NECESSARY

<u>Plan No:</u>	<u>Proposal:</u>	<u>Location:</u>
3/2009/1044/N	Proposed roofing over of the existing silage clamp	Overhacking Farm Stonyhurst, Clitheroe
3/2009/1067/N	Proposed agricultural livestock building.	Fober Farm Newton-in-Bowland

#### APPLICATIONS WITHDRAWN

<u>Plan No:</u>	<u>Proposal:</u>	<u>Location:</u>
3/2009/0575/P	Change of use of 3 barns to form 5 holiday lets	Higher Lickhurst Farm Leagram
3/2009/1005/P	Provision of a new additional vehicular access and a new boundary fence	The Old Vicarage Lower Lane, Longridge

APPEALS UPDATE

<u>Application No:</u>	<u>Date Received:</u>	<u>Applicant/Proposal/Site:</u>	<u>Type of Appeal:</u>	<u>Date of Inquiry/Hearing:</u>	<u>Progress:</u>
3/2008/0674 & 0675 D	27.8.09	John Reilly Civil Engineering Ltd Proposed alterations to listed boundary wall including the creation of a new access point and track to serve stud farm The Stud Farm Woodfold Park Further Lane Mellor	WR	Now to be determined under the written reps procedure	Awaiting site visit
3/2009/0466 D	10.9.09	Mr John Bailey & Miss Kirsty Sellers Erection of two storey rear extension and additional accommodation for dependent relatives Dean Slack Head Smalden Lane Grindleton	WR	—	AWAITING DECISION
3/2009/0321 O	16.9.09	Mr Terry Griffiths Erection of a new industrial unit (class B2 use) at the rear of the existing industrial unit Unit 3 90 Berry Lane Longridge	WR	—	APPEAL ALLOWED 5.1.10
3/2009/0079 D	25.9.09	Mrs Christine Verity Proposed single storey garden room to front elevation Holkers Cottage Whins Lane Read	WR	—	Awaiting site visit
3/2009/0383 & 0384 C	8.10.09	Individual Inns Ltd Extension to first floor to form bedrooms and associated works (Resubmission) The Spread Eagle Hotel Sawley	WR	—	Awaiting site visit

3/2009/0352 D	2.11.09	Mr H Berry Retention of agricultural workers dwelling and residential curtilage for temporary period of three years Lower Monubent Farm Hellifield Road Bolton-by-Bowland	–	Hearing – to be held 23.2.10, commencing at 10am
3/2009/0631 D	5.11.09	Mr & Mrs J Hayes First floor extension to side of dwelling Seedalls Barn Easington Road Cow Ark	Householder Appeal	– APPEAL DISMISSED 31.12.09
3/2009/0730 D	11.1.10	Mrs Judy Bateman Change the use of part of existing front garden to provide off-road car parking for one vehicle, steps to join existing garden path to house and to provide storage area for 3no. wheelie bins and housing for meters (Resubmission) 4 Greendale View Grindleton	Householder Appeal	– Notification letter sent 13.1.10 Questionnaire sent 15.1.10 Awaiting decision
3/2009/0844 D	19.1.10	Mr Mark Haston Construction of a single garage for domestic use Carr Meadow Barn Carr Lane Balderstone	Householder Appeal	– Notification letter and questionnaire sent 22.1.10 Awaiting decision

### LEGEND

D – Delegated decision  
C – Committee decision  
O – Overturn