

RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL REPORT TO PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Agenda Item No

meeting date: THURSDAY, 26 MAY 2011
 title: PLANNING APPLICATIONS
 submitted by: DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY SERVICES

PLANNING APPLICATIONS UNDER THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990:

APPLICATION NO: 3/2011/0001/P (GRID REF: SD 376115 445664)
 PROPOSED NEW PAVILION AND COMMUNITY ROOM ON THE SITE OF THE EXISTING CHANGING FACILITY AND CAR PARKING. NEW ACCESS AND EGRESS AND CHANGE OF USE OF LAND FROM AGRICULTURAL TO RECREATIONAL GROUND (MARKED AREA A) AT GRINDLETON RECREATION GROUND, SAWLEY ROAD, GRINDLETON, LANCASHIRE.

PARISH COUNCIL: No objection.

LCC COUNTY SURVEYOR: The County Surveyor has no objections in principle but has raised a number of concerns regarding aspects of the proposed development indicated on the originally submitted plans that he thought could prove detrimental to its operation and the adjacent local highway network. He has not formally commented on the revised scheme at the time of this reports submission.

SPORT ENGLAND: Sport England wishes to object to the application until they receive further information:

- 1) A site layout plan showing existing and proposed playing pitch layouts (including the minimum runoffs required by the FA).
- 2) Information on what type of drainage improvements were made previously to the football pitch. If the improvements took the form of a sub-surface drainage system, an assessment is also needed on the impact on the system of moving the pitch and introducing the vehicular access route.

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS: One letter has been received from a nearby neighbour who wishes to object to this proposal on the following grounds:

1. Object to size and location of the building,
2. Objection to the use of the building,
3. Concern regarding noise impact due to use of building for holding 'social events',
4. There has been talk of using marquees as well as the building for social functions; surely this requires consent and requisite conditions also?

5. Concern regarding safety and welfare of children due to the car park taking up more of the play area,
6. Despite the proposal creating more parking, the issues created on football match days will still be evident as most players park on the road and will not want to use the parking adjacent to the pitch, and
7. I also have concerns that permission is a foregone conclusion following a discussion with a Local Councillor, and as such I hope this proposal is given a full and proper hearing.

Proposal

This application seeks permission for a new Pavilion and Community Room on the site of the existing changing facility at Grindleton Recreation Ground, Sawley Road, Grindleton. The existing building comprises two changing rooms and is considered no longer fit for purpose. The proposed new facility will provide new and modern changing facilities, toilets, disabled access, a multi purpose function area at ground floor, a large upstairs area with potential for use as a function room, storage facilities and kitchen area. The intention is to provide improved sporting facilities for users of the football pitch and the multi-use games area (MUGA) and tennis court, as well as providing a Community facility for use by the residents of Grindleton. The scheme also includes revisions to the existing car parking area, a new access and egress and the change of use of a small strip of land from agricultural to recreational ground (marked area A on the submitted map). This particular section is in order to move the football pitch approximately 2.3m northwards to allow for the additional overspill parking adjacent to the Sawley Road boundary of the site. The existing car parking area will be altered to provide 14 spaces when used on its own, which includes 2 spaces for people, however when used in conjunction with the new overspill parking area, there will be a total of 27 spaces made available. The overspill parking area will work with a one way system in operation, exiting from a new access to the east of the existing access. The existing car parking area will be re-tarmaced, however the track through the overspill car park, as well as the spaces themselves, will be finished with a plastic matting that not allows the grass to grow through, but also provides drainage properties. It will also extend the 1.8m run-off required by Sport England in-between the football pitch and the car parking area and track. The scheme also requires the removal of two sycamore trees and the re-siting of part of the existing hedgerow, however the Applicant proposes to re-plant additional trees elsewhere on site to mitigate for their loss.

Site Location

The site is located at Grindleton Recreation Ground, which lies outside the village settlement boundary on the north side of Sawley Road, opposite the entrance to Grindleton C of E Primary School. The land lies within the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

Relevant History

3/2003/1042/P – Retention of existing and provision of new play equipment. Replacement fencing & new end treatment to tennis court & retention of boundary fence fronting Sawley Road – Granted Conditionally.

Relevant Policies

Policy G1 - Development Control.

Policy G5 - Settlement Strategy.

Policy ENV1 - Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

Policy ENV13 - Landscape Protection.

Policy RT1 - General Recreation and Tourism Policy.

Environmental, AONB, Human Rights and Other Issues

The other key issues to consider are land use acceptability, the potential visual impact caused by the development, the potential impact on the amenity of other properties in this vicinity, the potential ecological impact and any potential impact on highway safety.

PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT

In order to assess the principle of the scheme, we must assess the scheme against Policies G5 and RT1 of the Districtwide Local Plan. Policy G5 notes that planning consent will only be granted for small-scale developments which are, amongst other things,

- essential to the local economy or social well being of the area; or
- other small-scale uses appropriate to a rural area, which conform to the policies of this plan.

In addition, Policy RT1 is also considered appropriate as it notes that the Council will again only approve development proposals that extend the range of tourism and visitor facilities subject to the scheme meeting the following criteria;

- Proposal must not conflict with other Policies,
- Proposal must be well related to an existing main village or settlement,
- Development should not undermine the character, quality or visual amenities,
- Proposal should be well related to the existing highway network and should not generate additional traffic movements of a scale and type likely to cause problems, and
- Site should be large enough to accommodate the necessary car parking service areas.

As noted earlier, the intention of this proposal is to provide improved sporting facilities for users of the football pitch and the multi-use games area (MUGA) and tennis court, as well as providing a Community facility for use by the residents of Grindleton. On this basis, as the site is well-related to the existing settlement of Grindleton and will not only be replacing and upgrading existing facilities on-site but also providing new facilities for the village; thereby potentially helping the local economy and social well-being of the area, providing the scheme complies with the other criteria of RT1, then I consider the principle of the proposed development is acceptable.

VISUAL IMPACT

As the site is within the A.O.N.B. Policy ENV1 of the Local Plan is an important consideration. It states "The landscape and character of the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty will be protected, conserved and enhanced. In addition, development will also need to contribute to the conservation of the natural beauty of the area. The environmental effects of proposals will be a major consideration and the design, materials, scale, massing and

landscaping of development will be important factors in deciding planning application (see Policy G1).”

The existing changing facility at this site is a single storey building of concrete panel construction with a flat roof, and has a pebbledash finish. It is being used at present however at the end of the current football season, it will no longer be used to its current state of repair. The building proposed is a significantly larger facility, with a floor area measuring approximately 304.5 sq.m. and a maximum height of 8.8m. The building has been designed to be as visually unobtrusive as possible with the ground floor area almost five times the size of the first floor area to ensure that the two-storey element is as minimal as possible. The key feature to the building is the pitched, glazed gable roof that faces onto the existing car park that provides not only light to the upstairs community room, but also adds a notable feature to the buildings design that is not considered to be unduly prominent in this location. In addition, the design of the steeply pitched, sloping roofs is actually considered to give the illusion of a relatively low level building when viewed from adjacent highway vantage points. The materials proposed include a stone frontage facing the vehicular entrance onto the site with the three other elevations rendered, and a tiled roof, however the colour schemes proposed for the render and tiles are not considered appropriate for this particular location and in order to provide a satisfactory palate for the overall design, a specific materials condition will be added to this recommendation. Looking at the site as a whole, the introduction of a plastic mesh car parking area and additional planting around the entrances and along the highway boundary will ensure that this particular section of the development will not detract from the aesthetic nature of the site and will rather seek to preserving this particular pocket of the A.O.N.B. and as such, given the above, I do not consider the scheme will have an adverse visual impact on the streetscene or on the wider landscape or local environment.

IMPACT ON NEARBY AMENITY

In respect of potential impact on neighbouring amenity, the nearest properties lie to the west of the site, approximately 18 metres away, and are separated by a mixture of close boarded timber fences, leylandii and individual trees along this particular boundary. The objector lives in one of these properties, and has raised the use of the new building, either as a Community Facility or as a social venue, as one of the main concerns, namely the late hours of use and the potential noise. The Applicant has sent a letter in order to allay the concerns raised about disturbance to the residents in the vicinity of the Pavilion site, by events that might take place there. She also notes that the management committee will have full control of the bookings and only those suitable for the situation will be accepted. In addition to this they state there is a restriction on the time by which events must have finished which will be until 2230 hours Sunday to Thursday nights, with only Friday and Saturday being available until the later opening of 0000hrs. In further discussions with the Agent, the building has been designed so that the main entrance doors to the hall are to the south, away from these properties, in order to try and focus any outside usage of the site away from the neighbouring properties. They have also agreed to accept a condition closing any windows in this elevation after a certain time. In conclusion, and whilst I am mindful of the concern raised, given the overall benefits related to such a proposal, I do not consider the introduction of the proposed facility would create a situation at this site that would be significantly detrimental to the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring properties.

ECOLOGICAL IMPACT

Having discussed the proposal with the Council's Countryside Officer, whilst disappointed with the loss of two prominent roadside trees that offer a level of visual amenity value for this area,

he accepts that the added benefit of greater visibility from the two access points to the site and the overall improvements to vehicular and pedestrian safety far outweigh their loss. In addition, as nine additional trees will be planted at the site, this is considered to be adequate mitigation for the loss.

IMPACT ON HIGHWAY SAFETY

The County Surveyor raised no objection in principle to this application on highway safety grounds, however he did raise a number of concerns regarding aspects of the proposed development that could prove detrimental to its operation and the adjacent local highway network, and requested that these matters should be resolved and formal agreements reached prior to permission being granted. A revised scheme seeking to resolve the matters raised have been submitted by the Agent, however there have been no formal comments received at the time of this reports submission.

OTHER ISSUES

The other main issue raised was that made by Sport England in relation to their concern about inadequate drainage and the lack of satisfactory runoff between the touchline and the embankment to the north of the pitch, and the car park to the south. A plan indicating the existing (and recently improved) drainage system for the site has since been received, and the revised plan also seeks to create a sufficient area of run off after the touchline. Again, there have been no formal comments received back from Sport England in relation to the revised plans at the time of this reports submission.

Therefore bearing in mind the above, and whilst I am mindful of the comments from the objector, it is considered that as the proposed application complies with the relevant policies and will provide a building of significant benefit for the residents of Grindleton, as well as potentially creating a number of jobs for local people, and I therefore recommend the proposal accordingly.

SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR APPROVAL

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

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

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

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

2. The permission shall relate to the development as shown on Plan Drawing No's 70/4, 70/5/2 and 70/5/3.

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

3. This permission shall be implemented in accordance with the proposal as amended by letter and plan received on the 11 May 2011.

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

4. 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 Policies G1 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan.

5. The proposed trees, as highlighted within an e-mail dated 11 January 2011, to be planted as part of the landscaping scheme indicated on the submitted plans, 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.

6. Before the development hereby permitted becomes operative, the position of the existing hedge fronting the site shall be altered in line with the layout indicated on plan drawing number 70/4, and shall be maintained at a maximum height of 0.9m above the carriageway." Reason to include "This is to insure that an adequate visibility splay is achieved and maintained for the safe movement of vehicles and pedestrians.

REASON: To comply with Policy G1 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan and to ensure adequate visibility for the drivers of vehicles entering and leaving the site.

7. The surface of the car park must be made up to a suitable, specified standard to ensure that no debris is brought onto the highway and that the parking spaces can be clearly and permanently marked out on site. This definition can be achieved through materials other than thermoplastic paint but the appropriate means must be identified. These and other details, namely the materials to be used, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in correspondence with the County Highways Officer.

REASON: To comply with Policies G1, G5 and ENV1 of the Local Plan and to allow for the effective use of parking areas without being to the detriment of the visual amenity of the area.

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

The visibility splay to be the subject of this condition shall be that land in front of a line drawn from a point 2.5m measured along the centre line of the proposed road from the continuation of the nearer edge of the carriageway of Sawley Road to points measured 90m in each direction along the nearer edge of the carriageway of Sawley Road, from the centre line of the access, and shall be constructed and maintained at verge level in accordance with a scheme to be agreed by the Local Planning Authority in conjunction with the Highway Authority.

REASON: To comply with Policy G1 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan and to ensure adequate visibility at the street junction or site access.

9. Other than the amendments required to re-locate part of the hedgerow fronting the site, the hedgerow itself shall be protected in accordance with the BS5837 [Trees in Relation to Construction]. A protection zone shall be agreed in writing with the LPA, and shall remain in place until all construction work has been completed and all excess materials have been removed from site including soil/spoil and rubble.

REASON: In order to ensure that the hedgerow affected by development, and considered to be of visual value, is afforded maximum physical protection from the adverse affects of development.

10. No part of the development, hereby approved, shall be occupied or opened for trading until the approved scheme referred to in Conditions 6, 7 and 8 have been constructed and completed in accordance with the scheme details.

REASON: To comply with Policies G1 and RT1 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan and in order that the traffic generated by the development does not exacerbate unsatisfactory highway conditions in advance of the completion of the highway scheme/works.

11. The use of the premises in accordance with this permission shall be restricted to the hours between the hours of 0930hrs to 2230hrs on Sundays, 0830hrs to 2230hrs Monday to Thursday and 0830hrs and 0000hrs on Fridays and Saturdays.

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.

12. The window(s) on the west facing elevation of the building shall be closed, and shall remain closed after 2100 hours, whenever the building is used in the evenings.

REASON: In order to protect nearby residential amenity as required by with Policy G1 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan.

NOTE

1. This consent requires the construction, improvement or alteration of an access to the public highway. Under the Highways Act 1980 Section 184 the County Council as Highway Authority must specify the works to be carried out. Only the Highway Authority or a contractor approved by the Highway Authority can carry out these works and therefore before any access works can start you must contact the Environment Directorate for further

information by telephoning Area Surveyor East 01254 823831 or writing to the Area Surveyor East, Lancashire County Council, Area Office, Riddings Lane, Whalley, Clitheroe BB7 9RW quoting the planning application number.

APPLICATION NO: 3/2011/0153/P (GRID REF: SD 363797 436351)
PROPOSED REMOVAL OF CONDITION NO 2 OF PLANNING PERMISSION 3/2005/0615/P
TO ALLOW THE HOLIDAY LET TO BE USED AS A PERMANENT SEPARATE RESIDENTIAL
DWELLING AT PINFOLD FARM, PRESTON ROAD, RIBCHESTER

PARISH COUNCIL: The Parish Council objects to this application.

While the Council did not object in principle to the original application, they did express reservations about the progressive over development of the site and to the danger posed by the nature of the road on which it stood (fast and with a sweeping bend). There was also a view at the time, but not articulated, that the application was merely a precursor to a further application to circumvent the Policies G1 and RT1 of the Local Plan.

That situation has now come to pass. No evidence has been submitted to support the application nor has it been demonstrated that the current use of the property as a holiday let is no longer viable. If that were truly so then the rationale behind the same applicant's application to increase the number of holiday lets on a nearby site in Stoneygate Lane is flawed.

There is a secondary reason for the Parish Council's objection. To allow this change of use would set a dangerous precedent for other similar holiday let developments now under consideration within the area.

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS: None received.

Proposal

Planning permission was granted for the conversion of an existing garage/outbuilding at this site into a holiday let in February 2005 (3/2004/1239/P).

Planning application 3/2005/0615/P then sought permission for the demolition of that existing garage/outbuilding and its replacement by a new build holiday cottage with a similar floor area. The overall maximum dimensions of the proposed holiday cottage were 18.5m x 9.5m with eaves/ridge heights of 2.3m/4.9m. The accommodation to be provided included three bedrooms, lounge, dining room, kitchen and bathroom. The building was to be faced in random stone with a blue slate roof.

The proposal was considered to be acceptable by the Planning and Development Committee on 8 September 2005 and permission was therefore granted subject to a number of conditions including the following condition No 2:

The unit of accommodation shall not be let to or occupied by any one person or group of persons for a continuous period of longer than three months in any one year and in any event shall not be used as a permanent accommodation. A register of such lettings shall be kept and made available to the Local Planning Authority to inspect on an annual basis.

The permission was implemented and the building has been used (and is still being used) as a holiday let in accordance with condition No 2.

Permission is now sought for the removal of the condition to allow the building to be used as a permanent separate dwelling.

Site Location

The group of buildings at Pinfold Farm is on the north east side of Preston Road within an area designated as open countryside approximately 1500m to the north east of Ribchester. The holiday let building is sited between but to the rear of the main farmhouse and Pinfold Farm Barn that has been converted to form two dwellings.

The single entrance to the group of buildings at Pinfold Farm is opposite the entrance to Pinfold Cottages, a terrace of three dwellings on the opposite side of Preston Road.

Relevant History

3/2004/1239/P – conversion/rebuild of existing garage/outbuilding to provide a holiday let. Approved with conditions.

3/2005/0615/P – demolition of existing garage/outbuilding and erection of new building to form holiday let. Approved with conditions.

Relevant Policies

Policy G1 - Development Control.

Policy G5 - Settlement Strategy.

Policy ENV3 - Development in Open Countryside.

Policy H2 - Dwellings in the Open Countryside.

Policy H15 - Building Conversions - Location.

Policy H16 - Building Conversions - Building to be Converted.

Policy H17 - Building Conversions - Design Matters.

Policy H23 - Removal of Holiday Let Conditions.

Environmental, AONB, Human Rights and Other Issues

Policy H23 of the Local Plan states that 'proposals seeking the removal of conditions which restrict the occupation of dwellings to tourism/visitor usage will be refused unless the proposal conforms to the normal development control policies of the Local Plan. Policies G5, H2 and H15, H16 and H17 will be particularly relevant in any assessment'.

Now that the Council is in a situation where a five year housing land supply cannot be identified, residential development should be favourably considered taking account of the requirements of PPS3: Housing and the relevant saved policies of the Local Plan. In practice, what we presently have, is an established built development with a restricted class of residential use. In many ways, there is little difference between this being a form of conversion, and the proposal can be treated as tantamount to a conversion.

Saved Policy H2 of the Local Plan allows the conversion of buildings to dwellings in the open countryside subject to certain criteria. Policies H15, H16 and H17 provide more detailed criteria. The explanatory text to Policy H17 says that 'the conversion of appropriate buildings within settlements or which form part of already defined groups is acceptable'. The single storey building to which this application relates is within a group that also includes three dwellings and a number of outbuildings, and there is a group of a further three dwellings on the opposite side of the road. Overall, I therefore consider the building to form a part of an established group of buildings. As such, if the garage/outbuilding that previously occupied the site was still in existence, its conversion into a dwelling with unrestricted occupancy would now be acceptable in principle and in accordance with the currently applicable policies and guidance. Therefore, I consider the lifting of the occupancy condition on the now existing building to also be acceptable in principle.

As the proposal does not involve any external alterations to the building or to its curtilage, there would be no detrimental effects upon the appearance of the locality. It is not considered that the use of the building as a permanent dwelling would have any detrimental effects upon the amenities of any existing nearby residents.

The Parish Council expresses a concern about highway safety. In response to this, the County Surveyor has stated orally that he sees no significant difference between the use of the building as a holiday let and as a permanent dwelling. Indeed, he said, that if anything, the use as a permanent dwelling would be better as the drivers of vehicles would be more familiar with the access etc. There are therefore no highway safety objections to this application.

With regards to the other points raised by the Parish Council, the applicant has explained that the continued use of the building as a holiday let remains viable. He says that it is because there is still demand for this unit that he has sought planning permission for additional units of holiday accommodation in the locality. The applicant, however, has a disabled daughter, and this unit was specifically designed to cater for disabled holiday makers. He says that he has therefore submitted this application to enable the unit to be used by his daughter at some time in the future should this become necessary. This represents a response to the concerns of the Parish Council, but even without these specific personal circumstances, this application (in common with numerous recent similar applications) is still acceptable in principle. Overall, when viewed in relation through the presently applicable policies and guidance, the proposed removal of the condition is acceptable.

SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR APPROVAL

The requested removal of the condition is in accordance with the presently applicable policies and would not result in any seriously detrimental effects upon visual amenity, the amenities of any nearby residents or highway safety.

RECOMMENDATION: That permission be GRANTED for the removal of condition No 2 of planning permission 3/2005/0615/P.

APPLICATION NO: 3/2011/0178/P (PA) & 3/2011/0179/P (LBC) (GRID REF: SD 362315 443329)

PROPOSED DEMOLITION OF EXISTING CORRUGATED LEAN-TO STORE AND ERECTION OF FLAT ROOF SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION AT BRABINS SHOP AND GALLERY, 20 TALBOT STREET, CHIPPING

PARISH COUNCIL: Chipping Parish Council strongly support the proposals which will enhance the existing building. Will ensure the future of the oldest continuously trading shop in England by allowing the accommodation of an area in which to sell groceries to villagers.

Brabins shop is the site of an outreach post office for two mornings a week and a small popular tea shop but needs other initiatives to be a viable sustainable amenity for the village. The owners of the existing village grocery store have been trying to sell it for over 5 years. They are past retiring age and do not enjoy good health. They are persevering with their business because they are fulfilling a service to the village. Other than Brabins shop, Chipping only has a butchers, a café and two pubs.

The proposals will not detract from the visual aspect of this much loved building.

LANCASHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL (HIGHWAYS): Consulted, but no comments received.

ENGLISH HERITAGE: Pre-application advice comments received 19 November 2010 - the new extension represents quite a large addition to the listed building and would suggest consideration, especially given the anticipated different uses of the space, to the creation of a new separate building. 26 November 2010, - confirm that previous advice still stands and suggest that the proposed extension (though retaining the legibility of the building through its modern design) may not be in keeping with the appearance of the listed building, and is of such a size as to challenge its character.

Application comments received 13 April 2011 – English Heritage do not wish to offer any comments on this occasion. Recommend that the application be determined in accordance with national and local policy guidance, and on the basis of Ribble Valley Borough Council expert conservation advice.

Clarification has been sought on the relative standing of the above comments, and English Heritage have now confirmed that this is a case in which they do not wish to engage.

HISTORIC AMENITY SOCIETIES: Consulted, no representations received.

ADDITIONAL
REPRESENTATIONS:

30 letters of support have been received (including Bowland with Leagram Parish Council and Chipping Local History Society) which, in summary, make the following points:

1. Keeps a convenience store in Chipping. The Village Store appears unlikely to sell as a going concern and owners proposing to market as a residence.
2. Will improve the viability of the shop. Reduction in income from loss of HJ Berry furniture sales, the post office becoming an outreach service and the general decline in newspaper sales (40%). Loss of shop devastating for community. Only food shop other than a butchers. Convenience store and tearooms open 24/7. Many fear that Chipping is a dying village. Will allow diversification. Over last 20 years Chipping has lost a sweet shop, a bric-a-brac shop, the doctor's surgery and the bank.
3. Oldest continually trading shop in the country, having been built by John Brabin 1668. Trading is now different – change is natural and inevitable. Rural villages must be allowed scope for evolution.
4. Sympathetic impact on listed building/enhancement. Historic fabric untouched. Removal of 1970's structure. At rear. The design provides sufficient distinction and legibility from the truly historic parts.
5. Brabins Trust owners for 300 years – excellent custodians.
6. Will not overlook/inconvenience the area.
7. Brabins shop has always been at the centre of the village as a business and socially. A village store is on a par with a church or pub as a focal point. Chipping is not merely a commuter's dormitory – strong sense of community – significant retired and elderly population which cannot easily run off to a large supermarket (Longridge). Value to tourists. Brabins shop and gallery will be able to extend merchandise to fruit and vegetables. Will particularly benefit those without own transport.
8. Will complete an attractive courtyard garden, completely accessible to the public while the shop is open.
9. Do not restrict development just to adhere to listed status guidelines. Community before rules/regulations.

10. As a shop, the general public have access to this historic building.
11. Brabins Charitable Trust note that through the rents generated from this and other property, the Educational Trust is able to provide significant financial assistance to the educational needs of those under 25 in Chipping, Bowland with Leagram and Thornley with Wheatley.

Proposal

Listed building consent and planning permission is sought for the demolition of a rear 1970's open fronted store (loggia) of no architectural or historic interest, and the erection of a single storey extension. The proposed extension footprint closely marries with that of the existing store.

The design and access statement notes that the extension is to provide additional retail space in order to safeguard the future of the existing business.

The extension is flat roofed and to be constructed of local ashlar walling, dark grey single ply membrane roof and dark grey aluminium windows. It infills a trapezoidal space between the northeast wall of the Tillotson's Arms and Brabins shop's "card room" and 1950's brick extension. It measures 6.05m (maximum width), 6.7m (maximum depth) 2.43m (eaves height). The submitted information indicates that the site is not within an area of risk of flooding, that there will not be any change to existing pedestrian and vehicular access, roads, rights of way or parking provision, and the hours of operation will be 0700 to 1730 (Mon-Sat) and 0900 to 1730 (Sun and Bank Holidays). There are presently two full-time and six part-time (weekends and paper deliveries) employees; the proposal is expected to result in the employment of two full-time and seven part-time staff.

The design and access statement notes that the viability of the business is in serious jeopardy following closure of the full-time post office in 2008 (30% reduction in income) and the loss of a retail outlet for HJ Berry's furniture (15% of income). There is also an ongoing decline of newspaper sales and an increase to utilities costs. It is proposed to stock a range of groceries and household goods as a result of the proposed increase in floor space. It is proposed to consolidate convenience store business within Chipping on this site following the expected retirement of the owners of the Village Store, 1-3 Windy Street. New space is required as groceries/household goods carry lower retail margins than current product lines.

Site Location

Number 20 (the post office) and number 22 (John Brabins House) Talbot Street is a Grade II* listed (29 December 1952) house and shop of 1668. English Heritage's 'Revisions to Principles of selection for Listed Buildings' (March 2007) advises that Grade II* listed buildings are 'particularly important buildings of more than special interest'. The site includes a curtilage barn and rear garden which is publically accessible and prominent within Chipping Conservation Area and the setting of other listed buildings and heritage assets. The Chipping Conservation Area Appraisal. (The Conservation Studio; adopted by the Borough Council following public consultation 3 April 2007) notes that: "*in the heart of the village is a private open area formed by the rear gardens of properties on the south side of Talbot Street and the east side of Windy Street*".

The list description notes the listed building's construction from sandstone rubble and slate, and the rear wall having double-chamfered mullioned windows. The Chipping Conservation Area Appraisal notes that: *"the historic buildings of Chipping are almost exclusively built with local stone (a brick rear extension to number 20 Talbot Street looks extra-ordinarily out of place) ... the prevalent use of stone as a building material provides a cohesive and attractive townscape which is part of the village's local identity"*.

The brick built shop extension, a modern brick toilet extension, and the loggia proposed for demolition, result in an unfortunate assemblage of modern accretions to the 17th century structure.

Relevant History

Pre-application advice 14 December 2010 – existing red brick 1950's extension, adjoining loggia and render/red brick toilet have little merit and detract from the erstwhile coherence of stone construction on the site. Reference to PPS5, paragraph 178 and concerns as to the dominance of extensions to the listed building. English Heritage suggest reduction in size or provision of additional space within a separate building.

Pre-application advice 12 April 2006 – Replacement of loggia with new build would over-extend the listed building.

Pre-application advice 13 April 2006 – Tea rooms are unlikely to be considered an ancillary use to the post office.

3/2010/0726/P – Discharge of conditions for 3/2010/0087/P.

3/2010/0087/P – Attachment of heritage "blue plaques" to exterior of building. Listed building consent granted 6 April 2010.

3/2007/0140/P – Erection of octagonal summerhouse in rear garden of Chipping Post Office. Planning permission granted 5 April 2007.

3/1981/0322/P – Proposed extension to provide additional retail sales area, on the rear of the Post Office. Planning permission granted 14 May 1981.

3/1976/0329/P – Extension to existing shop and post office. Planning permission granted 1 July 1976.

6/10/1862/P – Change of use of barn to tearoom. Outline planning permission granted 31 July 1970.

Relevant Policies

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

PPS5 – Planning for the Historic Environment.

PPS4 – Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth.

PPS7 – Sustainable Development in Rural Areas.

Policy ENV19 - Listed Buildings (setting)

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

Policy ENV16 - Development Within Conservation Areas.
Policy EMP8 - Extensions/Expansions of Existing Firms.
Policy RT1 - General Recreation and Tourism Policy.
Policy ENV1 - Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

Environmental, AONB, Human Rights and Other Issues

The main consideration in the determination of the listed building consent application is the duty at Section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the (listed) building, its setting and any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

The Historic Environment Planning Practice Guide (March 2010) confirms at paragraph 110 that there is no statutory requirement to have regard to the provisions of the development plan for decisions on applications for listed building consent.

The main considerations in the determination of the planning application relate to the impact upon the listed building and its setting (including Section 66(1) of the above Act which requires that special regard be given to the desirability of preserving the listed building, its setting and any features of special architectural or historic interest, and Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan Policies ENV20 [alteration/demolition] and ENV19 [setting]), the impact upon Chipping Conservation Area (including Section 72(1)) of the above Act which requires that special attention be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area, and Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan Policy ENV16), the impact upon residential amenity and the public/community benefits of the scheme.

Planning Policy Statement 5 (PPS5, March 2010), Policy HE9.1 states *“there should be a presumption in favour of the conservation of designated heritage assets and the more significant the designated heritage asset, the greater the presumption in favour of its conservation should be. Once lost, heritage assets cannot be replaced and their loss has a cultural, environmental, economic and social impact. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. Loss affecting any designated heritage asset should require clear and convincing justification .”*

PPS5, Policy HE9.4 states *“where a proposal has a harmful impact upon the significance of the designated heritage asset, that is less than substantial harm, in all cases local planning authorities should:*

- (1) weigh the public benefit of the proposal ... against the harm;*
- (2) recognise that the greater the harm to the significance of the heritage asset, the greater the justification will be needed for any loss”.*

PPS5, Policy HE9.5 states *“Not all elements of a World Heritage Site or Conservation Area will necessarily contribute to its significance. Where an element does not positively contribute to its significance, local planning authorities should take into account the desirability of enhancing or better revealing the significance of the World Heritage Site or Conservation Area”.*

The Historic Environment Planning Practice Guide, which accompanies PPS5, is also a material consideration (HEPPG, paragraph 2). HEPPG paragraph 178 states *‘it would not normally be acceptable for new work to dominate the original asset or its setting in either scale, material or*

as a result of its siting. Assessment of an asset's significance and its relationship to its setting will usually suggest the forms of extension that might be appropriate'.

HEPPG paragraph 90 states *"harmful development may sometimes be justified in the interests of realizing the optimum viable use of an asset, notwithstanding the loss of significance caused, provided that the harm is minimised"*.

HEPPG paragraph 117 states: *"the contribution that setting makes to the significance does not depend on there being public rights or an ability to access or experience that setting"*.

HEPPG paragraph 118 states: *"where the significance and appreciation of an asset have been compromised by inappropriate changes within its setting in the past it may be possible to enhance the setting by reversing those changes"*.

HEPPG paragraph 120 states *"when assessing any application for development within the setting of a heritage asset, local planning authorities may need to consider the implications of cumulative change and the fact that developments that materially detract from the asset's significance may also damage its economic viability now, or in the future, thereby threatening its ongoing conservation"*.

PPS7 Sustainable Development in Rural Areas states at paragraph 7 that *'planning authorities should adopt a positive approach to planning proposals designed to improve the viability, accessibility or community value of existing services and facilities, e.g. village shops and post offices...that play an important role in sustaining village communities. Planning authorities should support the retention of these local facilities..'*

PPS7 paragraph 12 states that *'planning authorities should take a positive approach to innovative, high-quality contemporary designs that are sensitive to their immediate setting..'*

Policy EC13.1 of PPS4 Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth states that *'when assessing planning applications affecting shops, leisure uses including public houses or services in local centres and villages, local planning authorities should: ...c, respond positively to planning applications for the conversion or extension of shops which are designed to improve their viability..'*

'Saved' Policy ENV20 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan states *'..proposals for the alteration or repair of listed buildings should be sympathetic to their character and appearance. The most important features of any listed building will be preserved.'*

The explanatory text to 'saved' Policy ENV16 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan states *"the main elements of Council policy are retention and enhancement"*. The Policy itself states *"within conservation areas development will be strictly controlled to ensure that it reflects the character of the area in terms of scale, size, design and materials"*.

In my opinion the proposals are acceptable. I am disappointed at the applicant's wish not to use site redevelopment as an opportunity to remove the harmful modern brick additions highlighted in the Chipping Conservation Area Appraisal and the dismissal of pre-application advice from English Heritage in respect to the size and form of new retail space provision. The prominent and publicly accessible rear of the listed building and adjoining garden areas are interesting and significant. However, not only do the economic and social benefits of the scheme appear compelling but the proposed continued use of this very important historic building as a shop is

significant and welcome. Furthermore, no important historic fabric is shown is to be lost in development.

In my opinion the proposal has an acceptable impact upon the character and significance of listed building and its setting, the character, appearance and significance of Chipping Conservation Area and residential amenity.

SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR APPROVAL

The proposal has a acceptable impact upon the character, setting and significance of the Grade II* listed building, the character, appearance and significance of Chipping Conservation Area and residential amenity. This is in accordance with Policies ENV20, ENV19, ENV16 and G1 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan.

RECOMMENDATION 1: 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. Precise specifications and 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 by the Local Planning Authority before their use in the proposed works.

REASON: In order to safeguard the character, significance, appearance and setting of the listed building and Chipping Conservation Area.

RECOMMENDATION 2: Grant listed building consent subject to the following conditions:

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

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

2. Precise specifications and 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 by the Local Planning Authority before their use in the proposed works.

REASON: In order to safeguard the character, significance, appearance and setting of the listed building and Chipping Conservation Area.

APPLICATION NO: 3/2011/0185/P

(GRID REF: SD 375006 442452)

PROPOSED DEMOLITION OF EXISTING DWELLING AND REPLACEMENT WITH A NEW BUNGALOW WITH TWO BEDROOMS IN THE ROOF SPACE AT 24 CHATBURN PARK DRIVE, CLITHEROE

TOWN COUNCIL:

No objections.

ENVIRONMENT
DIRECTORATE
(COUNTY SURVEYOR):

Has no objections to this application on highway safety grounds.

ADDITIONAL
REPRESENTATIONS:

12 letters have been received from nearby residents who express objections to the proposal on the following grounds:

1. The proposed demolition of a perfectly good property is unnecessary.
2. The application says that no trees are required to be felled, this is because trees were felled prior to the submission of the application.
3. The replacement dwelling is much larger than the existing.
4. The replacement dwelling will spoil the appearance of the locality. Although there is a variety of house types in the locality, it would be brand new and would be too big for both the site itself and the area in general.
5. The position of the parking bays and the nature of the fencing around them and the permission of the replacement dwelling would all be detrimental to highway safety.
6. Detrimental effects on light and privacy to a number of nearby dwellings.
7. The proposal represents over development of the site that would be out of character with the estate.
8. Adverse effects on the quality of light of local residents during construction works in the form of noise nuisance and parking problems due to the parking of construction vehicles on the highway.

Proposal

Permission is sought for the demolition of a detached bungalow with an attached single garage and its replacement with what is described in the application as a bungalow with two bedrooms in the roof space.

The existing bungalow (which has no accommodation at first floor level) has overall dimensions (including the attached garage) of approximately 15m x 7.3m. Its eaves/ridge heights are approximately 2.8m/5.7m. Its walls are stone and render and it has a tiled roof.

The main front and rear walls of the proposed replacement dwelling will be in the same position as those walls of the existing bungalow. The side wall of the garage as proposed, however, would be approximately 1m closer to the side boundary than the existing, as it is claimed that the existing garage is too narrow to accommodate a modern car. There would be a single storey element projecting 4m beyond the main rear wall, and to the rear of the garage, at the south western rear corner of the replacement dwelling. The clearance to the rear boundary of the site would be 5.5m from the single storey element and 9.9m from the main rear wall.

The eaves/ridge heights of the proposed replacement dwelling are approximately 3m/7m at the front and (due to a change in ground levels across the site) 3.6m/7.6m at the rear.

The design of the replacement building incorporates two front facing gables, one on each side of a central entrance door. There would be windows to the proposed first floor bedrooms in the front gables. At the rear, the dwelling would have the appearance of a bungalow with no first floor windows, but two roof lights to storage areas and one roof light to an en-suite shower room.

The replacement dwelling would be constructed using coarsed natural stone and reclaimed natural slates.

The plans indicate that a 1.8m high timber fence would be erected on the side/rear boundary of the site, but would not project in front of the front wall of the dwelling.

Site Location

The application relates to a detached bungalow on a corner plot on the inside of a bend at the junction of Chatburn Avenue and Chatburn Park Drive. It is adjoined to the rear (west) by the end elevation of a bungalow on Chatburn Avenue and to the side (north) by the end elevation of a two storey house on Chatburn Park Drive. Opposite the site there are two storey houses on both Chatburn Avenue and Chatburn Park Drive.

The locality in general is characterised by a mixture of bungalows and two storey houses of a variety of designs and also with a variety of external materials.

Relevant History

None.

Relevant Policies

Policy G1 - Development Control.

Environmental, AONB, Human Rights and Other Issues

Policy H13 of the Local Plan stated that 'within settlements, the rebuilding or replacement of dwellings will be permitted subject to the provisions of Policy G1'. Although Policy H13 has not been saved, the proposed demolition and replacement of this dwelling within the settlement

boundary of Clitheroe remains acceptable in principle. The relevant aspects of Policy G1 relate to the effects of the proposed development on the appearance and character of the locality, the amenities of nearby residents and highway safety.

With regards to the first consideration, as previously stated, there is a variety of dwelling types, designs and external materials in the locality. The dwellings immediately adjoining this bungalow are another bungalow at the rear (west) and a two storey house to the northern side. Although having accommodation on two floors, the first floor accommodation in the proposed replacement dwelling is provided within the roof space. The height of the replacement will be higher than both the existing bungalow and the neighbouring bungalow at the rear, but lower than the two storey house to the north. I consider that, with regards to its height, the replacement dwelling would provide an appropriate 'transition' between the two existing immediately adjoining properties.

I do not consider the slight increase in the overall length of the building, putting it 1m closer to the side boundary of the site to result in any serious detriment to visual amenity as there would still be a clearance of approximately 5.6m to that boundary.

Within the existing context of a variety of house types, designs and external materials, I can see no objections to these aspects of the proposal. The replacement dwelling constructed in natural stone with a natural slate roof would not, in my opinion, form an inappropriate or incongruous feature within the street scene.

Subject to the submission for approval of precise details of its means of construction and its finished colour, I do not consider that a 1.5m high fence on the side boundary of the site would have any seriously detrimental effects upon the appearance of the locality.

With regards to the amenities of nearby residents, the two considerations relate to possible loss of light, and loss of privacy. In my opinion, the proposal has been appropriately and carefully designed in relation to both of these considerations. Although the replacement is higher than the existing, the fact that it has the appearance of a bungalow at the rear, with no first floor windows, is such that there would be no significant loss of light or adverse effect on the privacy of the adjoining bungalow at the rear. There are also no windows to habitable rooms in the side elevation facing the adjoining two storey house to the north. The position of the building is also such that it would have no effects on light to that immediate neighbour.

The two storey properties on the opposite side of the road are approximately 25m away from the front elevation of the replacement dwelling within which there are first floor bedroom windows. This is considerably in excess of the usual guideline that specifies a minimum separation distance of 21m in such circumstances. As such, I do not consider that the proposal would have any seriously detrimental effects upon the privacy of those dwellings on the opposite side of the road. Given this separation distance, there would be minimal (if any) effects upon light to those dwellings.

Overall, I therefore consider the proposal to be acceptable with regards to its effects upon the amenities of nearby residents.

With regards to the final consideration, the County Surveyor has not expressed any objections to the application on highway safety grounds. As the proposed 1.5m high boundary fence would not project in front of the front wall of the dwelling, it would not have any detrimental effects upon visibility across the corner.

The objection expressed by a number of nearby residents concerning harm to their amenities during construction works does not represent a legitimate reason for refusal of the application.

A bat survey report submitted with the application concludes that 'there is no evidence that bats are using or have ever used the existing building'.

Overall, I can see no objections to the proposed development.

SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR APPROVAL

The proposed replacement dwelling would not have any seriously detrimental effects upon visual amenity, the amenities of nearby residents or highway safety.

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

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

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

2. This permission shall relate to the proposal as shown on drawing number 4098-03A.

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

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

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

4. Precise details of the means of construction and the finished colour of the proposed fence on the side and rear boundaries of the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The fence shall not be erected other than in accordance with the approved details and shall be maintained in that form and colour in perpetuity unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent for any variation.

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

APPLICATION NO: 3/2011/0222/P (GRID REF: SD 377290 433370)
PROPOSED EXTENSION TO REAR OF BUILDING 'S' TO PROVIDE NEW DISPATCH AND STORAGE AREA AND ANCILLARY TO INDUSTRIAL USE OF BUILDING. ERECTION OF STAND ALONE ANCILLARY FACILITIES BUILDING AT FORT VALE ENGINEERING LTD, CALDER VALE PARK, SIMONSTONE LANE, SIMONSTONE

PARISH COUNCIL:	No objections.
LANCASHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL HIGHWAY AUTHORITIES:	No objection in principle. This is an established site and no reason to anticipate that the extension would place a burden on the highway network. There are no additional parking provisions shown but in view of the existing parking provision, has no concerns.
LANCASHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL PLANNING CONTRIBUTIONS SECTION:	Confirm that the only possible contribution request would be based on transport requirements in relation to sustainable transport measures. However the level of such contribution has not been yet determined.
HEALTH & SAFETY EXECUTIVE:	Does not advise on safety grounds against the granting of planning permission.
ENVIRONMENT AGENCY:	No objection in principle to the proposed development but advise that surface water runoff rates from the site to be restricted to existing rates in order that the proposal does not contribute to an increased risk of flooding and ideally it should be done through the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDS).
UNITED UTILITIES:	No objection to the proposal providing the development is in accordance with PPS25 and that surface water should be allowed to discharge to foul combined sewer as stated in the planning application.
ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS:	No representations received.

Proposal

This application is both for an extension of an existing industrial building and a new building within the complex of Fort Vale. The buildings are to be located on the southern part of the site and will form a boundary with the designated green belt and the land which faces towards Calder Works. The new building is to be a general industrial building.

The extension to the existing building known as "S" is by one further bay and would measure approximately 24m x 60m and have a height of approximately 6.8m to the eaves and 10.2m to the top of the ridge of the building. The proposal is an additional bay on the existing building so has the same profile and height of the main building which is currently in situ. The ancillary building which is on the southern side of the existing building measures approximately 12.6m x 40.4m and would have a height of approximately 5.9m. There are also two external gas receiving tanks located at the rear of the building.

The proposed materials of both buildings would be constructed of a mixture of brickwork and cladding with a cladded roof. The western gable of the main elevation has three high roller shutter doors and two personal doors and a window. The north and south elevation will be blank. The ancillary facilities building has a high roller shutter door and two door openings on

the north elevation, the east elevation has one roller shutter door with the south elevation and west elevation having one personal door.

The proposed building is for industrial purposes and would be used by the existing occupiers of the site.

Site Location

Fort Vale Engineering is located on the formal Mullards and Philips works site and has vehicular access off Simonstone Lane. The proposed building is at the rear and side of one of the main buildings currently within the site and the development is within the existing industrial land and would border onto the green belt. The site is in close proximity to the boundary of Hyndburn Borough Council.

Relevant History

3/2006/0824/P – Refurbish into existing building, creation of new car parking area. Approved with conditions.

3/2007/0893/P – New warehouse units. Approved with conditions.

3/2010/0564/P – Erection of new investment casting foundry, parking and servicing areas. Approved with conditions.

Relevant Policies

Policy G1 - Development Control.

Policy G3 - Settlement Strategy.

Policy EMP7 - Extensions/Expansions of Existing Firms.

Policy EMP8 - Extensions/Expansions of Existing Firms.

PPS1 - Delivering Sustainable Planning.

PPS4 – Planning for Sustainable Planning Growth.

Environmental, AONB, Human Rights and Other Issues

The main consideration in dealing with this application relate to the impact the development would have in relation to visual amenities, highway implications, landscaping and ecology issues, residential amenities and also the possible benefit of regeneration and local economy issues.

The development is on the boundary of the adjoining green belt designation land, I do not consider this would have any impact on the openness of the green belt given the siting of the existing buildings.

Land Use Issues

I am satisfied that given the proposal is adjacent to existing buildings and within the defined boundary of the industrial complex that the principle of development itself is acceptable. In relation to Policy EMP8, it states that the expansion of established firms on land outside main settlements will be allowed providing it is essential to maintain existing source of employment and is not contrary to other policies of the plan. I am satisfied that this proposal is a suitable

expansion of the existing business and will help to secure the existing employment use of the site.

Highway Matters

The County Surveyor has no objection to the proposal on the basis that the development would not lead to significant additional vehicular movements and that adequate parking facilities exist within the site.

Residential Amenity

I am of the opinion that as the proposal is set behind existing buildings and given that the resultant extensions would not significantly increase the activity and any associated noise do not consider there would be any significant amenity issues that will result in nuisance to residential properties. The nearest properties would be buffered by existing buildings. In a previous application, I am satisfied that the Council's Environmental Health Officer raised no significant concerns in relation to noise or air quality measures based on appropriate conditions. These conditions can be imposed on the existing application.

Visual Impact

I am of the opinion that given the existing buildings within the site and although the extension could be seen from the adjacent green belt land, that the visual impact is limited and not significant to cause any detriment to the overall visual amenity of the area.

Ecology Issues

On the basis of the supporting documents I am satisfied that the proposal would not result in any harm to ecology issues. In relation to drainage, it is clear that subject to suitable conditions there is no objection from any of the statutory undertakers in the form of United Utilities of the Environment Agency.

Conclusion

I am satisfied that this proposal would not cause harm of any significance and would help to consolidate the existing business and as such a recommendation of approval is appropriate.

SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR APPROVAL

The proposal has no significant impact on nearby residential amenity nor have an adverse visual impact or to the detriment of 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 shown on plans 40120/PL100; 40120/PL101; 40120/PL102; 40120/PL200; 40120/PL201; 40130/PL100; 40130/PL101; 40130/PL102; 40070/PL103 and 40070/PL104.
3. Precise specifications or samples of walling and roofing materials and details of any surface materials to be used including their colour and texture shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before their use in the proposed works.

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

5. The roller shutter doors on the building, the subject of this application, shall be fitted with automatic closing devices and acoustic curtains and shall not be open between 1930 hours and 0700 hours.

REASON: In the interest of safeguarding residential amenity and to comply with Policy G1 of the Districtwide Local Plan.

6. Noise emitted from the site shall not exceed

45dBLa eq 10hr at Railway Terrace
42dB La eq 10hr rear of Bank Terrace
49dB La eq 10hr River Bank Terrace
during the day and at night time not exceed 41dB La eq 9hr 30 min at Railway Terrace
38dB La eq 9hr 30min rear of Bank Terrace
40dB La eq 9hr 30min River Bank Terrace

REASON: In the interest of safeguarding residential amenity and to comply with Policy G1 of the Districtwide Local Plan.

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

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

APPLICATIONS APPROVED

<u>Plan No:</u>	<u>Proposal:</u>	<u>Location:</u>
3/2010/0729/P	6 No fascia signs, 2 No remote totem signs and 4 No sets of letters	Carr Hall Home & Garden Centre Whalley Road, Wilpshire
3/2010/0882/P	Two storey side extension, single storey rear extension and alterations	70 Mitton Road, Whalley
3/2010/0894/P	Proposed single storey extension to the existing bungalow and a proposed detached single storey garage	33 Abbots Croft Whalley
3/2011/0042/P	Proposed attic conversion including dormer window to rear and conservation roof lights to front	31 Water Street Ribchester
3/2011/0078/P	Front dormer	28 Pasturelands Drive Billington
3/2011/0081/P	Application for the discharge of condition 1 (timescale), condition 2 (approved drawings), condition 3 (materials), condition 4 (landscaping), condition 5 (Section 106 Agreement), condition 6 (renewable energy), condition 7 (window glazing), condition 8 (vehicular access), condition 9 (contaminated land assessment), condition 10 (surface water regulation), condition 11 (estate road) and condition 12 (proposed slab levels) of planning consent 3/2010/0054/P at land adjacent to rear	Primrose Mill Woone Lane Clitheroe
3/2011/0105/P	Conservation Area Consent for the demolition of toilet block	former toilet block to the rear of King Street, Whalley
3/2011/0121/P	Install a drop kerb	56 Padiham Road Sabden
3/2011/0124/P	Domestic outbuilding	Dennisfield House Rimington Lane, Rimington
3/2011/0127/P	Removal of the existing car-port. Proposed two, two storey side extensions including a dormer to the front roof slope	1 Derwent Crescent Clitheroe
3/2011/0142/P	Non material amendment to planning permission 3/2009/0620/P – 3 No windows on rear (long) and gable elevations	Ferraris Country House Hotel, Chipping Lane Thornley

<u>Plan No:</u>	<u>Proposal:</u>	<u>Location:</u>
3/2011/0144/P	Detached stable block including 3 No stables, tack room, covered horse box and mechanical tractor store and animal food store	Tithe Barn House Whins Lane, Simonstone
3/2011/0145/P	Conversion of rural building (former shippens) to form a single residential dwelling	Lane Side Farm Alston Lane, Longridge
3/2011/0148/P	Proposed two-storey extension to the rear of the dwelling	11 Berkeley Drive, Read
3/2011/0150/P	Extension to front elevation, lift the overall roof height by 450mm and alterations to the first floor layout and Juliet balcony to front elevation	30 Straits Lane Read
3/2011/0151/P	Extension to the side of the dwelling. Resubmission of 3/2010/0945P	101A Pasturelands Drive Billington
3/2011/0162/P	Single storey rear extension	7 Old Barrow Clitheroe
3/2011/0170/P	Extension to rear of existing residential care home and small front extension	High Break House Chatburn Road, Clitheroe
3/2011/0171/P	Proposed construction of first floor bedroom and bathroom extension and alterations to garage to provide study and home office space. Continuation of lean-to roof to create a covered sitting area to the front elevation linked to the side single storey lean-to extension (which is currently being built under general permitted development)	Rosedale School Lane Read
3/2011/0186/P	Re-profiling of garden areas: construction of a retaining wall and hard standing areas at White Carr Lodge and White Carr Lodge Barn. Hard surfacing and steps to rear of	White Carr Lodge Barn and White Carr Lodge Dilworth Bottoms, Ribchester
3/2011/0195/P	Proposed single storey, pitched roof side extension to form an extra utility room and storage area	Cottage No 1 Chapel Hill Farm Lower Lane, Longridge
3/2011/0196/P	Application to discharge condition no. 1 (time), condition no. 2 (amended drawings) and condition no. 3 (archaeological report) of planning consent 3/2010/0654P	18 Water Street Ribchester
3/2011/0197/P	Single storey rear extension to form dining area and detached single garage	152 Chatburn Road Clitheroe
3/2011/0199/P	Proposed erection of two stat vents adjoining south site manufacturing building	Johnson Matthey Pimlico Industrial Estate West Bradford Road Clitheroe
3/2011/0214/P	Provision of two externally accessed WC's	Chipping & District Memorial Hall Garstang Road, Chipping

<u>Plan No:</u>	<u>Proposal:</u>	<u>Location:</u>
3/2011/0215/P	Application for the discharge of condition no. 10 (rooflight) and condition no. 12 (materials) of planning consent 3/2010/0529	The Barn (no.2) High House Far Dilworth, Longridge
3/2011/0218/P	Installation of photovoltaic solar panels to existing panels to existing roof on south facing elevation	Steadplan Ltd/ Deli-Solutions Ltd Salthill Industrial Estate Clitheroe
3/2011/0221/P	Erection of entrance porch	Oak Tree Farm Preston Road, Alston
3/2011/0226/P	Application for the discharge of condition no.3 (materials) and condition no. 7 (tree planting scheme) of planning consent 3/2011/0037P	Stoneygate Holiday Centre Stoneygate Lane Ribchester

APPLICATIONS REFUSED

<u>Plan No:</u>	<u>Proposal:</u>	<u>Location:</u>	<u>Reasons for Refusal</u>
3/2010/0729/P	6 No fascia signs, 2 No remote totem signs and 4 No sets of letters	Carr Hall Home & Garden Centre Whalley Road Wilpshire	Policies G1 and ENV3 – the two remote totem signs (signs 9 and 10) by virtue of their location some distance away from the site entrance and their excessive size would be detrimental to the visual amenities of this rural locality.
3/2011/0114/P	Erection of a general purpose equestrian building on agricultural land	off Knotts Lane Tosside	Policies G1 and ENV1 – inappropriate and excessively large building on a prominent undeveloped site detrimental to the appearance and character of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

<u>Plan No:</u>	<u>Proposal:</u>	<u>Location:</u>	<u>Reasons for Refusal</u>
3/2011/0115/P	Two-storey flat-roofed rear extension	Head over Heels 9 Market Place Longridge	G1, ENV16 Inappropriate design and use of materials to the visual detriment of the appearance of the property and Longridge Conservation Area.
3/2011/0120/P	Two storey extension with Juliet balcony to form bedroom and dining room	Blue Trees Copster Green	Policy G1 – inappropriate intensification of existing back land development that would be unsympathetic to existing and proposed land uses in terms of size, intensity and nature; and detriment to the amenities of nearby residents as a result of increased traffic noise and general activity.
3/2011/0140/P	Proposed earth covered sanitary accommodation unit built into hillside within valley to form Bond Beck Campsite on land adjacent	High Gill Barn Tosside	Contrary to Local Plan Policies G1, G5, ENV1, ENV9, ENV13 and RT1, Polices EM1 and DP7 of the RSS, PPS1, PPS7 and PPS9 – Adverse visual impact on the landscape character, setting and appearance of the area, adverse ecological impact on the Biological Heritage Site, impact of the proposal on highway safety at this location and impact on residential amenity.

<u>Plan No:</u>	<u>Proposal:</u>	<u>Location:</u>	<u>Reasons for Refusal</u>
3/2011/0159/P	Proposed erection of two 12Kw Proven 35-2 wind turbines on 15 metre masts on land adjacent	Sooty Laithe Barn Knotts Lane Tosside	Proposal by virtue of their location, siting and scale would be contrary to Policies G1, ENV1, ENV24, ENV25, ENV26 of the Districtwide Local Plan and PPS 22, in that they would represent an isolated, incongruous feature into the open landscape to the detriment of the visual amenity of the area.
3/2011/0164/P	Application for the modification of Condition no. 13 of planning consent 3/2005/0245/P, to allow the eastern, four-bedroom holiday cottage to be used as a permanent residential dwelling	Marl Barn Tosside Skipton	Contrary to Policies H2, H15, H16, H17, H23 and ENV1 of the Local Plan, and PPS3. Tantamount to the creation of a new dwelling within open countryside without sufficient justification, and the intensification of the use would be to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area.
3/2011/0183/P	Two-storey side extension	26 Mearley Syke Clitheroe	G1, H10, SPG – Prominent extension to the visual detriment of the street scene.

SECTION 106 APPLICATIONS

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

CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS FOR A PROPOSED USE OR DEVELOPMENT

<u>Plan No:</u>	<u>Proposal:</u>	<u>Location:</u>
3/2011/0174/P	Application for a Lawful Development Certificate for retention of a conservatory on the property	Turner Fold Birdy Brow Chaigley
3/2011/0175/P	Lawful Development Certificate for the retention of chimneys	Turner Fold Birdy Brow, Chaigley
3/2011/0236/P	Application for a Certificate of Lawfulness for the proposed installation of Solar Panels to the roof of the dwelling and detached garage	14 Crow Trees Brow Chatburn

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>
3/2010/0233 D	17.11.10	Mr D M Clegg Proposed detached house in garden area to side of Manor House (Resubmission of 3/2009/0449/P) Manor House Copster Green	WR	—	APPEAL DISMISSED 21.4.11
3/2010/0635 D	18.1.11	Mr Steve Burke Proposed provision of a pair of handrails to the vestry door in the east elevation of the church At Mary & All Saints Church Church Lane Whalley	WR	—	AWAITING DECISION
3/2010/0738 C	24.1.11	Diocese of Bradford Construction of 3no. affordable two-storey houses Land on Main Street Grindleton	WR	—	APPEAL DISMISSED 19.4.11
3/2010/0969 D	17.2.11	John Carrington Application for a lawful development certificate for a proposed cantilevered canopy 8A Longridge Road Hurst Green	WR	—	AWAITING DECISION

<u>Application No:</u>	<u>Date Received:</u>	<u>Applicant/Proposal/Site:</u>	<u>Type of Appeal:</u>	<u>Date of Inquiry/Hearing:</u>	<u>Progress:</u>
3/2010/0893 D	23.2.11	HWS Ltd Retrospective application for insertion of window to gable front elevation at first floor of existing semi-detached dwelling Roadside Farm Preston Road Alston	Householder appeal	-	APPEAL DISMISSED 13.4.11
3/2010/0926 D	9.3.11	Mr C J Hutchings Proposed two-storey side extension Happy Cottage Lovely Hall Lane Copster Green	Householder appeal	-	APPEAL DISMISSED 27.4.11
3/2010/0861 D	23.3.11	Mr Jason Holden Proposed first floor extension at the rear to create master bedroom and en-suite. New window at first floor to the front elevation 92 Ribchester Road Clayton-le-Dale	Householder appeal	-	APPEAL ALLOWED 4.5.11
3/2010/0820 O	28.3.11	Co-Operative Estates Outline application for a maximum of 80 residential units at land off Riddings Lane with access from Hayhurst Road with all other matters reserved Land to the north of Riddings Lane Whalley	-	Inquiry date – 4 Aug 2011 (scheduled to last for 2 days)	
3/2010/0819 D	1.4.11	Mrs Helen Meloy Proposed single storey extension to the dining room to the north elevation Waddington Old Mill Mill Lane Waddington	Householder appeal	-	AWAITING DECISION

<u>Application No:</u>	<u>Date Received:</u>	<u>Applicant/Proposal/Site:</u>	<u>Type of Appeal:</u>	<u>Date of Inquiry/Hearing:</u>	<u>Progress:</u>
3/2011/0007 D	7.4.11	Mr Richard Moir Erection of single storey rear extension, with the addition of dormer windows to the rear creating a two-storey conversion. Roof will be replaced and the ridge line raised 10 Carleton Avenue Simonstone	Householder appeal	–	AWAITING DECISION
3/2011/0032 D	21.4.11	Ms Joanne Williams Single storey extension to side and rear of existing house 7 Elswick Lodge Mellor Brow Mellor	Householder appeal	–	Notification letter sent 27.4.11 Questionnaire sent 28.4.11 AWAITING DECISION
3/2010/1010	3.5.11	Ribble Valley Homes Ltd Scheme to provide Juliet balconies to flats in sheltered housing scheme, involving removal of existing windows and creating large opening to house inward opening patio doors. 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 31, 32 & 33 Showley Court, Clayton-le-Dale	WR	–	Notification letter and questionnaire to be sent by 17.5.11 Statement to be sent by 14.6.11

LEGEND

D – Delegated decision
C – Committee decision
O – Overturn