

RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL REPORT TO PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Agenda Item No

meeting date: THURSDAY, 16 JUNE 2011
 title: PLANNING APPLICATIONS
 submitted by: DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY SERVICES

APPLICATION NO: 3/2011/0163/P (GRID REF: SD 364840 430988)
 PROPOSED DEMOLITION OF TWO OUTBUILDINGS AND CONVERSION OF A THIRD TO
 FORM A NEW DETACHED DWELLING AT HEY MOO, ELSWICK FARM, MELLOR BROW,
 MELLOR

PARISH COUNCIL: The Parish Council objects to the application as follows:

- Over-development – massing.
- Due regard must be taken to any objections from neighbours/neighbouring properties.
- The address should be Mellor Brow not Mellor Lane as stated in the application.

ENVIRONMENT
 DIRECTORATE
 (COUNTY SURVEYOR):

No written observations have been received at the time of report preparation but, orally, has commented that he has no objections to this application on highway safety grounds.

ADDITIONAL
 REPRESENTATIONS:

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

1. Extra traffic associated with the proposal will exacerbate existing parking problems in the locality; will also increase the danger caused to residents carrying items etc between their own parking spaces and their dwellings.
2. The proposal is for a very large detached dwelling over 20m in length running the entire length of the rear garden area to numbers 52 to 62 Mellor Brow. There are ground floor windows overlooking the gardens of those properties to the detriment of their privacy. This privacy issue had been acknowledged in previous applications.
3. The plans say that no trees are to be felled yet there is a large tree covered by a Preservation Order in the position of the proposed rear patio area.
4. Due to its height and length, the building will adversely affect light to neighbouring properties.
5. Looking at a single building of this length would certainly be an "imposition".

6. The proposed large dwelling in conjunction with the existing holiday lets in an adjoining building represents over-development of the site.
7. The increased vehicular traffic resulting from the proposed development would exacerbate an existing highway safety problem due to poor visibility at the access onto Mellor Brow.
8. The proposed development would block an existing right of way to numbers 52 to 62 Mellor Brow that presently passes through a gate in the wall next to 50 Mellor Brow.

Proposal

I consider it appropriate in this case to describe the proposed development having first described an alternative development on the site for which planning permission has been granted.

Planning application 3/2009/0063/P sought planning permission for the creation of two units of holiday accommodation to add to the existing four units at the site.

The first unit was to be formed by the conversion and alteration of an existing single storey building to form a unit comprising 1 bedroom, bathroom, living area and dining kitchen. As existing, that building has a mixture of stone, brick and render to its walls with a slate roof. An existing brick extension on the building was to be demolished and replaced with a stone and glass extension with a gabled roof, the roof being set below that of the main roof and comprising a mixture of blue slate and glass. The maximum height of the building was to be maintained at 3.5m and the maximum dimensions of the footprint were to be 9.8m x 5.8m.

The second proposed unit in the previous application firstly involved the demolition of a garage and a stable building which are of modern construction with brick and timber walls and corrugated sheet roofs, and not considered to be of any benefit to visual amenity. The unit was to be built in the area presently occupied by these buildings and would involve a net increase in footprint of approximately 28%. That proposed two storey unit had two bedrooms and an 'L' shaped footprint, the maximum dimensions of which were 10.4m x 8.4m; the height to the ridge of the two storey element was to be 6.2m, and 4.1m on the single storey wing. Natural stone and blue slates were to be used throughout on the building, with its north western elevation featuring a glazed curtain wall in order to take advantage of the views of the adjoining farm land. That design feature also reduced the need for windows in other elevations, so avoiding any problems or overlooking.

One parking space was to be provided for the small unit and two spaces for the larger unit.

The application was considered by the Planning and Development Committee on 16 July 2009 when planning permission was granted subject to conditions. No works had commenced on the implementation of that previous permission, but it remains extant.

Permission is now sought for the formation/erection of one dwelling in basically the same position as the two approved holiday lets. The traditional single storey building at the southern

end of the group would be retained and extended northwards to provide a single storey part of the proposed dwelling. This would contain a garage, conservatory, bedroom with en suite shower room, a separate wc and a kitchen/breakfast room. A two-storey part of the dwelling would be attached to the northern end of the single storey part. This would contain a lounge/dining room occupying the whole of the ground floor with two bedrooms, each with en suite bathrooms, on the first floor.

In this way the dwelling would have an elongated footprint of irregular shape. Its single storey element would be in approximately the same position as the approved single storey holiday let and its two storey element would be in roughly the same position as the approved two storey holiday let. Again in common with the approved holiday lets, the northern elevation of the two storey part of the dwelling contains a glazed curtain wall overlooking the adjoining farm land.

The building would be of natural stone construction with a natural slate roof. The main eaves/ridge heights of the single storey section would be approximately 3.6m/4.8m, whilst the maximum eaves/ridge heights of the two storey part of the dwelling would be approximately 4.1m/6.2m.

Site Location

The site is located to the north of Mellor Brow. It is served by a single width access track from Mellor Brow that runs parallel to the gable end elevation of a terrace of houses. The access track coincides with the settlement boundary which includes the terrace of properties to the east of the farm but excludes the farm itself and the properties to the west and south. Accordingly, the application site is located within the open countryside just outside the settlement boundary.

The complex of buildings at Elswick Farm is adjoined to the south, east and west by residential properties and to the north by farmland.

Relevant History

3/2002/0128/P – Change of use of tack room to general works accommodation. Refused.

3/2003/0055/P – Conversion of agricultural building to restricted business use, self catering accommodation. Refused.

3/2003/0865/P – Conversion of barn to form four holiday lets. Refused.

3/2004/0450/P – Change of use to form self-catering holiday accommodation. Approved subject to conditions.

3/2009/0063/P – Proposed creation of two holiday cottages. Approved subject to conditions.

3/2010/0416/P – Extensions and alterations to main farmhouse, Hey Moo. Approved subject to conditions.

Relevant Policies

Policy G1 - Development Control.

Policy G5 - Settlement Strategy.

Policy ENV3 - Development in Open Countryside.

Policy H2 - Dwellings in the Open Countryside.

PPS3 – Housing.

Environmental, AONB, Human Rights and Other Issues

As previously stated, the site of the proposed dwelling is within the open countryside but immediately adjoining the settlement boundary of Mellor. In general housing policy terms (including consideration of PPS3 and the fact that the Council cannot identify a five-year supply of housing land) it is considered that the provision of one dwelling on this site immediately adjoining the settlement boundary is acceptable in principle.

The relevant detailed considerations relate to the effects of the proposed dwelling on visual amenity, the amenities of nearby residents, the single remaining tree on the site, and highway safety.

Visual Amenity

The proposal involves the retention and conversion/extension of an existing traditional agricultural building. The extensions would be carried out using natural stone and natural slates would be used on all the roofs of the proposed dwelling. The proposed dwelling would be similar in appearance to the two holiday lets that could be constructed under an extant permission, except that there would be a larger single storey element in order to link the two buildings. I consider that the proposed dwelling would compliment the existing group of buildings and would not have any seriously detrimental effects upon the visual amenities of the locality.

Residential Amenity

The dwellings that would be most affected by the proposal are numbers 50, 52/54, 56, 58 and 60 Mellor Brow to the south and west of the site. Those same dwellings would be the most affected if the extant permission for two holiday lets was to be carried out.

This application has drawn upon that existing permission in order to address any possible harmful effects on the amenities of the occupiers of those dwellings. The heights of the single storey and two storey parts of the dwelling now proposed are similar to those heights on the approved holiday lets and the position of the dwelling is similar to the two holiday lets except that there is a single storey part of the dwelling where there would be a gap between the two holiday let units. I do not consider that the proposed dwelling would have any more of an effect on light to those dwellings than would result from the construction of the holiday lets.

Light to all three rooms in the two-storey part of the building is provided by the totally glazed northern elevation so that there would be no windows in either side elevation or in the rear elevation of this particular part of the building. Light to the rooms in the single storey part of the building is provided in the main by roof lights rather than windows. In the western rear elevation there would be windows to a bedroom, an en suite shower room and a separate wc, two of which would be obscure glazed as a matter of course. There is also a patio door to the kitchen/breakfast area in a “return” elevation at the rear, not directly facing the adjoining

properties to the west. I consider that a requirement for a 2m high wall or fence on the rear boundary of the rear patio area would prevent any seriously detrimental effects upon the privacy of adjoining properties from those ground floor windows.

Windows in the eastern side elevation have also been kept to a minimum and are to non-habitable rooms in order to prevent privacy problems between the proposed dwellings and the existing holiday lets.

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

Trees

Until recently there was a group of 9 trees close to the site of the proposed building that formed Group 1 of the Elswick Farm Tree Preservation Order 1989. An arboricultural report submitted with application 3/2009/0063/P concluded that none of the trees were particularly worthy of retention. It recommended that 8 should be felled and replaced with appropriate stock in a more appropriate location. The ninth, a Sycamore, was recommended to be either removed or retained but that if it was retained, it should be the subject of remedial pruning and monitoring. The Countryside Officer visited this site in relation to the previous application and provided a visual amenity valuation of the trees in which he generally concurred with the conclusions of the applicants arboricultural report. He considered the trees to be of little importance to the landscape and of "some" visual amenity value to people. Overall he considered that the visual amenities of the locality would benefit by the felling and replacement of these trees. A condition was imposed on the permission to that effect.

The Sycamore is now the only remaining tree, the other 8 having been felled. This tree might survive for a while if the patio area is carefully constructed around it, but subject to its replacement, the loss of this one remaining tree (as already determined in relation to the previous application) would not have any seriously detrimental effects upon the visual amenities of the locality. In the event of planning permission being granted, a condition requiring the replacement of at least 9 replacement trees would be appropriate (whether the Sycamore is to be retained or felled).

Highway Safety

Three parking spaces are to be provided for the dwelling. The dwelling would be occupied by persons who would become familiar with the precise form of the access etc, as opposed to the numerous short-term occupiers of the approved two holiday lets. I consider that this therefore represents an improvement in highway safety terms over the holiday let permission that could still be implemented if this application was refused. The County Surveyor has not expressed any objections to the application on highway safety grounds.

Other Matters

A bat survey report submitted with the application concludes that no signs could be found of use of the existing buildings by bats. The Countryside Officer concurs with the findings of the report.

Reference has been made by a number of nearby residents to an existing right of way that they claim would be blocked by the proposals. This relates to a private legal matter that would not represent a reason for refusal of this application. The applicant has, however, acknowledge the

existence of the right of way and, on amended plans received on 26 May 2011, a gateway is now shown in the wall giving access to the neighbouring properties in accordance with the right of way.

Conclusion

Overall, it is considered that the erection of a dwelling in this location is in accordance with the presently applicable policies and guidance relating to housing, and that it has been designed and sited so that it would not have any seriously detrimental effects upon visual amenity, the amenities of nearby residents or highway safety.

SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR APPROVAL

The proposed dwelling is in accordance with the presently applicable housing policies and guidance and would not have any seriously detrimental effects upon visual amenity, the amenities of any nearby residents or highway safety.

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

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

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

2. This permission shall relate to the proposal as shown on the amended plan received by the Local Planning Authority on 26 May 2011 (drawing number WI/03DWG02B).

REASON: For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure compliance with the submitted amended 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. Prior to the first use of the dwelling hereby permitted, three parking spaces shall be formed as shown on the approved plans. Thereafter, the spaces shall be permanently retained and available for use by the occupiers of the dwelling.

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

5. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (Amendment) (No 2) (England) Order 2008 (or any Order revoking or re-enacting that Order) any future extensions, external alterations to the building, including any

development within the curtilage as defined in the Schedule to the Order, Part 1, Classes A to H shall not be carried out unless a further planning permission has first been granted in respect thereof.

REASON: In order that the Local Planning Authority can retain effective control over the development to ensure compliance with Policy G1 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan.

6. In the first planting season following the completion of the development or the first occupation of the dwelling (whichever is the sooner) a replacement planting scheme shall be carried out on land within the applicants ownership to replace the 8 trees (previously covered by a Tree Preservation Order) that have recently been felled, and the one remaining tree within that Tree Preservation Order (a Sycamore) that may either be felled or retained as part of the development hereby approved. Precise details of the number, (which shall be a maximum of 9) species and location of the replacement trees shall first have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The replacement trees 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 which is removed, or dies, or is seriously damaged, or becomes seriously diseased, by a species of similar size to those originally planted.

REASON: To replace trees that have recently been felled in the interests of visual amenity and to comply with Policy ENV13 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan.

7. Prior to the first occupation of the dwelling hereby permitted a 2m high wall or fence shall be erected on the rear (west) boundary of the proposed patio area in accordance with details that have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

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

APPLICATION NO: 3/2011/0169/P (GRID REF: SD 374882 443200)
PROPOSED ERECTION OF A THREE BEDROOM BUNGALOW WITH AN INTEGRAL GARAGE ON LAND TO THE REAR OF THE PUBLIC HOUSE AT THE BLACK HORSE INN, PIMLICO ROAD, CLITHEROE

TOWN COUNCIL: Objects to the application on the grounds that the proposal will lead to an over intensive development in the vicinity.

ENVIRONMENT
DIRECTORATE
(COUNTY SURVEYOR):

No objections on highway safety grounds.

There is an agreed right of access to the property which is of an acceptable standard and allows for adequate visibility to/from Pimlico Road. The proposed integral garage and driveway will provide a minimum of two off road parking spaces. In order to retain this level of parking provision a condition should be imposed on any planning permission that the garage is retained for the parking of a private motor vehicle and not converted to residential accommodation at a later date.

The dwelling is on a steeply sloping site that will require engineering works to make a level site as shown on the submitted elevational drawings. There do not appear to be any retaining structures in the vicinity of the highway but, if any are proposed, the highway authority needs to be informed as a priority.

HEALTH & SAFETY
EXECUTIVE:

Has noted that the application site is within the consultation distance of a major hazard site/pipeline, but confirms that they do not advise on safety grounds against the granting of planning permission in this case.

ADDITIONAL
REPRESENTATIONS:

None received.

Proposal

Permission is sought for the erection of a detached bungalow containing lounge, dining room, kitchen, three bedrooms, study, bathroom, garage and utility room. The main part of the building has dimensions of 18m x 14.3m. The single garage and utility room would be in an 8.1m x 5.6m section attached to the northern part of the western (front) elevation.

The garage section would have eaves/ridge heights of 2.4m/4.8m whilst the main roof would have eaves/ridge heights of 2.4m/5.9m.

The front and both side elevations would be natural Yorkshire stone whilst the rear elevation would be rendered. The roof would be natural Welsh blue slates. All doors and window surrounds would be timber.

In order to provide a uniform finished floor level, the rear part of the bungalow would be cut into the ground. There would be a 1.5m wide path along the rear elevation, along the outer edge of which would be a retaining wall as the ground level at this point would be approximately 1.8m higher than the finished floor level of the bungalow.

Site Location

The Black Horse public house is located on the east side of Pimlico Road inside the settlement boundary of Clitheroe. At the rear of the public house, and within the same ownership is an area of grassed open land that is just outside the settlement boundary. To the east of this land, is the wooded area around the disused Coplow Quarry. The former quarry area is designated

as a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and a County Biological Heritage Site (CBHS). To the south of the sloping grassed area and running to the south of the public house car park, is an access road to the former quarry that is owned by the Hanson Heidelberg Cement Group. The public house benefits from a right of access over this private road.

The application site comprises the grassed area at the rear of the public house plus the first approximately 44m of the access road leading off Pimlico Road. This section of the access road will provide access to the driveway that is to be formed in front of the proposed garage.

Appropriate Notice has been served on the owners of the access road and a letter from that company to the applicants has been submitted with the application. In this letter, it is confirmed that the company has no objections to the access road being used to gain access to the land at the rear of the public house subject to a requirement that no cars or vehicles are to be parked on the road as it also gives access to other residential properties beyond. It is stated in the letter that unobstructed access to these properties must be maintained at all times for other residents and emergency services.

Relevant History

3/2008/0030/P – Proposed timber storage shed on land to rear of public house. Approved.

Relevant Policies

Policy G1 - Development Control.

Policy G5 - Settlement Strategy.

Policy ENV3 - Development in Open Countryside.

Policy ENV8 - Sites of Special Scientific Interest.

Policy ENV9 - Important Wildlife Site

Policy H2 - Dwellings in the Open Countryside.

PPS3: Housing.

Environmental, AONB, Human Rights and Other Issues

As previously stated, although the public house is within the settlement boundary of Clitheroe, the site of the proposed bungalow is outside the settlement and within the open countryside. However, the site is within a reasonable walking distance of all the facilities of Clitheroe town centre and there is a bus stop immediately adjoining the front of the site. This is therefore a sustainable location for residential development. As the Council is presently in a situation where a five year supply of housing land cannot be identified, the proposed development of one dwelling in this location is therefore considered to be in accordance with the guidance in PPS3: Housing. The proposal is therefore acceptable in principle.

The detailed considerations to be made relate to visual amenity, the amenities of nearby residents, highway safety, and any possible effects upon the adjoining Site of Special Scientific Interest/County Biological Heritage Site especially upon the trees immediately adjoining the eastern boundary of the site.

Visual Amenity

The proposed dwelling would be located the rear of the two storey public house and the attached terrace of two storey houses. It would be constructed using natural stone and natural

slates in-keeping with the predominant external materials in the locality. To the rear (east) the site is screened by a dense woodland on higher ground. To the south, the site is adjoined by another dwelling that is set back from Pimlico Road and served by the former quarry access road. In this location, and using appropriate external materials, I do not consider that the proposed bungalow would have any seriously detrimental effects upon visual amenity, even though it is on higher ground than the properties immediately facing Pimlico Road.

The Town Clerk has confirmed that the Town Council considers **this** proposal to represent over-development (as opposed to setting a precedent that would lead to over-development in the general vicinity). The proposed bungalow has a clearance of approximately 13m to the rear boundary of the site and approximately 24m to the front boundary; and its main front elevation (excluding the garage) is approximately 33m away from the rear elevation of the public house. I do not consider this to represent over-development of the site.

The Amenities of Nearby Residents

The bungalow is to be sited immediately behind the public house that is in the same ownership. It is off-set from the terrace of dwellings to the north of the public house and is approximately 40m away from the nearest of those dwellings. The position of the garage at the front of the main building prevents any direct overlooking of these adjoining properties from habitable rooms. The adjoining dwelling to the south is approximately 50m away from the proposed bungalow and there is substantial tree screening between the two properties.

I consider the proposal to be acceptable in relation to the amenities of nearby residents.

Highway Safety

The County Surveyor has no objections to the application on highway safety grounds subject to a condition to ensure that the garage is not converted to residential use at a later date.

Effects Upon Trees and Upon the Adjoining Site of Special Scientific Interest and County Biological Heritage Site

The bungalow is to be sited 13m away from the rear boundary of the site. The Countryside Officer considers that a root protection zone of 12m will, in this case, be more than adequate to ensure that the development would not adversely impact upon the trees on the adjoining land.

The proposed development is therefore a minimum distance of 13m away from the boundary of the Coplow Quarry SSSI/CBHS. It is unlikely that the development will have any detrimental effects upon the special interests of the designated area as it is only for one dwelling and is entirely outside the boundaries of the designated site. The type of operation listed on the Natural England website as “likely to damage the special interest” of Coplow Quarry all relate to developments inside the site. The Council’s Countryside Officer and a County Ecologist, however, have both recommended orally that a condition be imposed to ensure appropriate protection of the SSSI/CBHS during construction works. The condition relating to the provision of a root protection zone, previously referred to, can be worded to ensure that it also protects the adjoining designated site. Subject to such a condition the proposal is considered to be acceptable in relation to these particular considerations.

SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR APPROVAL

The proposed development is in accordance with the presently applicable housing policies and guidance and would not have any seriously detrimental effects upon visual amenity, the amenities of nearby residents, highway safety or the special interests of the adjoining Coplow Quarry SSSI and County BHS.

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

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

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

2. This permission shall relate to the proposal as shown on drawing numbers PL-291 Sheets 1, 2, 3 and 4.

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

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

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

4. The integral garage comprised in the approved development shall be permanently retained for the housing of the private motor vehicle, and shall not be converted into residential accommodation unless a further planning permission has first been granted in respect thereof.

REASON: To ensure the retention of adequate off road parking provision in the interests of highway safety and to comply with Policy G1 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan.

5. The adjacent neighbouring Coplow Quarry Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and County Biological Heritage Site (CBHS) and the trees on the western boundary of that designated site shall be protected during the entire duration of all development work by a protection zone of at least 12m measured from that site boundary. Within the boundaries of the protection zone (that shall be defined by an appropriate fence) there shall be no incursion of building operations, and no excavated material, soil/spoil or building material shall be stored or redistributed. Additionally, no services or access points shall be made or routed into or through the SSSI/CBHS.

REASON: To ensure the protection of trees adjoining the site boundary and the protection of the special interests of the adjoining site of Site of Special Scientific Interest and County Biological Heritage Site in accordance with Policies G1, ENV8 and NV9 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan.

NOTE

1. The applicant is advised that, should any retaining structures be required adjacent to the highway, the County Highway Authority should first be informed as a matter of priority.

APPLICATION NO: 3/2011/0187/P (GRID REF: SD 368342 437933)
DEMOLITION OF THE EXISTING DETACHED GARAGE AND REPLACEMENT GARAGE TO
BE BUILT AND DRIVEWAY WITH TURNING AREA AT 10 THE DENE, HURST GREEN,
LANCASHIRE, BB7 9QF

AIGHTON, BAILEY &
CHAIGLEY PARISH
COUNCIL:

The Parish Council object for the following reasons:

1. Plan will increase the area of garaging and number of parking spaces for a site on which there are plans for a five-bed house.
2. Increase in vehicular movements on a minor road close to a narrow bridge.
3. Moving the garage will increase the footprint and be close to an existing conservatory.
4. Objections from neighbours need to be taken into consideration.

ENVIRONMENT
DIRECTORATE (COUNTY
SURVEYOR):
ADDITIONAL
REPRESENTATIONS:

No objections to the application in principle on highway safety grounds.

Nine letters have been received from five different households, with a brief summary of the points of objection being raised outlined below:

1. Too close to the bungalow and it will obscure the view of the east facing bank of Dean Brook.
2. The height of the garage would look out of place next to the 1950's bungalow.
3. No need for toilet/office in ancillary domestic building.
4. The present garage sits well on site at present and is adequate in size.

5. Increase in size of garage is unacceptable.
6. Its design would make it stand out instead of merging into the landscape.
7. Increase in traffic will impact on vehicular and pedestrian safety at this location.
8. Will not fit in with the concept of an A.O.N.B.
9. Unacceptable difference between the design of the bungalow at 10 The Dene and the proposed garage.
10. Moving the garage serves no purpose for residents of The Dene.
11. Impact on Conservation Area.
12. The application is misleading as the land in question is now no longer part of 10 The Dene.
13. The completion of this sale has been delayed in order to help this application so this is no normal situation.
14. The 'current' owners of no. 10 The Dene are not aware of any proposals on this land.
15. Impact on residential amenity of nearby neighbours.
16. The new garage will no longer associated with 10 The Dene which surely not an acceptable outcome.
17. Surely this is just a pre-requisite for a future application for a full dwelling on this site?
18. Unsuitable site for development.
19. Detrimental visual impact on streetscene.
20. Development is intrusive, inappropriate and out of character with this area of Hurst Green.
21. Previous schemes on this site have been refused based on the impact on the A.O.N.B. and the Conservation Area, how is this different?

Proposal

This application seeks permission for the demolition of an existing detached garage at 10 The Dene, Hurst Green and its replacement with a slightly larger detached double garage with a driveway and turning area.

Site Location

The application relates to a detached bungalow that lies outside the village boundary of Hurst Green, but within the Hurst Green Conservation Area (adopted April 2007), and within the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, as defined by the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan.

Relevant History

3/2009/0927/P – Proposed loft extension to the existing property and single storey extensions to the side and front with rooms in the roof space. Proposed dormer windows to the NE elevation and a dormer window and a balcony to the NW elevation (Re-Submission) – Granted Conditionally.

3/2009/0380/P - Demolition of existing detached bungalow and erection of two-storey detached house (CAC) – Granted Conditionally.

3/2009/0379/P – Demolition of existing detached bungalow and erection of two-storey detached house – Refused.

3/2009/0378/P – Demolition of domestic double garage and erection of a detached two-storey holiday cottage (Re-submission) - Withdrawn.

3/2008/0892/P – Demolition of domestic garage and construction of holiday cottage in part of side garden – Withdrawn.

3/2008/0891/P – Demolition of conservatory, boiler house and detached domestic garage, and erection of 2-storey extension and alterations – Withdrawn.

Relevant Policies

Policy G1 - Development Control.

Policy H10 – Residential Extensions.

Policy ENV1 – Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

Policy ENV16 - Development Within Conservation Areas.

SPG – “Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings”.

Hurst Green Conservation Area Appraisal (adopted April 2007).

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

PPS5 – Planning for the Historic Environment.

Environmental, AONB, Human Rights and Other Issues

This application seeks permission for the demolition of an existing detached garage at 10 The Dene, Hurst Green and its replacement with a slightly larger detached double garage with a driveway and turning area. This site has been subject to a number of applications in past years, however this current application must be treated on its own merits and as it has been submitted, which is a replacement garage for an existing dwelling (as per the submitted red edge plan and application form suggests). On this basis, the main considerations are the potential impact on the amenity of nearby neighbours, the potential impact on highway safety and the impact on the

A.O.N.B. and Hurst Green Conservation Area by virtue of the suitability of the design, scale, size and massing of the proposed garage.

IMPACT ON RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

In terms of the impact on nearby residential amenity, the Applicant notes that current position of the existing garage on site causes problems with access given it is less than 1m back from the highway. The proposed position of the new garage will be set approximately 7m back from the highway edge of The Dene, which will allow cars to pull fully off the highway and also turn on site to allow them to leave the site in forward gear. Given this improvement to the access to the site, and the reduction in the potential for cars to be sat waiting in the road before entering the garage, I do not consider that there will be any significant detrimental impact on the amenity of the occupiers of nearby dwellings by virtue of this proposal.

IMPACT ON HIGHWAY SAFETY

Whilst I note the points of objection from the nearby neighbours in respect of concerns regarding the proposals impact on highway safety, however the LCC Traffic and Development Engineer has considered the proposed and improved access with turning area, and notes that the design of the double garage satisfies the standard dimensions recommended by Lancashire County Council, 6.0m by 6.0m minimum and the driveway accessed from The Dene allows for manoeuvring to and from the highway in a forward gear, sufficient for four vehicles, and as such has no objections in principle to this proposal on highway safety grounds.

On another note, he states that should this application prove successful there will be a direct impact on the previous permission granted for the replacement dwelling detailed as part of 3/2009/0380 (this was a Conservation Area Consent Application and he was actually referring to the proposal approved under 3/2009/0927/P). Having assessed this previous approval, the position of the new garage has no impact on the approved extensions, and nor does it affect the existing vehicular access that will lead to the attached garage approved on this proposal, so I consider this statement to be incorrect and is not something that should be considered as a reason for refusal.

IMPACT ON CONSERVATION AREA AND A.O.N.B.

As with previous schemes at this site, given that Hurst Green Conservation Area has been recently granted this status (April 2007), long after the construction of this property, this site and indeed the property must have been thought to provide a positive contribution to it to have been included within the Conservation Area boundary. The Hurst Green Conservation Area Appraisal (adopted by the Borough Council on 3 April 2007) includes within the 'Summary of Special Interest' the Dean Brook, the wooded east bank of Dean Brook, and its rural setting within the A.O.N.B. and the Architectural and historic interest of the Conservation Area's buildings. The importance to the Conservation Area of the natural features of the Dean Brook (well treed steeply sloping east bank) are further emphasised in 'Green spaces, trees and other natural elements' and 'Hurst Green Conservation Area boundary'. However, the buildings on site are not mentioned, indeed the existing modern bungalow and timber garage (subject to this application) are of no interest. The house itself is relatively innocuous due to the height, size and location on site, however the garage sits reasonably prominent adjacent to the highway. As such, the question is whether or not the proposed new garage on site will protect, preserve or enhance the Conservation Area and the Forest of Bowland A.O.N.B.

Whilst the existing modern bungalow is of no interest, fortunately it is relatively innocuous due to its height, size, location on site and lack of address to the road, which results in only a minor interruption (along with the modern house immediately to the north) to the interest provided by the Conservation Area's buildings. The existing garage, on the other hand, sits immediately adjacent to the highway. The proposed new garage will be positioned 7m further from its existing location, and will be sited well within the site. Given the relative, and acceptable, increase in the size of the new garage (it will be 2m longer and 1m higher), I consider that the slight difference in land levels as you enter the site will ensure that the garage will be subservient to the main bungalow, meaning that the setting of the Conservation Area and the openness of the A.O.N.B at this location is considered to be preserved. The key elevation to the site will be the southeast elevation, which faces onto The Dene, and given the garage will be set back into the site, I am of the opinion that the scheme will not dominate this part of the Conservation Area/A.O.N.B. Bearing this in mind, the proposal is considered to comply with the relevant Policies and the SPG note 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'.

OTHER ISSUES

There are a number of points of objection raised with regards to the application being misleading however, the forms and the correct Certificates have been signed so as submitted the Department consider that there is little wrong with the proposal. Other objection points note the inappropriate use of materials, however there are a mixture of house styles and materials in the nearby vicinity, including the garage for no. 5 The Dene which is also faced in stone. As such, I do not feel the materials proposed are out of keeping with the area.

Therefore, whilst I am mindful of the points of objection from nearby neighbours and from the Parish Council, I consider the scheme to comply with the relevant Local Plan Policies and the SPG note 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings', and as such be recommended accordingly.

SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR APPROVAL

The proposal is in accordance with the relevant policies and guidance relating to new residential development and would not have any seriously detrimental effects upon the character or appearance of the Conservation Area, upon visual amenity, the amenities of nearby residents or upon highway safety.

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

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

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

2. The permission shall relate to the development as shown on Plan Drawing No. PA – 0078.

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

3. The proposed garage/car port shall be for private and domestic purposes only and no trade or business whatsoever shall be carried out from within the building.

REASON: In order to safeguard nearby residential amenities as provided for within Policies G1 and H10 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan and the adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance “Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings”.

4. The proposed garage shall not be used for any purpose (including any purpose ordinarily incidental to the enjoyment of the dwelling house as such) which would preclude its use for the parking of a private motor vehicle.

REASON: In the interests of visual amenity and to facilitate adequate vehicle parking and/or turning facilities to serve the dwelling in accordance with Policy G1 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan and the adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance “Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings”.

APPLICATION NO: 3/2011/0202/P (GRID REF: SD 360979 437006)
TWO STOREY FRONT AND SIDE EXTENSIONS WITH ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION. INCREASE IN ROOF PITCH TO ACCOMMODATE LOFT CONVERSION WITH TWO DORMERS TO THE SOUTH EAST ELEVATION, PHOTOVOLTAIC INTEGRATED TILE PANELS TO THE SOUTH EASTERN ROOFSLOPE WITH ADDITIONAL PARKING TO THE FRONT OF THE PROPERTY AT 1 ALSTON COURT, LOWER LANE, LONGRIDGE.

PARISH COUNCIL: No comments received at the time of writing this report with regards to the amended plans. The Parish Council made an objection to the initial plans on the basis that the development continues to be over-scaled in relation to the existing property, and will lead to an over-intensive use of the site and create a building out of character with others in the general area.

ENVIRONMENT DIRECTORATE (COUNTY SURVEYOR): No written representations received at the time of writing this report. Verbally confirmed no objection to the amended application on highway safety grounds on the basis of additional parking being made available by retaining the attached garage.

COUNTRYSIDE OFFICER (RVBC): No objection. Recommends appropriate condition in order to safeguard the existing trees which are part of a Tree Preservation Order (TPO).

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS: Five letters of objection have been received from neighbouring residents, who wish to raise a number of objections, summarised as follows:

- Overlarge extension and unsympathetic design resulting in overbearing impact and overdevelopment of the site.
- Loss of light due to increased size, width and height.
- Development would alter the character and setting of the estate.
- Loss of privacy as a result of the house moving forward and the increase in height.
- Ratio of proposed building to plot size is disproportionate.
- Noise disturbance as a result of number of people living at the property.
- Lack of parking provision resulting in increased likelihood of parking on Lower Lane with subsequent impact upon highway safety.
- Potential impact upon trees protected by a Tree Preservation Order.

Objectors to the application also wish to note that they consider that the latest amendment does not alter any of their previous concerns, as it is in effect the same property as proposed in the first application. The concern is that the amended application has been window dressed to appear to have fewer bedrooms and more “non-bedrooms”, but the property can still accommodate 8/9 bedrooms with the same requirement for parking.

Proposal

The amended plans which form the basis of this report is the third submission made by the applicant for a number of extensions to the existing property in order to provide additional accommodation. This application has sought to address the main concerns of previous submissions by virtue of reducing the massing of the extensions against the original property, safeguarding trees that are protected by a Tree Preservation Order and meeting parking standards at the property. Therefore the application as proposed includes the projection of the front building line of the property at ground and first floor level by 1.5 metres, the part demolition of the existing utility to the south-western elevation of the property and part demolition of the garage to accommodate a two-storey extension measuring 3.5m x 6.3m x 7.7m in height to the ridge, with an extension of same measurements to the north-eastern gable elevation of the property. The south-eastern roofslope of the two-storey side extensions are to be installed with integrated solar photovoltaic tiles. The majority of the existing footprint of the attached garage to the south-western elevation of the property is to be retained, but with the partial demolition proposed, is to be reduced to a single car garage with dimensions of 3.8m x 6.1m x 4.8m in height with a hipped roof. To the rear, the existing conservatory is to be demolished and

replaced with a single storey flat-roofed extension measuring 3.4m x 17.4m, with a maximum height of 3.2 metres. The ridge height of the main property is to be increased by 1 metre with the addition of two piked dormers to the front roofslope with velux windows to the rear.

Site Location

The property is one of three large detached properties within the residential estate of Alston Court, with shared access onto Lower Lane, within the main settlement of Longridge. A 2 metre in height stone boundary wall marks the northern edge of the application site with a number of mature trees flanking the western edge protected by a Tree Preservation Order, with again a high stone boundary wall on the far eastern common boundary between the applicants property and 'The Coach House'.

Relevant History

3/2011/0028 – Demolition of existing attached double garage/utility room and conservatory. Erection of two-storey side/front extension, single storey rear and side extension including annexe accommodation for dependent relatives. Two balconies to main bedrooms and green roof to NW elevation. Solar panels to SW elevation. Dormers to SE elevation. Increase in roof pitch for loft conversion. Internal alterations. Additional parking. Integrated solar photovoltaic tiles to SE elevation – Application withdrawn by applicant 21/02/2011

Relevant Policies

Policy G1 – Development Control.

Policy ENV13 – Landscape Protection.

Policy H10 – Residential Extensions.

Policy SPG – “Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings”.

Environmental, AONB, Human Rights and Other Issues

Matters for consideration in the determination of this application are the impact of the development upon the amenity of neighbouring residents, the visual appearance of the proposed development as viewed from Lower Lane and within the estate, as well as the potential impact upon trees within the immediate vicinity which are protected by a Tree Preservation Order, discussed as follows:

Visual Appearance

With regards to the appearance of the property as a result of the proposed extensions I note the concerns from neighbouring residents with regards to the size of the property and its visual appearance. A calculation of the percentage increase in floor space from the original at 205m² to the proposed at 476m² amounts to a 131 percentage increase in total floor space. Whilst the Councils SPG “Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings” provides an indicative guide of not to increase the size of the original dwelling by in excess of a 75% increase in floor area, it does state however that extensions above this threshold ‘does not mean that large extensions will be automatically refused, they do however need to be carefully considered’. I note the concerns from neighbouring residents with regards to the extensions resulting in a property, which is not

suitable for its plots size. The existing property benefits from a large plot and as such consider that there will still remain adequate amenity space to the sides and rear of the property after the subsequent additions to the property have been built, thus ensuring that the property does not have a cramped appearance. I consider that the amended scheme as proposed is an improvement upon the initial plans that were submitted as part of this application. In particular, the side extensions will appear more 'balanced' against the original property and respect the form and detailing of the original dwelling, as will the additional piked roof dormers to the front roofslope and the proposed window and door alterations. In addition, as the side extensions will be set back from the proposed front building line of the property by 1.5 metres and set down from the main ridge height by 0.4 metres they will appear as subservient additions to the main property in accordance with the Councils SPG 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'.

I consider that the increase in ridge height of the main property with the additional extensions to the side will not prove visually dominant or incongruous in the street scene. The two-storey property is set back from the centre of Lower Lane by 17.5 metres, in addition the 2 metre high boundary wall that runs along the full northern boundary of the property will obscure the majority of the property and in particular the flat roofed extension to the rear when viewed within the public realm from Lower Lane. The mature trees to the north-western edge of the site (protected by a T.P.O) will obscure the property at first floor level, thus reducing the visual prominence of the property within the street scene.

Potential Impact Upon the Amenity of Neighbouring Residents

I note the concern with regards to the potential impact of the increased ridge height and projection of the front elevation upon privacy and loss of light. With regards to the latter, no windows are proposed to be inserted to the north-eastern gable elevation of the proposed side extension, which faces 'The Coach House', and an existing stone boundary wall on the common boundary will safeguard privacy at ground floor level. The distance between the front elevation of the property and the front elevation of 2 Alston Court will be reduced 1.5 metres as a result of the proposed two-storey extension to the existing front elevation, however a distance of over 20 metres will remain between the two properties. I am therefore satisfied, even with the increase of ridge height and the insertion of piked dormers to the front roofslope that any impact upon the privacy of residents at 2 Alston Court will be minimal and not sufficient so as to warrant refusal of the application.

It is also considered that as the distance between the proposed extensions and residential property 'The Coach House' to the north-east (of which the majority of the property is sited forward of the front building line of the applicants property) is over 12 metres away, and the property is over 20 metres from 2 Alston Court to the south-east, any impact upon loss of light to these properties will be minimal. In addition, due to the distance between the applicants property and those immediately adjacent, it is considered that any noise disturbance as a result of the number of people residing at the property will be minimal.

Potential Impact Upon Highway Safety

I note the concerns with regards to lack of parking provision. The County Surveyor initially raised an objection to the application on the basis that 'the site plan identifies car parking provision for three vehicles, with the removal of the existing integral garage.....this provision is not realistic for the proposed function of the property both now and in the future'. However the amended site plan (Drg. No. 1752/3 Rev. H) identifies three parking spaces to the front of the property with space for one further vehicle in the attached garage. Whilst the County Surveyor

has not submitted formal comments with regards to this amendment at the time of writing this report, I can confirm that he has seen sight of the amended plan and has verbally confirmed that he has no objection to this arrangement. Of note is the reference he made to this arrangement in his initial formal comments in which he states that 'I am aware that it is possible to arrange the parking layout in a manner that would allow increased off street parking provision. It has also been indicated to me that the games room could be made available as a garage space. The relevant amendments should be shown on a revised site plan.....I would have no objection if the Planning Committee were minded to approve this application subject to the implementation of a suitable Condition requiring the provision of the requisite off street parking provisions'. Whilst I note the concerns with regards to the possibility of use of rooms in the property to be changed to bedrooms in the future, the authority can only base their determination on what is submitted as part of this amended application, of which the ratio of bedrooms to parking spaces is considered to be sufficient for the County Surveyor to raise no objection. In order to address this concern and if committee are mindful to approve the application I have recommended a condition stating that the integral garage cannot be used for purposes incidental to the enjoyment of the property in the future without seeking formal consent from the Local Planning Authority.

Potential Impact Upon Trees Protected by a Tree Preservation Order (T.P.O)

A Tree Preservation Order protects all trees towards the north-west of the application site, adjacent to the main access to Alston Court, as well as trees to the northern boundary and to the rear of the applicants property. I note the concerns from neighbouring residents with regards to the potential impact of the development upon the appearance and possible loss of these trees. The submitted tree survey and site plan (Drg. No. 1752/3 Rev. H) states that a number of trees are to be pruned, that a diseased horse chestnut is to be removed and that a number of trees are to be removed to the north-eastern boundary of the property. The applicant has subsequently confirmed via e-mail that the trees to be removed are T12 – 16 to the north-eastern boundary of the property as indicated on the submitted site plan, and that he now has no intention of removing the Chestnut (T10). The Countryside Officer is aware of the proposed removal of these trees and is satisfied with this proposal. In addition, as the footprint of the building is to be retained towards the north-western part of the property, with no further encroachment of built development he has no objection to the amended application in terms of the impact of the proposed development upon the protection and future retention of these trees. In order to ensure that trees T1-11 as well as T17 (which are subject to a T.P.O) are protected during construction works and that no tree surgery or pruning is carried out to these trees an appropriate condition is placed on the decision notice.

I note from a neighbouring resident concern with regards to which plans would be used to specify the work as the application has been partly amended. I can confirm that all initial plans will be superseded and that notwithstanding the information submitted in the initial Design and Access Statement and Application Form, the plans to be referred to if committee are minded to approve the application and of which shall be referred to throughout all construction works, are the full scale amended drawings only, as outlined in condition 2. of this report.

Therefore, having regard to all the above I am of the opinion that 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.

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 is 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 plans received on the 16th of May 2011. Drawing number 1752/1 Rev. B in relation to existing floor plans and elevations and the extent of the existing property to be demolished. Drawing number 1752/2 Rev. H in relation to the proposed ground and first floor and Drawing number 1752/3 Rev. H in relation to the proposed loft, elevations and site plan.

REASON: For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the submitted plans in accordance with Policy G1 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan.

3. The attached garage shall not be used for any purpose (including any purpose ordinarily incidental to the enjoyment of the dwelling house as such) which would preclude its use for the parking of a private motor vehicle.

REASON: In order to facilitate adequate vehicle parking to serve the dwelling in accordance with Policy G1 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan.

4. Unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority the mitigation measures (para. 5.1 and 5.2) as outlined in the Bat Survey submitted with the application should be adhered to during any construction works.

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

5. Prior to commencement of any site works including delivery of building materials and excavations for foundations or services all trees included in the Alston Court Tree Preservation Order [W1] and identified in the arboricultural/tree survey report [tree T1 – T11 + T17 inclusive] shall be protected in accordance with the BS5837 [Trees in Relation to Construction] the details of which, including a tree protection monitoring schedule, shall be submitted, agreed in writing and implemented in full.

The root protection zone shall be 12 x the DBH and shall remain in place until all building work has been completed and all excess materials have been removed from site including soil/spoil and rubble.

During the building works no excavations or changes in ground levels shall take place and no building materials/spoil/soil/rubble shall be stored or redistributed within the protection zone, in addition no impermeable surfacing shall be constructed within the protection zone.

No tree surgery or pruning shall be implemented with out prior written consent, which will only be granted when the local authority is satisfied that it is necessary, will be in accordance with BS3998 for tree work and carried out by an approved arboricultural contractor.

REASON: In order to ensure that any trees affected by development and included in a Tree Preservation Order considered to be of visual, historic or botanical value are afforded maximum physical protection from the adverse affects of development. In order to comply with planning policies G1, ENV13 of the District Wide 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 by the Local Planning Authority before their use in the proposed works.

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

7. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning General Permitted Development Order 2008 (or any Order revoking or re-enacting that Order) any future extensions, external alterations to the dwelling including any development within the curtilage as defined in Schedule 2 Part 1 Classes A to H shall not be carried out without the formal consent of the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: In order that the Local Planning Authority shall retain effective control over the development in accordance with Policy G1 in the interests of safeguarding residential and visual amenity and also to safeguard trees protected by a T.P.O from future development in compliance with Policy ENV13 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan.

8. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning General Permitted Development Order 2008 (or any Order revoking or re-enacting that Order) any future additional structures, hard standing or fences as defined in Schedule 2 Part I Classes E, F and G, and Part II Class A, shall not be carried out without the formal consent of the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: In order that the Local Planning Authority shall retain effective control over the development in accordance with Policy G1 in the interests of safeguarding residential and visual amenity and also to safeguard trees protected by a T.P.O from future development in compliance with Policy ENV13 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan.

APPLICATION NO: 3/2011/0216/P (GRID REF: SD 364143 431224)
ERECTION OF ONE DWELLING ON LAND AT WHALLEY ROAD, MELLOR BROOK,
BLACKBURN

- MELLOR PARISH COUNCIL: No objections to the application.
- BALDERSTONE PARISH COUNCIL: No observations or comments received at the time of this reports submission.
- ENVIRONMENT DIRECTORATE (COUNTY SURVEYOR): No objections on highway safety grounds.
- ENVIRONMENT AGENCY: No objection in principle to the proposed development, subject to certain Condition's should the Council grant permission.
- UNITED UTILITIES: No observations or comments received at the time of this reports submission, however the Agent has provided a copy of a letter from UU relating to the proposed development, dated 12 January 2011.
- ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS: Two letters has been received from an adjacent neighbour who wishes to raise the following points of objection:
1. Aintree Cottages were built in the late 18th Century, and a detached, three bedroom property built in front of them will not be in keeping with the properties within the Mellor Brook (actual brook), Whalley Road and Mellor Brook Road Triangle.
 2. All properties in the vicinity are stone, and we object to this property having three sides in render. Why should only the road facing elevation be stone when we will look at rendered sides?
 3. New properties at The Willows are even built in reconstituted stone (although they do not exactly blend in with other properties).
 4. Plans show an 'assumed' line for a sewer, however United Utilities have not been consulted.
 5. During periods of sustained rainfall, the pumping station on the site is unable to handle the volume and a mixture of foul and surface waters flow into the Brook.
 6. Noise disturbance during construction.
 7. The amendment to the plans involves a revised parking area which requires a significant amount of infill which would potentially affect the drainage of the site.
 8. The Applicant is not seeking to build the house, merely use the enhanced value of the land to help fund his business.

9. We have concerns that it could be used as a base for his business in the future?

Proposal

This application seeks permission for the erection of a detached two-storey, three bedroom dwelling within land adjacent to Whalley Road, Mellor Brook. The land is currently private residential land within the ownership of the owner of no. 5 Aintree Cottages. The dwelling is designed as a traditional two-storey dwelling, with a single storey side extension. The Agent notes that the dwelling will be constructed in traditional materials to complement the existing properties in the area, and following an e-mail received on the 26 May 2011 the Agent has confirmed that the Applicant is happy to use stone facing on all elevations. The plans have been amended to alter the parking area for the property, which has required the existing vehicular opening onto Whalley Road to be widened by 2m.

Site Location

The site is located within the village settlement boundary of Mellor Brook, as designated by the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan.

Relevant History

No relevant history.

Relevant Policies

Policy G1 - Development Control.

Policy G3 – Settlement Strategy.

Policy T7 – Parking Provision.

SPG – “Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings”.

PPS3 - Housing (June 2010).

Affordable Housing Memorandum of Understanding (AHMU).

Environmental, AONB, Human Rights and Other Issues

The matters for consideration in the determination of this application involve an assessment of the application in relation to the currently applicable housing policy, the effects of the development on visual amenity and the amenities of nearby residents. There are no objections raised from a highway safety point of view.

PRINCIPLE OF THE DEVELOPMENT

As Committee will be aware, applications for new housing are now determined in accordance with the Saved Settlement Strategy Policies of the Local Plan which, for this development within the Village Settlement Boundary of Mellor Brook, is Policy G3. That policy defines as acceptable, the development or redevelopment of land wholly within the settlement boundary. As the application site lies within the boundary and is surrounded by development, I consider that it complies with Policy G3. In addition, as a single dwelling within the Settlement Boundary of Mellor Brook, there is no requirement under the terms of the Affordable Housing Memorandum of Understanding (AHMU) for the dwelling to be ‘affordable’. The proposed

development of this site for one dwelling is therefore acceptable in principle when considered in relation to the current housing policies and guidance.

VISUAL IMPACT OF THE DEVELOPMENT

The land in question sits to the east of Aintree Cottages and on the south side of Whalley Road, Mellor Brook. The land levels on the site drop away from the adjacent highway gradually, leaving the finished floor level of the proposed dwelling approximately 3m lower than Whalley Road. The parking area for the property will remain level with the highway. The main part of the dwelling proposed has a footprint measuring approximately 9m (in width) x 7m (in depth), with single storey extension on the western facing elevation with a footprint of 4m x 6m. The overall height of the dwelling to the ridge will be approximately 8m. The scheme involves the removal of a number of Leylandii trees close to the stone retaining wall that separates the site from Whalley Road, as well a number of smaller, ornamental trees from within the site to allow the site to be developed.

Visually, any development of this site will affect the streetscene and views through the site, however in order to refuse a development the harm of a proposal must be demonstrated. The dwelling itself has been designed to blend in with the adjacent properties on Whalley Road in terms of its scale, principle elevation, size and massing, and following an e-mail from the Agent dated 26 May 2011, the Applicant is happy to use stone on all elevations of the property in order to blend with nearby properties and also negate one of the points of objection. The dwelling is considered to fit neatly within the site, and provides sufficient amenity space around it to ensure it does not appear cramped within the streetscene. I am satisfied that the materials proposed, and the principle elevations, size and massing of the dwelling are acceptable in this particular area of the streetscene. On this basis, the visual impact is considered to be acceptable.

With regards to the views of the site from the adjacent dwellings known as Aintree Cottages, the existing trees to the southwest corner of the site will be retained as part of this development, with the existing gateway in the stone wall built up to enclose the site. The building itself is over 20m away, and considering its present use as private residential amenity space, I have no concerns regarding the visual impact of this site from the views of occupiers of the adjacent dwellings.

On this basis, the scale, design and massing of the proposed new dwelling is considered to be visually acceptable within the streetscene.

IMPACT ON RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

One of the main concerns in regards to the proposed development is the potential overlooking/loss of privacy caused by the development of this site, however given the present use of this site as private, residential amenity space, the question is whether or not the erection of a dwelling on this site will exacerbate the present situation. The guidance provided within the SPG – “Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings” discusses a distance of 21m between existing dwellings and the proposed first floor windows of habitable rooms in new developments. However, given the orientation of the proposed property, namely that its first floor windows are at right angles to the main elevations of properties on both The Willows and those known as Aintree Cottages, I do not consider that the property will cause a loss of privacy to the occupiers of these properties. The land to the south of the site is garden area used by occupiers of Aintree Cottages, however given the orientation of the property on site, and significant band of screening provided on the boundary of the site around the pumping station, I do not consider

that the scheme will have a significant detrimental impact on the amenity or enjoyment of the adjacent garden space south of the site.

OTHER ISSUES

The objector has raised an issue regarding the impact of the development on the existing pipeline that runs through the site, however although no formal reply has been received from United Utilities, the Agent has provided a copy of a letter from UU relating to the proposed development, dated 12 January 2011, in which it states the requirements for development on and around this site. On this basis, I am satisfied the development is achievable and will have no significant impact on the pipeline crossing the site.

Bearing this in mind, it is considered that the scheme submitted complies with the relevant Local, Regional and National Policies. Therefore, bearing in mind the above comments and whilst I am mindful of the points of objection from the nearby neighbour, I recommended the scheme accordingly.

SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR APPROVAL

The proposal is in accordance with the relevant policies and guidance relating to new residential development and 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 conditions:

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

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

2. Notwithstanding details regarding the proposed materials to be used for the dwelling hereby approved, the permission shall relate to the development as shown on Plan Drawing No's PL-01A, PL-11, E:01 and WALSH 02.

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 20 April 2011.

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

4. Precise specifications and samples of walling and roofing materials and details of any window and door surrounds including materials to be used shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before their use in the proposed works.

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

Districtwide Local Plan and the adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance – “Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings”.

5. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning General Permitted Development Order 2008 (or any order revoking or re-enacting that Order) any future extensions or external alterations to the dwelling, including any development within the curtilage, hard standing or fences, as defined in Schedule 2 Part 1 Classes A to H, and Part II Class A, shall not be carried out without the formal consent of the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: In order that the Local Planning Authority shall retain effective control over the development to ensure compliance with Policy G1 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan.

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

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

7. The car parking area indicated on plan drawing no. E:01 shall be surfaced/ paved and marked out in accordance with the approved plan, and made available for use prior to the occupation of the dwelling hereby.

REASON: To comply with Policies G1 and T7 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan and to allow for the effective use of the parking areas.

8. 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.

9. No development shall take place until a scheme for the boundary treatment adjacent to the watercourse has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such a scheme shall be completed in accordance with the approved plans.

REASON: To protect and conserve the habitat and amenity value of Mellor Brook.

10. Prior to commencement of any site works, including delivery of building materials and excavations for foundations or services, the trees identified on the site plan shall be protected in accordance with the BS5837 [Trees in Relation to Construction] the details of which shall be agreed in writing.

A protection zone 12 x the DBH covering at least the entire branch spread of the tree/s, [the area of the root soil environment measured from the centre of the trunk to the edge of the branch spread] shall be physically protected and remain in place until all building work has

been completed and all excess materials have been removed from site including soil/spoil and rubble.

During the building works no excavations or changes in ground levels shall take place and no building materials/spoil/soil/rubble shall be stored or redistributed within the protection zone, in addition no impermeable surfacing shall be constructed within the protection zone.

REASON: In order to ensure that any trees affected by development are afforded maximum physical protection from the adverse affects of development.

INFORMATIVES

The proposed development is in close proximity to a watercourse and access to carry out maintenance works to remove any blockages or to ensure the freeflow of water is likely to be restricted. Therefore it is recommended that the proposal be amended or assessed to ensure that future maintenance responsibilities by the riparian owner can be fulfilled.

Any works to the watercourses within or adjacent to the site which involve infilling, diversion or culverting or which may otherwise restrict flow, require the formal Consent of the Environment Agency under Section 23 of the Land Drainage Act 1991. Culverting other than for access purposes is unlikely to receive Consent, without full mitigation for loss of flood storage and habitats.

Development on this site should be drained on separate foul and surface water systems. All foul drainage must be connected to the foul sewer and only uncontaminated surface water should be connected to the surface water system.

However, where there are established combined systems the possibility of deviation from this general policy may be discussed with the Council's Chief Technical Officer.

Under the terms of the Water Resources Act 1991, the prior written consent of the Agency is normally required for any discharge of sewage or trade effluent into controlled waters, and may be required for any discharge of surface water to such controlled waters or for any discharge of sewage or trade effluent from buildings or fixed plant into or onto ground or into waters which are not controlled waters. Such consent may be withheld. (Controlled waters include rivers, streams, groundwater, reservoirs, estuaries and coastal waters).

The foul drainage system should be sited so as not to cause pollution of any watercourse, well, borehole, spring or groundwater.

Establishments of this nature can cause problems when connected to a septic tank. The applicant would be advised to consider the use of a package sewage treatment plant for preference.

All downspouts should be sealed directly into the ground ensuring the only open grids present around each dwelling are connected to the foul sewerage systems.

APPLICATION NO: 3/2011/0272/P

(GRID REF: SD 372382 437803)

PROPOSED 25 BED LOW SECURE UNIT WITH DAY FACILITIES AND SECURITY FENCING, INCLUDING PERIMETER OF ADJACENT BUILDINGS, NEW VEHICULAR ACCESS TO PENDLECROFT, IMPROVEMENTS TO MAIN HOSPITAL ACCESS FROM MITTON ROAD AT CALDERSTONES PARTNERSHIP NHS FOUNDATION TRUST, MITTON ROAD, WHALLEY

PARISH COUNCIL: The Parish Council has no observations to make on this application.

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

The increased secure provision to be provided on the site will have minimal impact on the adjacent local highway network, with the exception of a marginal increase in servicing and deliveries to the site. I have had detailed discussions with the applicants highway engineer concerning the proposed access improvements at the junction of Chestnut Avenue with Mitton Road.

The site plan drawing H-048849-02-SK3 is the agreed junction design, providing swept path realignment to both north and south sides of the junction and improvements in pedestrian facilities. There is also an alternative design, -SK4, and this could be considered should the proposed footway provision affect the root protection area of trees to the north side of Chestnut Avenue. The revised arrangement would retain the pedestrian facilities and acceptable sight lines.

In view of the retained highway benefits, I would have no objection to either of the junction improvement schemes that are being suggested, but it should be noted that the scheme – SK3 provides additional benefits and is to be progressed as a priority. Only in circumstances where –SK3 cannot proceed, due to an adverse impact on the root protection areas, should SK4 be taken forward.

ENVIRONMENT DIRECTORATE (CONTRIBUTIONS OFFICER): Confirms that details of this application have been circulated to the relevant contacts but no requests for any planning contributions have been received.

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS: Two letters have been received from nearby residents on Calderstones Drive who object to the application on the following grounds:

1. The security fence is to be moved to a position immediately behind the 2m high brick wall in front of their properties. If this is the same as the existing security fencing, it will look unattractive and obtrusive.

It will emphasise what the hospital is used for and will detract from their quality of life.

2. It is stated in the application that the fencing will provide additional security for neighbours, which suggests the need for security, possibly due to the position of a new unit. This is worrying to the neighbour as a mother of young children.
3. Given the land available within the site, some of which borders open fields, is the best place for this unit so close to family housing?
4. Increased noise and lighting from the unit that will be in 24 hour use and there will also be CCTV cameras and extra noise from the plant room.
5. The trees and shrubbery along both sides of their property that border the hospital will be adversely affected by the proposed development.
6. The proposal will adversely affect the value of adjoining dwellings.

Proposal

There are four main elements to this application as follows:

- A The erection of a new 25 bedroom low secure unit with day facilities. This is in the form of an L shape building that would adjoin the southern and eastern edges of the existing X shaped phase I building. The building would be predominantly single storey but the day unit at the southwestern corner of the building would be two storey. The two legs of the 'L' would have overall lengths of approximately 104m and 85m.

Although there are different roof heights to provide interest in the design, the lowest eaves height and the maximum ridge height of the single storey part of the building are approximately 3m and 5.9m respectively. The two storey day unit has eaves/ridge heights of approximately 6m/9.7m.

The proposed external materials include the following:

1. Slate grey coloured interlocking concrete roof tiles.
2. Red multi facing brickwork.
3. A contrasting dark brick up to 150mm above finished floor level and to a number of feature panels.
4. Coloured render.
5. Horizontal and vertical cladding of a colour to be confirmed.

6. Rainwater goods, eaves, soffits, window frames and doors are to be white UPVC except for aluminium coated sliding doors and adjacent window frames to the main entrance.
- B The provision of 3.5m high dark green coloured security fencing around the proposed facility and also around other existing buildings. Much of this fencing is internal to the hospital complex but, on the northern edge of the site, it would be close to residential properties and close to an area of open space on the south side of Calderstones Drive.
- C The widening of an internal road and new turning area at Pendlecroft. Pendlecroft is an industrial type unit which currently provides a toilet and changing room for the garden centre and a variety of activity workshops providing day facilities for the service users of Maplewood phase 1 and those who will occupy phase 2. These functions are to be transferred on a smaller scale to the new day unit comprised in this current application, and the small printing facility will be transferred to Ribble Lodge. The garden centre toilet will remain, but the vacated parts of Pendle Croft will then become a facilities department base with workshop, storage and a delivery point for all large vehicles to the site.
- D Improvements to the junction of the main site access road with Mitton Road to assist the turning movements of large commercial vehicles.

There are two alternative options for this improvement, both of which will impact upon surrounding trees. It is therefore proposed that the preferred option of the County Surveyor (drawing number SK3) will be considered.

The submitted plans also show a detailed landscaping scheme; details of external lighting and details of three new external CCTV cameras.

Site Location

The application relates to the existing Calderstones Hospital located off the western side of Mitton Road, Whalley and to the south of the housing development of Calderstones Park. The main part of the proposed development is in the north eastern corner of the hospital complex. A separate part of the application site is around the junction of Chestnut Drive (the main access road into the hospital) and Mitton Road.

Relevant History

1994/0241 – All weather play area. Approved.
 2000/0224 – Reconstruction of junction of Chestnut Drive and Mitton Road. Approved.
 2000/0425 – Erection of internal fencing. Approved.
 2000/0552 – erection of polytunnel. Approved.
 2000/0898 – new build 20 bed unit (Maplewood phase I). Approved with conditions.
 2000/899 – new two storey ward accommodation. Approved with conditions.
 2003/0022 – gate house on main driveway. Approved.
 2005/0252 – new build 36 bed medium secure unit to replace existing unsuitable accommodation. Outline permission granted subject to conditions.
 2005/0912 – new build 36 bed medium secure unit to replace existing unsuitable accommodation. Full planning permission granted subject to conditions.

2006/0437 – new external generator and oil tank. Approved with conditions.

Relevant Policies

Policy G1 - Development Control.

Policy G5 - Settlement Strategy.

Policy ENV3 - Development in Open Countryside.

Policy A3 Calderstones Area Policy.

Environmental, AONB, Human Rights and Other Issues

The planning permission for Maplewood phase 1 (3/00/0898/P) was granted in February 2001 and included a linked two storey day unit building with a floor area of 646m² which was intended as a later phase of development on the current application site. The day unit has not been constructed but the permission is still valid as it was part of the original application that has been partially implemented. The facilities that were to be included in the day unit are now included in the current proposals in a different location to combine with the function of a main entrance to Maplewood phases 1 and 2.

Concurrently with the permission for Maplewood phase 1, outline permission 3/00/0899 was granted in February 2001 for new build two storey ward accommodation on the current application site comprising floor space of 4240m², to replace the buildings demolished for the construction of Maplewood phase 1. That outline permission has now lapsed.

The current application is for 3410m² gross internal floor area which is substantially less than the previous outline approval and the unbuilt day unit that was originally approved (4240 + 646 = 4886m² in total). It is also worthy of note that the current application is substantially single storey with 2883m² at ground floor level and only 527m² gross internal floor area on the upper floor. Additionally, the two storey part of the building is now located in a position where it is furthest away from the neighbouring houses on Calderstones Drive.

Planning permission 3/2000/0224/P was granted in May 2000 for the reconstruction of the junction of Chestnut Drive and Mitton Road. The approved work has not been implemented and that permission has now lapsed. An alternative scheme of improvements to this junction is now included as part of this current application. This comprises the realignment of kerbs to provide an increased radius for large vehicles and the retention of a central island for pedestrians on Chestnut Drive.

The proposed new building will accommodate 25 service users who are currently housed in unsuitable accommodation on Chestnut Drive. The applicant's agent has advised that future proposals for the building on Chestnut Drive will be submitted in due course which will be the last major stage of modernising the hospital. This current application does not increase the occupancy of the hospital but will facilitate one further potential re-development of redundant buildings on Chestnut Drive which will be vacated at the completion of this currently proposed development.

The agent has advised that there has been no significant change to the occupants of Maplewood phase 1 since its first occupation. However, when phase 2 is completed, it is proposed that the phase 1 building will be occupied predominantly by females. Phase 2 will be the same low secure registration, but constructed to current national standards which are slightly enhanced from phase 1 in terms of ceiling heights, fencing and robustness. Phase 2 will

therefore provide accommodation predominantly for male service users. Both buildings are divided into flats allowing flexibility as ratios between males and females change. It is proposed that the less challenging service users will be accommodated in the existing building closest to the boundary with the adjacent housing.

The main element of the application (the construction of the low secure unit with day facilities) effectively comprises an amended means of providing new accommodation/facilities for which planning permissions have previously been granted. For that reason, and as the development is within the confines of the existing hospital complex, I can see no objections in principle to this main element of the proposal.

With regards to matters of detail, I consider the design and external materials to be appropriate for the site (although precise details of the external materials will need to be submitted for approval at a later date). As the use of the building is similar to the existing phase I building, I consider this to be acceptable with regards to its relationship with the adjoining residential properties.

The changes to the internal road layout in order to provide an approved access to Pendle Croft for larger commercial vehicles will not have any implications outside the site. The County Surveyor has no objections to this element of the application. These alterations to the internal road layout do, however, have implications for existing trees on this part of the site. Subject to the imposition of a Tree Protection Condition, however, the Countryside Officer has no objections to this particular aspect of the development.

A scheme of alterations to the Chestnut Drive junction with Mitton Road has previously been approved. The County Surveyor has been involved in the formulation of the scheme of alterations for that junction that is put forward in this application. He therefore has no objections to the junction improvements as shown on submitted drawing number SK3. Again, this element of the application has implication for trees in the vicinity, but is considered to be acceptable by the Countryside Officer subject to the imposition of a condition.

The final main element of the proposal relates to the erection of 3.5m high dark green coloured security fencing in positions both within and on the boundaries of the site.

Two nearby residents have expressed objections to the erection of this fencing immediately behind the 2m high brick wall in front of their dwellings. This fencing, however, is an important and integral part of this hospital facility. As stated, it will be dark green in colour to match similar fencing elsewhere within the site and the bottom 2m of its 3.5m height will be hidden from view by the existing brick wall. There are also existing shrubs/trees on the resident's side of the wall that will also serve to screen the fence and "soften" its impact.

Overall, I consider this aspect of the proposed development to be acceptable with regards to its effects upon visual amenity and the amenities of nearby residents.

The proposed three new CCTV camera installations are not unduly close to any residential properties; and I consider that the proposed lighting scheme has also been designed such that it would not adversely effect nearby residents. Overall, I can see no sustainable objections to any aspect of the proposed development subject to appropriate conditions.

SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR APPROVAL

The proposal will result in improved facilities for the existing established hospital, an improved access into the site and improved road layout within the site without any serious detriment to the visual amenities of the locality, 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 proposed development as shown on the submitted drawing numbers as follows:

- 08-0905-105 REVE – Pendle Croft
- 08-0905-108 REVA – Tree works Plan
- 08-0905-110 REVV – Proposed site plan
- 08-0905-111 – External works plan
- 08-0905-112 (sheet 1) – Proposed site levels
- 08-0905-113 (sheet 2) – Proposed site levels
- 08-0905-151 REVA – Proposed elevations
- 08-0905-152 REVD – Proposed elevations
- CS-048270-800-001 – Proposed drainage layout
- CAL-CS-DFP-ES-G540-004 REVP1 – External lighting
- CAL-CS-DFP-ES-G571-001 REVP1 – External CCTV locations
- CAL-LA-900-001 REVP1 – Landscape general arrangement
- CAL-LA-900-002 REVP1 – Landscaping staff break area
- CAP-LA-900-003 REVP1 – Landscaping widened access road
- H-048849-02-SK3 – Access design

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

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

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

4. Prior to commencement of any site works including delivery of building materials and excavations for foundations or services all trees included in the Calderstones Tree Preservation Order and identified in the arboricultural/tree survey dated the 3 May/13 May 2001 to be retained shall be protected in accordance with the BS5837 [Trees in Relation to Construction] the details of which, including, a tree protection monitoring schedule, shall be submitted, agreed in writing and fully implemented.

The root protection zone shall be 12 x the DBH and shall remain in place until all building work has been completed and all excess materials have been removed from site including soil/spoil and rubble.

During the building works no excavations or changes in ground levels shall take place and no building materials/spoil/soil/rubble shall be stored or redistributed within the protection zone, in addition no impermeable surfacing shall be constructed within the protection zone.

No tree surgery or pruning shall be implemented with out prior written consent, which will only be granted when the local authority is satisfied that it is necessary, will be in accordance with BS3998 for tree work and carried out by an approved arboricultural contractor.

REASON: In order to ensure that any trees affected by development and included in the Calderstones Tree Preservation Order and considered to be of visual, historic or botanical value are afforded maximum physical protection from the adverse affects of development in order to comply with Policies G1 and ENV13 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan.

5. The landscaping scheme (as shown on drawing numbers CAL-LA-900-001 REVP1, 002 REVP1 and 003 REVP1) 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.

APPLICATION NO: 3/2011/0330/P (GRID REF: SD 369967 436646)
CONSTRUCTION OF A FIVE BEDROOM DETACHED DWELLING. CHANGE OF DESIGN OF THE ORIGINALLY APPROVED DWELLING (3/2007/1071/P), APPROVED ON APPEAL AND REMOVAL OF THE LIVE/WORK UNIT AT PLOT FIVE, WEAVERS LOFT, CHERRY DRIVE, BROCKHALL VILLAGE, BLACKBURN

PARISH COUNCIL: The Parish Council object to this application. The site initially had planning permission granted for a dwelling, which included a live/work unit. The live/work unit was the reason that permission was granted. The P.C. feel that by passing this amended application, Ribble Valley Borough Council will be backtracking on what was originally agreed. The P.C. object strongly to this application as we feel the number of dwellings originally agreed to be built on this site will have increased and be over the original quota agreed. In addition, there are no facilities for residents on this site (another condition of building in this area). Infrastructure will also be affected.

ADDITIONAL
REPRESENTATIONS:

No additional representations have been received.

Proposal

This proposal relates to Plot 5 within a development of seven detached houses with associated work units off Cherry Drive, Brockhall Village for which permission was granted on Appeal under reference 3/2007/1071/P. The dwelling originally approved on this plot was a five-bedroom property with an integral double garage and a single storey live/work unit to the rear of the main dwelling, meaning that the property itself would be relatively narrow in width and long, extending quite a distance into the site. This proposal now seeks permission for a 5-bedroom property; over two-storeys, of a significantly different and wider design, and the live/work element of the previously approved scheme has been removed. The property will also be approximately 0.45m taller than the previously approved dwelling. The first floor windows have been positioned so they do not overlook the amenity areas of neighbouring properties, and nor do they directly look at first floor windows of these neighbouring properties. The dwelling will be constructed in brick and oak cladding, with dark grey tiles for the roof and aluminium doors and windows. The scheme also includes an area of solar panels on the front (south east facing) elevation of the property in an effort to reduce its carbon footprint.

Site Location

The site is located within the Generally Developed Area (GDA) of the Brockhall Village development, as designated by the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan. The plot itself would back onto an area of trees covered by Tree Protection Order's (T.P.O.) that separate the site from the units on Franklin Hill.

Relevant History

3/2007/1071/P – 7 detached dwellings with associated work. – Granted on Appeal.
3/2007/0740/P – 7 detached dwellings with associated work units – Withdrawn.
3/2006/0830/P – Erection of 24 live/work units – Granted Conditionally.
3/2006/0008/P – Erection of 26 live/work units – Granted Conditionally.

Relevant Policies

Policy A2 – Brockhall Area Policy.
Policy G1 - Development Control.
Policy G4 – Settlement Strategy.
Policy T7 – Parking Provision.
SPG – “Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings”.
PPS3 - Housing (June 2010).

Environmental, AONB, Human Rights and Other Issues

This application effectively seeks permission for a change of house type on this site, as well as seeking to remove any restrictions to do with the work element of the previously approved schemes. The principle of a dwelling on this plot has been accepted, and the principle of the removal of live/work elements has been accepted on both the adjacent complex known as Eden Court, and recently on Plots 1 and 2 Weavers Loft. As such, the main concerns relate to the visual impact of the new dwelling, whether it has any impact on the amenity of the residential

amenity of the occupiers of nearby dwellings and whether the scheme has any impact on the trees subject to a T.P.O. to the rear of the site. I do not perceive there to be any potential issues with the proposed scheme or layout given the satisfactory level of on-site parking provided and the visibility splays provided at the access.

VISUAL IMPACT OF THE DEVELOPMENT

In relation to the design, size and height of the proposed dwelling, it is considered similar to other residential properties in the nearby vicinity, both existing and currently being constructed/approved, and is considered to be acceptable given the difference in house types all over the Brockhall Village development.

Visually, any development of the site will affect the streetscene and views around and through the site, however in order to refuse a development the harm of a proposal must be demonstrated. The dwelling has been designed to be closely related to the variety of properties in the nearby vicinity in terms of its principle elevations, and its size and massing is considered to be acceptable as the property carries the same form and is similar in scale to other properties on this road, with similar sized openings. The dwelling is considered to provide sufficient amenity space around it to ensure it does not appear cramped within the streetscene. On this basis, the visual impact is considered to be minimal.

IMPACT ON RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

As noted earlier in my report, due to the position of the dwelling on site, all first floor windows are positioned so they do not overlook the amenity areas of neighbouring properties, and nor do they directly look at first floor windows of these neighbouring properties. For this reason, I do not believe there would be any significant loss of privacy by virtue of this development.

I note the concerns expressed by the Parish Council, but I am of the opinion that that given the previously approved dwellings on adjacent plots that no longer comprise any work elements, as well as the recent consent on the adjacent complex known as Eden Court (which again established the principle of allowing purely residential), I do not consider that refusing this proposal could be substantiated. In determination of the previous scheme, consideration was given to the lack of five-year housing supply (in relation to PPS3). As such, it is no longer considered to be a requirement for a dwelling to have associated work space, as the exception policy is not necessary, and I am therefore of the opinion that that it would be difficult to sustain a refusal.

IMPACT ON TREES SUBJECT TO T.P.O.

Having discussed the proposed development with the Council's Countryside Officer, he is satisfied that the proposed development will be set a sufficient distance from the existing trees on site, and more importantly outside the Root Protection Area (R.P.A.) of the trees. He has recommended a site-specific condition to be attached to any recommendation.

Bearing this in mind, and whilst I am mindful of the points of objection from the Parish Council, the scheme submitted is considered to comply with the relevant Local, Regional and National Policies. I recommended the application accordingly.

SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR APPROVAL

The proposal is in accordance with the relevant policies and guidance relating to new residential development and 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 conditions:

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

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

2. The permission shall relate to the development as shown on Plan Drawing Reference No's p5/01, p5/02, p5/03 and p5/04.

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

3. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning General Permitted Development Order 2008 (or any order amending revoking or re-enacting that Order) any future extensions or external alterations to the dwelling, including any development within the curtilage, hard standing or fences, as defined in Schedule 2 Part 1 Classes A to H, and Part II Class A, shall not be carried out without the formal consent of the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: In order that the Local Planning Authority shall retain effective control over the development to ensure compliance with Policy G1 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan.

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

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

5. The proposed garage shall not be used for any purpose (including any purpose ordinarily incidental to the enjoyment of the dwelling house as such) which would preclude its use for the parking of a private motor vehicle.

REASON: In the interests of visual amenity and to facilitate adequate vehicle parking and/or turning facilities to serve the dwelling in accordance with Policy G1 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan and the adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance "Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings".

6. 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.

7. Prior to commencement of any site works including delivery of building materials and excavations for foundations or services, all trees identified in the arboricultural/tree [T2 – T18 inclusive] survey shall be protected in accordance with the BS5837 [Trees in Relation to Construction] the details of which shall be agreed in writing, implemented in full, a tree protection monitoring schedule shall be agreed and tree protection measures inspected by the local planning authority before any site works are begun.

The root protection zone shall be 12 x the DBH and shall remain in place until all building work has been completed and all excess materials have been removed from site including soil/spoil and rubble.

During the building works no excavations or changes in ground levels shall take place and no building materials/spoil/soil/rubble shall be stored or redistributed within the protection zone, in addition no impermeable surfacing shall be constructed within the protection zone.

No tree surgery or pruning shall be implemented with out prior written consent, which will only be granted when the local authority is satisfied that it is necessary, will be in accordance with BS3998 for tree work and carried out by an approved arboricultural contractor.

REASON: In order to ensure that any trees affected by development and included in a Tree Preservation Order are afforded maximum physical protection from the adverse affects of development, and in order to comply with planning policies G1, ENV13 of the District Wide Local Plan.

APPLICATION NO: 3/2011/0336/P (GRID REF: SD 369923 436604)
PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL DWELLING WITH ASSOICIATED ACCESS GARAGING AND GARDENS AT PLOT 7, WEAVERS LOFT, BROCKHALL VILLAGE, BLACKBURN

PARISH COUNCIL:

The Parish Council object to this application. The site initially had planning permission granted for a dwelling, which included a live/work unit. The live/work unit was the reason that permission was granted. The P.C. feel that by passing this amended application, Ribble Valley Borough Council will be backtracking on what was originally agreed. The P.C. object strongly to this application as we feel the number of dwellings originally agreed to be built on this site will have increased and be over the original quota agreed. In addition, there are no facilities for residents on this site (another condition of building in this area). Infrastructure will also be affected.

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS:

One letter of objection has been received from a resident of Masefield Close whose property backs onto the development. The following points of objection are raised:

1. The original development on this plot was refused due to its size.
2. New plans have significantly increased the footprint.
3. Loss of view.
4. The dwelling will be within metres of my boundary.
5. Loss of privacy.
6. Lounge windows will be overlooked by the development.
7. Only thing in-between the properties is a refuse area which will cause a nuisance.
8. Loss of value on house due to the developments at Weavers Loft.
9. Loss of light.
10. Overdevelopment of the site.
11. Overbearing mass of new building in relation to my property.
12. Surely a live/work unit is more appropriate given the traffic congestion issues and pressure in surrounding towns?

Proposal

This proposal relates to Plot 7 within a development of seven detached houses with associated work units off Cherry Drive, Brockhall Village for which permission was granted on Appeal under reference 3/2007/1071/P. The dwelling originally approved on this plot was a five-bedroom property with a single storey live/work unit and an attached double garage. This application now

seeks permission for a 5/6 bedroom, two-storey property, of a significant different, linear design, that now runs almost parallel to Cherry Drive. Internally, due to the position of the dwelling on site being moved, the first floor windows have been positioned so they do not overlook the amenity areas of neighbouring properties, and nor do they directly look at first floor windows of these neighbouring properties. One en-suite bathroom window faces the rear elevation of properties on Masefield Close, however this will be obscurely glazed. The scheme includes the provision of a detached double garage within the site, and the live/work element of the previously approved scheme has been removed. The dwelling and garage will be constructed in brick and render, with a slate roof finish, and will have timber windows throughout. The scheme also includes an area of landscaping to the eastern corner of the site.

Site Location

The site is located within the Generally Developed Area (GDA) of the Brockhall Village development, as designated by the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan. The plot itself would back onto the units on Masefield Close.

Relevant History

3/2007/1071/P – 7 detached dwellings with associated work. – Granted on Appeal.
3/2007/0740/P – 7 detached dwellings with associated work units – Withdrawn.
3/2006/0830/P – Erection of 24 live/work units – Granted Conditionally.
3/2006/0008/P – Erection of 26 live/work units – Granted Conditionally.

Relevant Policies

Policy A2 – Brockhall Area Policy.
Policy G1 - Development Control.
Policy G4 – Settlement Strategy.
Policy T7 – Parking Provision.
SPG – “Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings”.
PPS3 - Housing (June 2010).

Environmental, AONB, Human Rights and Other Issues

This application effectively seeks permission for a change of house type on this site, as well as seeking to remove any restrictions to do with the work element of the previously approved schemes. The principle of a dwelling on this plot has been accepted, and the principle of the removal of live/work elements has been accepted on both the adjacent complex known as Eden Court, and recently on Plots 1 and 2 Weavers Loft. As such, the main concerns relate to the visual impact of the new dwelling and whether it has any impact on the amenity of the residential amenity of the occupiers of nearby dwellings.

VISUAL IMPACT OF THE DEVELOPMENT

In relation to the design, size and height of the proposed dwelling, it is considered similar to other residential properties in the nearby vicinity, both existing and currently being constructed/approved, and is considered to be acceptable given the difference in house types all over the Brockhall Village development.

Visually, any development of the site will affect the streetscene and views around and through the site, however in order to refuse a development the harm of a proposal must be demonstrated. The dwelling has been designed to be closely related to the variety of properties in the nearby vicinity in terms of its principle elevations, and its size and massing is considered to be acceptable as the property carries the same form and is similar in scale to other properties on this road, with similar sized openings. The dwelling is considered to provide sufficient amenity space around it to ensure it does not appear cramped within the streetscene. On this basis, the visual impact is considered to be minimal.

On this basis, the scale, design and massing of the proposed dwelling and detached garage are considered to be visually acceptable within the streetscene.

IMPACT ON RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

One of the residents to the rear of the site in question, living on Masefield Close, has raised strong objection to this development on the basis of a number of reasons, but mainly on the impact on their residential amenity. The dwelling previously approved on this site was also close to the boundary with properties on Masefield Close, however the closest elevations were at angles as opposed to parallel with the boundary. Despite this, the development must be considered on its own merits as to whether this new design will have a detrimental impact on the amenity of the nearby properties. There will be approximately 13 metres between rear (north facing) elevations of the properties on Masefield Close and the side (south facing) elevation of the new property proposed, and with the only window in this elevation being obscure glazed, en-suite window, I do not believe there would be any significant loss of privacy by virtue of this development.

With regards to the close proximity of the dwelling to the boundary and also the rear elevations of the properties on Masefield Close, the overall height and massing of the dwelling must be a consideration. Given its relatively low eaves height (4.56m), and the relatively low height to the ridge of this portion of the dwelling, approximately 7.4m, I do not consider the overall mass of this particular portion of the new dwelling will cause sufficient harm to the occupiers of the adjacent dwellings to warrant refusing this application. Therefore, overall I do not believe the scheme will cause significant harm to the residential amenity to the occupiers of the adjacent dwellings.

HIGHWAY SAFETY ISSUES

I do not perceive there to be any potential issues with the proposed scheme or layout given the satisfactory level of on-site parking provided and the visibility splays provided at the access.

I note the concerns expressed by the Parish Council, but I am of the opinion that that given the previously approved dwellings on adjacent plots that no longer comprise any work elements, as well as the recent consent on the adjacent complex known as Eden Court (which again established the principle of allowing purely residential), I do not consider that refusing this proposal could be substantiated. In determination of the previous scheme, consideration was given to the lack of five-year housing supply (in relation to PPS3). As such, it is no longer considered to be a requirement for a dwelling to have associated work space, as the exception policy is not necessary, and I am therefore of the opinion that that it would be difficult to sustain a refusal.

Bearing this in mind, and whilst I am mindful of the points of objection from the Parish Council and the nearby neighbour, the scheme submitted is considered to comply with the relevant Local, Regional and National Policies. I recommended the application accordingly.

SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR APPROVAL

The proposal is in accordance with the relevant policies and guidance relating to new residential development and 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 conditions:

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

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

2. The permission shall relate to the development as shown on Plan Drawing Reference No's 1001, 1002, 1003, 1004 and 1005.

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

3. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning General Permitted Development Order 1995 (or any order amending revoking or re-enacting that Order) any future extensions or external alterations to the dwelling, including any development within the curtilage, hard standing or fences, as defined in Schedule 2 Part 1 Classes A to H, and Part II Class A, shall not be carried out without the formal consent of the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: In order that the Local Planning Authority shall retain effective control over the development to ensure compliance with Policy G1 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan.

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

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

5. The dwelling hereby approved shall be constructed with the first floor, en-suite window in the south east facing elevation (facing Masefield Close) obscurely glazed, details of which shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing, by the Local Planning Authority before development commences; and also fitted with restrictors limiting the degree of opening of each opening light to not more than 45°. Thereafter it shall be maintained in that condition in perpetuity to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

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

6. The proposed garage shall not be used for any purpose (including any purpose ordinarily incidental to the enjoyment of the dwelling house as such) which would preclude its use for the parking of a private motor vehicle.

REASON: In the interests of visual amenity and to facilitate adequate vehicle parking and/or turning facilities to serve the dwelling in accordance with Policy G1 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan and the adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance "Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings".

7. 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.

8. Prior to commencement of any site works including delivery of building materials and excavations for foundations or services, any trees to be retained on the site shall be protected in accordance with the BS5837 [Trees in Relation to Construction]. The root protection zone shall be 12 x the DBH and shall remain in place until all building work has been completed and all excess materials have been removed from site including soil/spoil and rubble.

During the building works no excavations or changes in ground levels shall take place and no building materials/spoil/soil/rubble shall be stored or redistributed within the protection zone, in addition no impermeable surfacing shall be constructed within the protection zone.

No tree surgery or pruning shall be implemented without prior written consent, which will only be granted when the local authority is satisfied that it is necessary, will be in accordance with BS3998 for tree work and carried out by an approved arboricultural contractor.

REASON: In order to ensure that any trees affected by development are afforded maximum physical protection from the adverse affects of development. In order to comply with Planning Policy G1 of the District Wide 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>
3/2010/1019 & 3/2010/1020/P (LBC)	Proposed change of use of adjoining barn and associated buildings from agricultural to residential use to form an extension to the existing farmhouse. Minor internal and external alterations	Merrybent Hill Farm Catlow Road Slaidburn
3/2010/1028/P	Take down and reconstruct the north west wingwall up to the cutwater. Replace existing fill with a lightweight concrete. Repoint cracks and missing mortar in east and west parapets (amended description)	Croasdale Bridge Slaidburn
3/2011/0094/P	Proposed demolition of the existing two-storey extension including single garage and bedroom and the erection of a detached double garage with a hobby room	Fairclough House Loud Bridge Chipping
3/2011/0113/P	Change of use of the existing retail business to one dwelling	7 Woone Lane Clitheroe
3/2011/0133/P	Change of use from public house (Class A4) to a beauty salon/hairdresser (Class A1) at ground floor level and residential accommodation on the remaining floors. Two extensions to the rear of the accommodation – one to provide an access stair to the first floor level and a second only extending from the basement to first floor level providing additional accommodation for the beauty salon at ground floor level and stores below. The existing single storey timber framed area to the right-hand side of the building is to be rebuilt in stone	Pendle Hotel Clitheroe Road Chatburn
3/2011/0180/P	Proposed two-storey extension to the side after demolition of garage/utility. Extension to existing dormers to front and rear. Single storey extension to the rear	45 Mardale Road Longridge
3/2011/0184/P	Two-storey side extension. (Re-submission of application 3/2010/0698)	24 Stubbins Lane Sabden
3/2011/0192/P	Proposed two-storey extension, new single storey porch, new door and window into existing garage	Bowtree Cottage Slaidburn Road, Waddington

3/2011/0198/P 3/2011/0200/P	Change of use from residential to office Erection of garage and carport – revised design to approval 3/2005/0488/P	45 Berry Lane, Longridge The Barn Higher Greystonely Whitewell
3/2011/0203/P	Proposed erection of a detached double garage	Orchard House, Back Lane Rimington
3/2011/0209/P	Solar PV panels to first floor roof of a shippon. The Installation will be less than 4Kw and have a surface area of 27 sq.m	South Barn Higher Greystoneley Farm Leagram
3/2011/0210/P	Replacement of existing flat roofed garage and extensions to front and rear flat roofed dormers with single storey extension to rear	Nearfield Eastham Street Clitheroe
3/2011/0227/P	Single storey rear extension	Smithy Cottage Barn Walker Fold, Chaigley
3/2011/0233/P	Application for the discharge of condition no.4 (access materials) and condition no. 5 (completion of access) of planning consent 3/2009/0172P	Bambers Lane Ends Bolton-By-Bowland
3/2011/0244/P	Replacement of existing conservatory with orangery	Salthill Villa, Salthill Road Clitheroe
3/2011/0248/P	Proposed conservatory extension	8 Crumpax Meadows Longridge
3/2011/0251/P	Proposed detached garage (re-submission)	Knott Barn Leagram, Preston
3/2011/0254/P	Existing site entrance and exit gate widths reduced to improve availability of adjacent site entrance	Steadplan Ltd Salthill Industrial Estate Lincoln Way, Clitheroe
3/2011/0255/P	Proposed single storey lean-to extension to rear	Wilcock Brook Barn Woods Brow, Balderstone
3/2011/0264/P	Single storey rear extension (Retrospective application)	13 Cockerill Terrace Barrow
3/2011/0265/P	Non material amendment to consent 3/2008/0548 to allow amendment to design and footprint of courtyard, bedroom wing to support project phasing with incorporation of undercroft spa/gym and addition to stairwells and relocation of balancing pond	Stanley House Preston New Road Mellor
3/2011/0270/P	Application for a non-material amendment to planning consent 3/2010/0724P to allow a window for the bathroom on the first floor and removal of tile verges from the dormer sides	9 Homeacre Avenue Sabden
3/2011/0277/P	Proposed conservatory extension at rear of	48 St Peters Close Clayton-le-Dale
3/2011/0280/P	Application for the discharge of condition no. 4 (material for the glazed screen) of planning consent 3/2010/0876	Dene House 8 Longridge Road Hurst Green

3/2011/0282/P	Proposed adaptation of existing approved oak framed pergola and stone external stairs to create a lazed infill, single storey exercise space adjacent to the pool hall	Fields House Farm Edisford Road, Waddington
3/2011/0303/P	Single storey rear extension	70 Knowsley Road Wilpshire
3/2011/0308/P	Extension of existing playground by 437sq m	Clitheroe Royal Grammar School Chatburn Road, Clitheroe
3/2011/0319/P	Application for non-material amendment for 2no. windows in lounge/dining room to be changed to doors to give access to garden area and re-introduction of PV panels previously omitted from original planning consent 3/2008/0808P	Abbeyfield House Union Street Clitheroe

APPLICATIONS REFUSED

<u>Plan No:</u>	<u>Proposal:</u>	<u>Location:</u>	<u>Reasons for Refusal</u>
3/2011/0089/P	Proposed demolition of the existing building and erection of a holiday cottage	Pinfold Cottage (formerly part of Smithy Cottage) Tosside	Policy G1, ENV1 and RT1 – scale, design and massing would cause visual harm to the street scene and AONB due to cramped appearance.
3/2011/0189/P	First floor extension above the existing garage	51 Warwick Drive Clitheroe	Policies G1, H10 and the Council's SPG on extensions and alterations to dwellings – scale and massing – street scene.
3/2011/0204/P	Proposed replacement dwelling	Wadow House Clitheroe Road Waddington	G1 - Dominant extension to the visual detriment of the street scene.
3/2011/0208/P	Proposed construction of a porch extension	Carr Meadow Barn Carr Lane Balderstone	G1, ENV3 & H17 – Detrimental visual impact upon the traditional character of the barn to the visual detriment of the Open Countryside.

3/2011/0241/P Two-storey rear extension 2 Bushburn Drive, G1, H10, SPG -
 Langho. Prominent extension to the visual detriment of the street scene.

SECTION 106 APPLICATIONS

Plan No: **Proposal/Location:** **Progress:**
 None

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>
3/2010/0635 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
3/2010/0969 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
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	House- holder appeal	–	APPEAL DISMISSED 13.5.11
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	House- holder appeal	–	APPEAL DISMISSED 18.5.11
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	House- holder appeal	–	APPEAL DISMISSED 26.5.11
3/2010/1010 D	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	–	Awaiting site visit

LEGEND

D – Delegated decision
C – Committee decision
O – Overturn