

RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL

please ask for: OLWEN HEAP
direct line: 01200 414408
e-mail: olwen.heap@ribblevalley.gov.uk
my ref: OH/EL
your ref:
date: 31 August 2012

Council Offices
Church Walk
CLITHEROE
Lancashire BB7 2RA

Switchboard: 01200 425111
Fax: 01200 414488
DX: Clitheroe 15157
www.ribblevalley.gov.uk

Dear Councillor

The next meeting of the **PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE** is at **6.30pm** on **THURSDAY, 13 SEPTEMBER 2012** at the **TOWN HALL, CHURCH STREET, CLITHEROE.**

I do hope you can be there.

Yours sincerely

CHIEF EXECUTIVE

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

AGENDA

Part I – items of business to be discussed in public

1. Apologies for absence.
2. To approve the minutes of the last meeting held on 16 August 2012 – copy enclosed.
3. Declarations of Interest (if any).
4. Public Participation (if any).

DECISION ITEMS

- ✓ 5. Planning Applications – report of Director of Community Services – copy enclosed.

- ✓ 6. Delegation Scheme and Development Management Protocol – report of Director of Community Services – copy enclosed.
- ✓ 7. Site Allocations – Initial Stages – report of Chief Executive – copy enclosed.

INFORMATION ITEMS

- ✓ 8. Housing Land Availability – report of Chief Executive – copy enclosed.
- ✓ 9. Appeals:
 - (a) 3/2011/0849/P – Proposed new detached garage, boundary wall, gates and hard landscaping at Great Mitton Hall, Mitton Road, Mitton – appeal dismissed.
 - (b) 3/2012/0160/P – Proposed two storey side extension incorporating kitchen, lounge, two further bedrooms and house bathroom; single storey rear extension to include downstairs cloaks and utility room. Existing shippon to be demolished at 74 Knowsley Road, Wilpshire – appeal dismissed.
- 10. Report of Representatives on Outside Bodies (if any).

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

None.

**INDEX OF APPLICATIONS BEING CONSIDERED
MEETING DATE 13 SEPTEMBER 2012**

	<u>Application No:</u>	<u>Page:</u>	<u>Officer:</u>	<u>Recommendation:</u>	<u>Site:</u>
A	APPLICATIONS REFERRED BACK TO COMMITTEE FOR APPROPRIATE CONDITIONS:				
				NONE	
B	APPLICATIONS WHICH THE DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY SERVICES RECOMMENDS FOR APPROVAL:				
	3/2012/0360/P	1	CS	AC	Middle Breaks Farm Settle Road, Gisburn
	3/2012/0672/P	3	GT	AC	14 Faraday Avenue Clitheroe
	3/2012/0682/P	5	MB	AC	8 Goosebutts Lane Clitheroe
	3/2012/0703/P	8	JM	AC	34 West Street Ribchester
C	APPLICATIONS WHICH THE DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY SERVICES RECOMMENDS FOR REFUSAL:				
	3/2012/0450/P	12	GT	R	Guest House at Jenkinsons Farm Alston
D	APPLICATIONS UPON WHICH COMMITTEE DEFER THEIR APPROVAL SUBJECT TO WORK DELEGATED TO DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY SERVICES BEING SATISFACTORILY COMPLETED				
				NONE	
E	APPLICATIONS IN 'OTHER' CATEGORIES:				
				NONE	

LEGEND

AC Approved Conditionally
R Refused
M/A Minded to Approve

JM John Macholc
SW Sarah Westwood
CS Colin Sharpe
AD Adrian Dowd

GT Graeme Thorpe
MB Mark Baldry
CB Claire Booth

RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL REPORT TO PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Agenda Item No

meeting date: THURSDAY, 13 SEPTEMBER 2012
 title: PLANNING APPLICATIONS
 submitted by: DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY SERVICES

PLANNING APPLICATIONS UNDER THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990:

APPLICATION NO: 3/2012/0360/P (GRID REF: SD 383430 450440)
 PROPOSED NEW LIVESTOCK AND PARLOUR BUILDING AT MIDDLE BREAKS FARM,
 SETTLE ROAD, GISBURN

PARISH COUNCIL: No representations or observations received.

ENVIRONMENT
 DIRECTORATE
 (COUNTY SURVEYOR): Has no objections to the application on highway safety grounds.

ENVIRONMENT AGENCY: Has confirmed that it has no comments to make on this application.

LANCASHIRE COUNTY
 COUNCIL (LAND AGENT): Have considered this application and, although no written report has been prepared, have confirmed that they have no objections to this application.

ADDITIONAL
 REPRESENTATIONS: None received.

Proposal

Middle Breaks Farm comprises an existing dairy unit with surrounding land holding extending to approximately 145 acres. In addition, the applicants also farm Gisburn Cotes Farm (approx 3.5 miles away) located off the A59 Gisburn Road towards Sawley that comprises an additional land holding of approximately 69 acres. Stock is also out wintered on other farms.

Full planning permission is sought for a new livestock cubicle building with adjoining parlour and associated facilities. It is stated in the submitted Design and Access Statement that the new building is required in order to facilitate the modernisation, restructuring and consolidation of the existing dairy unit at this farm.

The proposed new livestock building is intended to relocate and consolidate the existing dairy herd within one building, comprising approximately 130 cubicles with the provision of a new parlour incorporating the installation of a new automated robotic milking system and associated/ancillary accommodation (ie dairy/wash room, chemical store, office etc). The adjoining building is to provide additional holding pens, straw pen and accommodation for dry cows relocated from Gisburn Coates Farm.

The existing range of dairy buildings at Middle Breaks Farm are then to be restructured to accommodate young stock that will be relocated from Gisburn Coates Farm/out wintered farms thereby consolidating all livestock on the two farms.

The proposed building comprises the approximately 73m x 16.5m livestock/parlour building, with the adjoining building having dimensions of 10.3m x 22.9m giving a total combined floor area of approximately 1,440m². The building would have an eaves height of approximately 4m and a ridge height of approximately 7.3m. The external walls would comprise concrete panels or concrete blocks to a height of approximately 1.8m with Yorkshire boarding above. The roof covering would be fibre cement profiled roofing sheets of natural grey colour to match the existing roof sheeting elsewhere on the farm and incorporating profiled translucent roof lights.

Site Location

Middle Breaks Farm is on the eastern side of Settle Road, Newsholme. There is an area of higher ground between the road and the farm buildings complex. The access track to the farm has a junction with the main road to the south of the buildings complex and then follows a route on the eastern side of the higher ground. The proposed building would be sited on relatively low lying ground immediately to the east of the existing group of farm buildings.

Relevant History

3/2003/0618/P – Proposed dairy building. Approved but not implemented and permission now therefore lapsed.

3/2005/0237/P – Out of parlour feed building and dry midden store, together with bulk feed bins. Approved.

3/2005/0238/P – Proposed earth bank slurry store in the position of the building previously approved by 3/2003/0618/P. Approved.

Relevant Policies

Policy G1 - Development Control.

Policy G5 - Settlement Strategy.

Policy ENV3 - Development in Open Countryside.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Environmental, AONB, Human Rights and Other Issues

This application is for the construction of a new building in order to modernise, restructure and consolidate an existing dairy unit. The County Council Land Agents have confirmed orally that they had no objections to the application. The building is therefore accepted as being necessary and appropriate for its proposed agricultural purpose.

The building is appropriately sited immediately adjoining the existing group of farm buildings and is also on relatively low lying ground. Its design and external materials are entirely appropriate for its purpose and location. The proposal would not therefore, in my opinion, have any detrimental effects upon the visual amenities of the locality.

There are no neighbouring dwellings that are close enough to be in any way affected by the proposal; and there are no highway safety considerations in relation to this application.

Section 3 of NPPF is entitled "Supporting a Prosperous Rural Economy". Paragraph 28 states that planning policies should support economic growth in rural areas in order to create jobs and prosperity by taking a positive approach to sustainable new development; and that, to promote a strong rural economy, local and neighbourhood plans should (amongst other things) promote the development and diversification of agricultural and other land based rural businesses.

This application is entirely in accordance with those stated intentions of NPPF to support the rural economy. As such, I can see no sustainable objections to this application.

SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR APPROVAL

The proposed development would improve the buildings and facilities at an existing dairy farm thereby supporting the rural economy and would not have any 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 drawing numbers BS.11-083/02 REVA and 03 REVA.

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

APPLICATION NO: 3/2012/0672/P (GRID REF: SD 373660 441508)
APPLICATION FOR THE CREATION OF A CROSSING FOR VEHICLES FROM ROAD TO
PROPERTY AT 14 FARADAY AVENUE, CLITHEROE, LANCASHIRE, BB7 2LW

CLITHEROE TOWN COUNCIL: No observations or comments have been received within the statutory 21-day consultation period.

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

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS: No additional representations have been received.

Proposal

Planning permission is sought for the creation of a vehicular crossing to link the property no. 14 Faraday Avenue to Faraday Avenue itself. No's 8 and 10 have already carried out similar works involving the laying of concrete slabs or tarmac over the existing grass semi-circle that separates the properties and the highway. Notice has been served on the landowner.

Site Location

The application relates to a semi-detached dwelling within the settlement of Clitheroe.

Relevant History

None relevant.

Relevant Policies

Policy G1 - Development Control.
Policy G2 – Settlement Strategy.
National Planning Policy Framework.

Environmental, AONB, Human Rights and Other Issues

The scheme will simply allow the owner of no. 14 Faraday Avenue vehicular access to his property and allow the safe off-road parking of any vehicles within his ownership. The LCC Highways Officer considers that the layout for the driveway access and the location of the proposed gate must be designed to comply with LCC recommendations, and that should the Planning and Development Committee be minded to support this proposal, he would recommend the inclusion of specific highway conditions as the creation of the new access will require the provision of an additional drop kerb and associated alterations to the existing footway.

Adjacent properties have carried out similar development with success and there are no over-riding concerns with this proposed development that would cause me to make any other recommendation. As such, bearing in mind the above comments from the LCC Highways Officer, I consider the scheme to comply with the relevant policies, and I recommend the scheme accordingly.

SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR APPROVAL

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

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

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

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

2. The permission shall relate to the development as shown on Plan Drawing referenced as '14 Faraday Proposed 1/500'.

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

3. That part of the access extending from the highway boundary for a minimum distance of 5 metres into the site shall be appropriately paved in tarmacadam, concrete, block pavements, or other approved materials.

REASON: To prevent loose surface material from being carried onto the public highway thus causing a potential source of danger to other road users.

4. The kerbing at the vehicular crossing shall be reinstated in accordance with the Lancashire County Council Specification for Construction of Estate Roads, concurrent with the formation of the improved access.

REASON: This is to provide the necessary access and to maintain the proper construction of the highway.

INFORMATIVES

1. This consent requires the construction, improvement or alteration of an access to the public highway. Under the Highways Act 1980 Section 184 the County Council as Highway Authority must specify the works to be carried out. Only the Highway Authority or a contractor approved by the Highway Authority can carry out these works and therefore before any access works can start you must contact the Environment Directorate for further information by telephoning Area Surveyor East 01254 823831 or writing to the Area Surveyor East, Lancashire County Council, Area Office, Riddings Lane, Whalley, Clitheroe BB7 9RW quoting the planning application number.
2. This consent requires the construction, improvement or alteration of an access to the public highway. Under the Highways Act 1980 Section 184 the County Council as Highway Authority must specify the works to be carried out. Only the Highway Authority or a contractor approved by the Highway Authority can carry out these works and therefore before any access works can start you must contact the Environment Directorate for further information, details below:

Oliver Starkey, Public Realm Manager (Ribble Valley), Lancashire County Council, Willows Lane, ACCRINGTON BB5 0RT. 01254 770960 customerserviceeast@lancashire.gov.uk

APPLICATION NO: 3/2012/0682/P (GRID REF: SD)
PROPOSED EXTENSION TO CREATE A SUNROOM AT THE REAR OF THE PROPERTY AT
WINDWAYS, 8 GOOSEBUTTS LANE, CLITHEROE

TOWN COUNCIL: No representations received at the time of preparing the report.

UNITED UTILITIES: No objections.

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS: A letter of objection has been received from a nearby resident who objects to the proposed development for the reasons summarised below.

- The proposed development will overshadow the living room of the adjoining property leading to a loss of light.
- The proposal is contrary to the guidance given in the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance policies G1 and H10.

Proposal

The proposed development consists of a sunroom located to the rear of the property. The proposed development will project 4m from the rear of the existing dwelling and measure 3.75m in width. The development will have an eaves height of 3m and an overall height of 3.93m. The north west and south west elevations of the proposed development will be heavily glazed, whilst a row of windows are proposed in the north elevation. These will be located 2.4m from ground level. In addition to this, a roof light in the north facing roof slope is also proposed. The applicant has detailed in their submission that the development will be constructed from block and render. The proposed hipped roof will be finished with tiles to match the existing dwelling.

Site Location

The application relates to the property known as Windways, 8 Goosebutts Lane, Clitheroe. The development site is a semi detached dwelling which fronts Goosebutts Lane. The site is located within the settlement boundary of Clitheroe. The area is residential and consists of a range of differing house types.

Relevant History

3/2012/0440/P – Application for a Lawful Development Certificate for a proposed conservatory at the rear of the property – Approved.

3/2002/0786/P – Extension and alterations – Approved with conditions.

6/2/2003 – Bedroom extension built over existing garage – Approved (September 1972).

Relevant Policies

Policy G1 - Development Control.

Policy H10 - Residential Extensions.

Policy SPG – “Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings”.

Environmental, AONB, Human Rights and Other Issues

The key considerations in determining this application are the impact the development will have upon the character and setting of the dwelling and the impact the development will have upon the residential amenity of the area.

Members should note that a similar conservatory was proposed under application 3/2002/0786/P. The proposed conservatory was in the same position and of similar form and proportions to the development under consideration in this application. However, a conservatory was never approved under 3/2002/0786/P. The conservatory element was deleted from the approved scheme.

In addition to this a Certificate of Lawful Development – Proposed Use (3/2012/0440) has recently been issued in respect of a proposed conservatory to the rear of the property. The development proposed within this application projected 3m from the rear of the dwelling and measured 3.75m in width. The proposed eaves height was 3m with an overall height 3.95m. A Certificate of Lawful Development was granted because the development proposed was considered to be permitted development under The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (Amendment) (No.2) (England) Order 2008, Part 1, Class A.

In terms of the impact the proposed development will have upon the character and setting of the existing dwelling, I consider the development to be in-keeping. This is because the proposed development would appear subservient to the main dwelling in terms of scale and form and would have no impact upon the street scene. I am therefore of the opinion that the proposed development accords with policies G1 and H10 of the Local Plan and the Council's adopted SPG in respect to its character and appearance.

It is also relevant to consider the impact the extension would have upon the residential amenity of the area. The Council's SPG states 'extensions can have an effect on neighbouring properties due to their shadow which they cast. The larger the extension and closer to the neighbours property, the greater the effect. When deciding upon the location and size of an extension, this issue needs to be given serious consideration. Any proposal which reduces the level of daylight available to habitable rooms in neighbouring properties, or which seriously overshadows a neighbour's garden is likely to be refused'. This sort of impact is exacerbated in the case of semi-detached dwellings as they are adjoining. This generally, as is the case in this application, results in development that is located hard up to the common boundary of the properties and results in development being sited perpendicular to the adjoining property. In such circumstances, the Local Planning Authority use the 45 degree methodology developed by the Building Research Establishment (BRE) as set out in the Councils adopted SPG on Extensions and Alterations; to fully assess the impact the development would have upon the adjoining dwelling; in terms of potential loss of daylight. This methodology is by no means a statutory rule, nor does it form part of any planning legislation. It is merely a guide, of perhaps what could be deemed to be a method of best practice.

Additional plans have been received which show the relationship between the proposed development and the adjoining property. This allows the 45-degree methodology to be applied to the development; to provide an indication as to the level of shadowing that will be created.

In this instance, the proposed development fails this test in one aspect but passes in the other. The 45-degree point drawn from the furthest point of the proposed development passes well beyond the centre point of the patio doors of the adjoining dwelling. However when the 45-degree point is drawn from the eaves of the proposed development it passes the patio doors below the centre point, therefore passing this element of the test.

This would suggest that there would be some effect created by the proposed development; which subsequently may lead to a loss of daylight. However I do not believe that this potential loss of light would be sufficient to warrant refusing this application on these grounds. This is

because the development does not categorically fail the 45-degree test. Furthermore it should be noted that the patio doors of No.6, the adjoining dwelling, do not act as a principle window to the room they serve. The room in question is a through living room that has a large window at the opposite end fronting Goosebutts Lane.

Having considered the proposals and assessed the potential impact I recommend that planning permission is granted.

Summary Reason: The proposal has no significant detrimental impact on nearby residential amenity nor would it have an adverse visual impact.

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

1. The development must be began 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 Plans carrying reference number TOM/02DWG02B Amendment B and TOM/02DWG03.

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

3. Before the development hereby permitted is first occupied, the windows located in the side elevation (North East facing) which face the adjoining dwelling shall be obscure glazed and maintained as such in perpetuity.

REASON: To safeguard the residential amenity of the area in accordance with policies G1 and H10 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan and the Councils adopted SPG on Extensions and Alterations.

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”.

APPLICATION NO: 3/2012/0703/P (GRID REF: SD 365044 435289)
PROPOSED TWO STOREY EXTENSION AND DEMOLITION OF CONSERVATORY AT 34
WATER STREET, RIBCHESTER

PARISH COUNCIL: No observations received at the time of report preparation, though previously raised no objections.

ENVIRONMENT DIRECTORATE (COUNTY SURVEYOR):	Not formally consulted on this application but previously raised no objection.
ENVIRONMENT AGENCY:	Not formally consulted on this application but previously raised no objection as the application is to be considered in a low risk area.
LANCASHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL (COUNTY ARCHAEOLOGICAL UNIT):	Not formally consulted on this application but previously considered as the proposed site lies within the Roman settlement of Bremetenacum recommend that a condition should be imposed requesting an archaeological watching brief to be undertaken.
ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS AND STATUTORY ADVERTISEMENT:	At the time of preparing this report, three letters of objection have been received which raises concerns regarding the loss of natural light entering a property which currently consists of two dwellings as one larger unit but will be eventually returned as two units. Consider that the outlook from the property would be seriously affected due to a brick wall on the close boundary. It would also affect the financial returns of any property.

Proposal

The scheme seeks detailed consent for a two storey rear extension on a terraced property. The extension which would involve the demolition of the existing conservatory would measure approximately 4.8m x 3.250m and would have a maximum height of 5.2m and have a relatively shallow pitched roof. On the gable elevation that faces towards No 34 Water Street, there is one window at ground floor. The gable elevation facing the rear garden has a first floor window and a patio door arrangement on the ground floor but amended to incorporate a more traditional window which would help reduce any overlooking issues and perceived privacy issues. The proposal is to utilise render and slate and as submitted in terms of use of plastic windows.

Site Location

The property is located within the Ribchester Conservation Area and is one of a block of terraced properties.

Relevant History

3/2011/1025/P – Two storey extension. Refused.

3/2012/0445/P – Two storey extension. Refused.

Relevant Policies

Policy G1 - Development Control.
Policy ENV16 - Development Within Conservation Areas.
NPPF.
Ribchester Conservation Area Appraisal.

Environmental, AONB, Human Rights and Other Issues

The issues that need to be considered in relation to this application relate to the effect the proposal would have on residential amenity and with particular regard to privacy and natural daylight issues as well as the visual impact of the extension and in particular having regard to its setting within a Conservation Area.

I am mindful of the previous recommendation of the previously refused schemes which related to perceived loss of light entering an adjacent property's window as a result of the extension and also the first floor door has been an incongruous feature that would not preserve the character of appearance of the Conservation Area. Since the second refusal, a meeting has taken place and there has been a minor design change, which removes the full depth window which was in essence give the appearance of a patio door arrangement on the first floor to a more traditional window opening with stone surround. In assessing its impact on the Conservation Area, regard must be taken to its prominence although the mere fact that it cannot be readily seen is not in itself a reason to allow inappropriate development. However, I am of the opinion that having assessed its location and the extent of the work, that the extension and its window openings would no longer have an impact on the Conservation Area or the character of the building.

It is clear that this proposal would have an impact on the residential amenity of the adjacent property but I have assessed the proposal and mindful of the objections consider that the effect is not significant enough to warrant a recommendation of refusal. In this instance, due to the location of an industrial building at the rear of the property, there is some additional impact caused by the extension having a claustrophobic impact but having carefully assessed the overall impact, I do not consider this to be significant enough to warrant a refusal, although I do acknowledge that the location of this industrial building does further increase the impact.

It is considered that having regard to relevant material concerns, that this proposal is acceptable and that a recommendation of approval is appropriate.

SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR APPROVAL

The proposal has no significant detrimental effect on nearby residential amenity, nor would it have any significant visual impact that would be detrimental to the character of Ribchester Conservation Area.

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

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

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

2. The permission shall relate to the development as shown on plan reference B652402E received on 30 August 2012.

REASON: For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance 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 and the adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance – “Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings”.

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 windows on first floor 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 permission shall relate to the development as shown on Plan Drawing

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

6. Prior to the commencement of any ground disturbance on the site including any excavation of foundation design test pits, the developer shall have given the County Archaeologist, Lancashire County Council at least two weeks advance notice of such work, and shall in addition afford access to the site at all reasonable times to the County Archaeologist or other archaeologist nominated by the Local Planning Authority, to carry out a watching brief.

REASON: In view of the archaeological significance of the area, and to ensure that anything of archaeological importance may be adequately recorded in accordance with Policies G1, ENV14 and ENV15 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan.

7. In the event that any bats are found or disturbed during any part of the development, work shall cease until further advice has been sought from a licensed ecologist.

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.

C APPLICATIONS WHICH THE DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY SERVICES RECOMMENDS FOR REFUSAL

APPLICATION NO: 3/2012/0450/P (GRID REF: SD 361038 434759)
PROPOSED FIRST FLOOR EXTENSION TO CREATE 4 EN-SUITES TO EXISTING BEDROOMS INCLUDING PART DEMOLITION AND RE-BUILD OF KITCHEN TO GUEST HOUSE AT JENKINSONS FARM, THORN LANE, ALSTON, LANCASHIRE, PR3 3BQ

LONGRIDGE TOWN COUNCIL: Subject to the use of sympathetic materials, the Council has no objection to this application.

UNITED UTILITIES: No objection to the proposed development.

HEALTH AND SAFETY EXECUTIVE (HSE): HSE does not advise, on safety grounds, against the granting of planning permission in this case.

NATIONAL GRID: No observations or comments received within the statutory 21-day consultation period.

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS: No additional representations have been received.

Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a proposed first floor extension to the southeast facing elevation of the building in question. The scheme requires the part demolition and re-build of the existing single storey lean-to kitchen extension to the Guest House. The extension proposed would allow the internal reconfiguration of this area of the Guest House in order to create four en-suites for the four guest bedrooms that exist. These rooms currently share bathrooms that lie across the corridor within the Guest House.

The Guest House consists of 7 guest bedrooms, with 3 family bedrooms elsewhere in the building. Only 2 of the guest room's benefit from recently constructed en-suites, with the other 5 rooms sharing 4 bathrooms on the floor. The applicant's note that this proposal will allow them to update and modernise the existing facilities within the Guest House in order to improve the business and allow them to compete with the larger chains nearby such as the Swallow Hotel and Tickled Trout (near Preston close to the M6/A59). They note that they struggle to fill the rooms without en-suites once those with have been booked.

Site Location

The application relates to a property that has been run as a B&B since 1991. It is a family run business that helps sustain the existing working farm at Yew Tree nearby. The property is accessed off Thorn Lane; a single-track cul-de-sac off Alston Lane, and lies on the outskirts of Longridge (approximately 1.5 miles) within the open countryside.

Relevant History

3/2001/0917/P – Extension to form bathrooms at Bed and Breakfast – Granted Conditionally.

Relevant Policies

Policy G1 - Development Control.

Policy G5 – Settlement Strategy.

Policy ENV3 – Development in Open Countryside.

Policy H17 – Building Conversions – Design Matters.

Policy RT1 – General Recreation and Tourism Policy.

National Planning Policy Framework.

'Setting of Heritage Assets: English Heritage Guidance' (EH, October 2011).

Historic Environment Planning Practice Guide (HEPPG, March 2010).

Environmental, AONB, Human Rights and Other Issues

The main issues to consider with this scheme are the principle of the development, the visual impact of the scheme on the character and setting of the existing property and the potential visual impact on the surrounding countryside. There are no highway safety concerns as there is to be no increase in the number of bedrooms/visitors to the site.

The policy basis against which this scheme should be appraised is set out in the context of national, regional and local development plan policies. At a national level the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) came into force on 27 March 2012 and states that 'at the heart of the NPPF is a presumption in favour of sustainable development', which means that for decision making purposes that:

Where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date, granting permission unless,

- any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this framework taken as a whole; or
- specific policies in this framework indicate development should be restricted.

I am mindful of the statement in NPPF cited above which advocates a presumption in favour of sustainable development unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. The site under consideration here lies outside any saved settlement boundaries and as such should be considered in accordance with Local Plan Policy G5, which allows for small-scale tourism developments appropriate to a rural area subject to the development being in accordance with Local Plan Policy RT1. Policy RT1 notes that the Borough Council will approve development proposals that extend the range of tourism and visitor facilities in the Borough subject to certain criteria being met. These criteria include not conflicting with other policies in the Local Plan and that the development should not undermine the character, quality or visual amenities of the plan area by virtue of its scale, siting, materials or design. It is these elements of the policy where the proposal is considered to be contrary.

Architecturally and historically the property (circa 1800s), is a house with a barn attached. There was also originally a stable building extension and a lean-to shippon (circa 1844-1892), with the lean-to shippon demolished and re-built in the early 80s. The house and barn are stone built with a slate roof, and due to the age of the property the building is considered to be a 'non-designated heritage asset'. Paragraph 17 'Core Planning Principles' of the National Planning Policy Framework notes that planning should '*conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of this and future generations*', with Paragraph 126 stating that local planning authorities should recognise that '*heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource*' which should be conserved in a

'manner appropriate to their significance'. Local planning authorities should also take into account *'the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets ... the wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits that conservation of the historic environment can bring ... the opportunities to draw on the contribution made by the historic environment to the character of a place'*. These paragraphs highlight the importance of the conservation, preservation and enhancement of any non-designated heritage assets as important considerations when assessing such proposals.

Paragraph 131 provides advice when determining planning applications relating to heritage assets, noting that local planning authorities should take account of:

- the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and
- the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

Paragraph 132 provides more advice when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset noting that great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. It continues noting that the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be, and that the significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification. Paragraph 133 notes that where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to or total loss of significance of a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss.

From a Local Plan Policy point of view, Policy ENV3 considers development within the Open Countryside, and stipulates that 'development will be required to be in keeping with the character of the landscape area and should reflect local vernacular, scale, style, features and building materials,' and that 'proposals to conserve, renew and enhance landscape features will be permitted, providing regard has been given for the characteristic landscape features of the area'. Local Plan Policy H17 discusses the importance of good design to protect the rural environment, and that traditional farm buildings should remain largely unaltered and remain looking like farm buildings. It notes more specifically that 'Planning permission will be granted providing the design is of a high standard, in keeping with local tradition, particularly in terms of materials, geometric window form and window and door openings.'

In considering the proposed extension to the property, the Agent notes that the lean-to extension to be removed is not an original part of the property (re-built in the 80s). Whilst this is not disputed, any extension proposed must be in keeping with the historic and traditional linear form of the building. The proposal was considered at Pre-Application stage and at this time it was noted that the character and setting of the property/non-designated heritage asset would be detrimentally affected by the inappropriate and out of keeping two-storey extension (that would be replacing a more traditional lean-to extension) as the two storey gable ended extension at 90 degrees to the main linear form of the building coupled with the lean-to at right angles to the main property, neither conserves, renews nor enhances the existing features of the building. Whilst the reasoning behind the proposed extension is appreciated, namely the requirement for additional en-suite facilities on site, it still remains my view that a more suitable proposal would be to investigate either replicating the two-storey extension on the north facing elevation of the building that contains en-suite bathrooms for two rooms within the B&B (this was an extension

to the original farmhouse not the barn, and as such the relevant Policies by which we would assess such a proposal are slightly different), or via reorganising the internal layout of this portion of the building.

I am mindful of Paragraph 131 of the NPPF that notes 'local planning authorities should take account of the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality', however the scheme also conflicts with the next sentence which states that new development should make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness. I am also mindful of Paragraph 132 of the NPPF that notes 'great weight should be given to the asset's conservation', and Paragraph 133 that notes that where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to or total loss of significance of a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss. The scheme is considered to lead to substantial harm to the heritage asset and the public benefits are not considered to be sufficient to significantly outweigh the impact on the character and historic appearance of the property in question due to the fact that other options could be implemented that would safeguard the intrinsic character of the property whilst providing a workable solution.

Therefore in considering the scheme, the Council cannot therefore support the principal of developing this due to the irreversible, significant and detrimental visual impact the development of the site would have on the character and setting of the building, and on this basis, the scheme is not considered to be compliant with the current national and local plan policies.

The proposal is recommended accordingly.

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

1. Approval of this scheme would be contrary to the guidance contained within the NPPF, the HEPPG and Local Plan Policies G1, G5, ENV3, H17 and RT1. The character and setting of the property/non-designated heritage asset would be detrimentally affected by the inappropriate and out of keeping two-storey extension proposed, that would be replacing a more traditional lean-to extension, as it is considered that the two storey, gable ended extension at 90 degrees to the main linear form of the building, coupled with the new lean-to extension set at right angles to the main property, that would neither conserve, renew nor enhance the existing features of the building. The incongruous design and scale of the extension will not present a harmonious development that sympathetically and satisfactorily impacts on the character of the non-designated heritage asset, and would result in the domination of the traditional linear form of the existing traditional building and its setting, creating a development that will have an unacceptable visual impact.

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

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

APPLICATIONS APPROVED

<u>Plan No:</u>	<u>Proposal:</u>	<u>Location:</u>
3/2011/0738/P	Proposed demolition of existing lean-to building attached to existing agricultural barn and change of use of existing agricultural barn into two residential units and construction of new covered area between modern barn and existing agricultural building at barn opposite	Cold Coates Farm Collins Hill Lane Chipping
3/2012/0563/P	Proposed new agricultural building for the housing of dairy cattle	Bolton Fold Farm Alston Lane, Alston
3/2012/0060/P	Proposed erection of an 18.5m high wind turbine (22.52m to blade tip) – peak power of 12Kw	Crawshaw Farm Newton-in-Bowland
3/2012/0127/P	Demolition of redundant agricultural building and partially constructed farmworkers dwelling and erection of 2no holiday cottages	Dewhurst Farm Longsight Road Langho
3/2012/0249/P	Proposed new first floor extension above existing double garage	3 Carr Croft, Rimington
3/2012/0253/P	Substitution of house type. Amend approved application 3/2010/0877/P with additional roof lights and window openings.	Lane Ends Barn Balderstone
32012/0356/P	Conversion and redevelopment of a redundant public house and hotel with conference facilities into 3 private residential properties	Moorcock Inn Slaidburn Road Waddington
3/2012/0403/P	Proposed change of use from shop to shop with self-contained flat above	62 Whalley Road Clitheroe
3/2012/0442/P	Proposed 4 No retail shop units for agricultural supplies	Gisburn Action Mart, Gisburn
3/2012/0449/P	Proposed erection of two holiday units, patio garden and extend vehicular access	Park Hey House Stonygate Lane Knowle Green
3/2012/0453/P	Proposed use of the annex as a separate dwelling	The Conkers Dewhurst Road, Langho
3/2012/0489/P	Conversion of barn to dwelling. Replacement of agricultural building with a garage and creation of curtilage	Wittons Farm Bolton-by-Bowland, Clitheroe
3/2012/0491/P	To erect carport to cover vehicles and glass veranda to cover back patio	Kenmare, Littlemoor Road Clitheroe

<u>Plan No:</u>	<u>Proposal:</u>	<u>Location:</u>
3/2012/0502/P	Application for discharge of condition no. 3 (relating to a method statement – spillages of oils, fuels or chemicals) of planning consent 3/2012/0090/P at Land off private access track	Newton Road Dunsop Bridge
3/2012/0505/P	Proposed loft conversion and provision of two dormers to front elevation. Refurbish existing rear extension and provide new flat roof with lantern rooflight. Provide single storey rear extension with sunroom, utility and accessible toilet	16 Whalley Road Langho
3/2012/0519/P	Proposed extension of existing detached dwelling to form kitchen and dining room, utility room and entrance hall. Proposed new window openings in East gable wall and North flank wall	Wheatley Cottage Four Acre Lane Thornley
3/2012/0522/P	Application for the renewal of planning permission 3/2009/0548P for the Construction of a Stable Block	Paddock at High Ridge Primrose Lane, Mellor
3/2012/0524/P	Bank protection/stabilisation works consisting of rock armour wall, rip rap and regarded bank and improved temporary construction access junction	Holden Waste Water Treatment Works Bolton-by-Bowland Road Holden
3/2012/0528/P	Proposed change of use of the first and second floors from residential to office use, the ground floor is currently used as an office	18 Castlegate Clitheroe
3/2012/0529/P	Proposed extension to an existing stable building to be used for storage	Nookhouse Farm Longsight Road Clayton-le-Dale
3/2012/0530/P	Application for discharge of condition no. 3 (relating to details of conservation type roof lights) of planning consent 3/2012/0212/P	Withinreap Barn Moss Side Lane Thornley with Wheatley
3/2012/0533/P	Proposed demolition of the former Women's Institute Building and the erection of one dwelling on land at	Lynbrook Longsight Road Clayton-Le-Dale
3/2012/0537/P	Proposed single storey rear extension with a lean-to roof with two velux roof lights and double doors. Removal of existing external wall to kitchen to open kitchen area	30 Kirkmoor Road Clitheroe
3/2012/0541/P	Proposed single storey garage	Pear Tree Cottage Gallows Lane, Ribchester
3/2012/0543/P	Proposed use of premises for A1 retail use.	37 Inglewhite Road Longridge
3/2012/0547/P	Outline application for the erection of a new build ¾ bedroom detached dwelling house with detached garage within the existing garden rear of an existing property	Police Rural Beat House Manor Avenue/Preston Rd Ribchester

<u>Plan No:</u>	<u>Proposal:</u>	<u>Location:</u>
3/2012/0549/P	Proposed rear extension to form home office	New Marls Farm Ribchester Road, Dinckley
3/2012/0551/P	Application to discharge condition No.6 (containment and storage of manure) of planning consent 3/2010/0202P at former	De Tabley Arms Barker Brow Clayton-le-Dale
3/2012/0553/P	Erection of a conservatory to the rear of the existing bungalow (brickwork will match existing bungalow which is built in Bradstone)	2 Whinney Lane Langho
3/2012/0557/P	External alterations to the existing building to accommodate internal refurbishment works to office space and creation of ancillary laboratory (Use Class B1 (b) on the ground floor	United Utilities White Bull WTW Preston Road Longridge
3/2012/0559/P	Proposed demolition of the existing conservatory and replacement on same footprint with flat roofed sun lounge	Beechwood Lower Lane Longridge
3/2012/0565/P	Proposed erection of two new build semi-detached houses (1 x 3 bedroom 5 person and 1 x 2 bedroom 4 person) with off-road parking and private gardens	George Street Clitheroe
3/2012/0566/P	Application to discharge condition no.3 (materials), condition no.6 (precise details of solar and solar PV panels), condition no. 9 (landscaping details), condition no. 10 (disposal of foul and surface waters) and condition no. 11 (foul drainage scheme) of planning permission 3/2011/0861P relating	Brookside Farm Moss Side Lane Thornley
3/2012/0570/P	Proposed two storey extension to the rear	28 Wesley Street Sabden
3/2012/0574/P	Certificate of Lawful Development for proposed works to stream crossing point over Easington Brook to include the demolition of the existing structure, followed by construction of the replacement structure, involving sheet piling, shuttering and pouring concrete. No new or altered access, drainage or hard standing required	Manor House Farm Easington Road Slaidburn
3/2012/0581/P	Proposed single storey rear extension on front elevation to form dining room, extended hallway and ground floor wc	53 Riverside Clitheroe
3/2012/0582/P	Proposed part demolition of rear conservatory. Provision of single storey rear extension	Sycamore House Knowsley Road, Wilpshire
3/2012/0591/P	Proposed single storey rear extension following demolition of existing conservatory extension and proposed first floor side extension	Woodacre Cottage Fleet Street Lane Ribchester

<u>Plan No:</u>	<u>Proposal:</u>	<u>Location:</u>
3/2012/0592/P	Proposed change of use of barn to a 3 bed dwelling	Bowfields Farm Bowfields Lane, Balderstone
3/2012/0596/P	Installation of new pitched roof construction over existing flat roof infill	Greenacre, Showley Road Clayton-le-Dale
3/2012/0598/P	Application to discharge condition no.3 (detailed plans showing siting, design and external appearance of mobile homes, landscaping, boundary treatment and parking) and condition no. 4 (foul drainage scheme) of appeal decision APP/T2350/A/11/2157512 relating to planning application 3/2010/0959/P	Stubs Wood Farm Rimington Lane Rimington
3/2012/0600/P	Retrospective application for removal of the existing roof light and installation of new velux roof light to existing study/bedroom at 2 nd floor level	52 York Street Clitheroe
3/2012/0707/P	Application to discharge condition no 3 (updated protected species survey) of planning permission 3/2012/0435/P	16 Hesketh Road Longridge

APPLICATIONS REFUSED

<u>Plan No:</u>	<u>Proposal:</u>	<u>Location:</u>	<u>Reasons for Refusal</u>
3/2011/1032/P	Outline application for proposed 'log cabin' style holiday lodges	Whins Lodge Whalley Old Road Langho	Policies G1, ENV3, ENV4, RT1 and NPPF – detriment to the openness of the greenbelt and to the character and visual amenities of the open countryside locality.
3/2012/0159/P	Raise the roof to part of the existing house. Provide a two storey extension for a garage and dressing room/en-suite at	6 Knowsley Road Wilpshire	The proposal by virtue of its design would result in a development that would have a severely detrimental impact upon the residential amenity of the area. This would be contrary to Policies G1 and H10 of the Districtwide Local Plan and the Council's adopted SPG on alterations and extensions.

<u>Plan No:</u>	<u>Proposal:</u>	<u>Location:</u>	<u>Reasons for Refusal</u>
3/2012/0525/P	Proposed machinery/ tractor shed consisting of a steel frame, concrete panels and Yorkshire boarding	Fellview Barn Baygate Bolton by Bowland	Policy G1, G5 and ENV1 – No agricultural justification detrimental to visual amenity Policy G1 – adverse affect on nearby residential amenity due to noise by nature of the intended use.
3/2012/0552/P	Demolition of existing bungalow and replacement with a two-storey detached dwellings	Shay Cross Old Back Lane Wiswell, Clitheroe	Contrary to Local Plan Policies, the NPPF and the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. Due to the scale, massing and design of the proposed replacement dwelling, approval of this proposal would have an adverse visual impact on the character, setting and appearance of the street scene, adjacent Listed Buildings and the CA that neither preserves or enhances this location, and would have an unacceptable impact on the residential amenity of the occupiers of the nearest dwellings by virtue of its over dominating appearance.
3/2012/0605/P	Proposed demolition of prefabricated garage followed by the erection of a single storey extension incorporating a garage with utility room – toilet	6 Valley View Grindleton	The proposal by virtue of its scale, design and massing would result in a development that would be totally
Cont/			

<u>Plan No:</u>	<u>Proposal:</u>	<u>Location:</u>	<u>Reasons for Refusal</u>
Cont...	areas and entrance porch. Increased with to existing vehicular access		incongruous to the detriment of the character and setting of the street scene. This would be contrary to Policies G1 and H10 of the Districtwide Local Plan and the Council's adopted SPG on Alterations and Extensions.

CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS FOR A PROPOSED USE OR DEVELOPMENT

<u>Plan No:</u>	<u>Proposal:</u>	<u>Location:</u>
3/2012/0470/P	Application for a Lawful Development Certificate for the proposed use of a holiday cottage adjacent to Woodhouse Gate Farm, as permanent residential accommodation	Woodhouse Gate Farm Catlow Road Slaidburn
3/2012/0546/P	Application for a Lawful Development Certificate for the proposed conversion of the garage into annex accommodation	Pinfold Farm, Preston Road Ribchester

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (GENERAL PERMITTED DEVELOPMENT) ORDER 1995 PARTS 6 & 7 PRIOR NOTIFICATION OF AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY BUILDINGS AND ROADS PRIOR APPROVAL REQUIRED / FURTHER DETAILS REQUIRED

<u>Plan No:</u>	<u>Proposal:</u>	<u>Location:</u>
3/2012/0588/N	Open fronted building with a sloping roof for use as sheep housing	Lane Side Farm, Alston Lane Alston, Preston, PR3 2BN

APPLICATIONS WITHDRAWN

<u>Plan No:</u>	<u>Proposal:</u>	<u>Location:</u>
3/2012/0210/P	General purpose agricultural building for livestock housing and general storage	Back Lane Farm Back Lane Chipping
3/2012/0355/P	4kw solar PV installation to the south facing elevation, 16 x 250 kwh black PV modules, approximately 28m ² roof area	The Bungalow Copster Green
3/2012/0483/P	Demolition of existing garage and stable buildings and replacement with garage building linked to house via glazed porch	Pepper Hill Wiswell
3/2012/0513/P	Retention of new field access	Land off Old Clitheroe Road Stonyhurst

<u>Plan No:</u>	<u>Proposal:</u>	<u>Location:</u>
3/2012/0604/P	Conversion of garage to room, formation of door and improved vehicular access	Austin House Slaidburn Road, Waddington

SECTION 106 APPLICATIONS

<u>Plan No</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Date to Committee</u>	<u>Number of Dwellings</u>	<u>Progress</u>
3/2010/0078P	Old Manchester Offices Whalley New Road Billington	20/5/10	18	With agent and applicants solicitor
3/2010/0929P	Land between 36 & 38 Henthorn Road Clitheroe	14/7/11	8	Signed Legal Agreement received from Applicant
3/2011/0784	Old Whalley Nurseries Clitheroe Road Whalley	12/4/12	6	With Applicant
3/2012/0065	Land off Dale View Billington	24/5/12	12	With Agent
3/2011/1064	Sites off Woone Lane a) rear of 59-97 Woone Lane & b) Land to South-West of Primrose Village phase 1 Clitheroe	21/6/12	113	With applicants solicitor
3/2011/1071	Land at Chapel Hill Longridge	19/7/12	53	Negotiations on going
3/2012/0014	Land adj Greenfield Avenue Low Moor Clitheroe	19/7/12	30	With Planning
3/2012/0379	Primrose Mill Woone Lane Clitheroe	16/8/12	14	Deed of Variation With Legal
<u>Non Housing</u>				
3/2011/0649P	Calder Vale Park Simonstone	15/3/12		Subject to departure procedures so no progress on Section 106
3/2012/0455	Shireburn Caravan Park Edisford Road Waddington	7/8/12		Deed of Variation With Legal

<u>Plan No</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Date to Committee</u>	<u>Time from First Going to Committee to Decision</u>	<u>Number of Dwellings</u>	<u>Progress</u>
3/2011/0776	Land off Whiteacre Lane Barrow	12/4/12	19 weeks	7	Decision 22/8/12

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>
3/2011/0300 O	17.1.12	Mr & Mrs Myerscough Outline application for the erection of a country house hotel and spa Land adjacent to Dudland Croft Gisburn Road Sawley	-	Hearing adjourned on 12.7.12	Awaiting response from The Planning Inspectorate
3/2011/0624 D	17.2.12	Mr Ken Dobson Fit secondary glazing (Listed Building Consent) Vicarage House Vicarage Fold Wiswell	WR	-	AWAITING DECISION
3/2011/0567 D	16.3.12	Mr D Ashton Proposed erection of a holiday cottage (Re-submission) Pinfold Cottage Tosside	WR	-	Awaiting site visit
3/2011/0703 O	16.4.12	Mr T Brown Proposed erection of a three-bedroom, two-storey detached dwelling with attached garage (Re-submission of 3/2011/0315P) 43 Hawthorne Place Clitheroe	WR	-	AWAITING DECISION
3/2011/0095 D	11.5.12	Mr & Mrs S Cherry Re-submission of refused application application 3/2010/0002P for two affordable dwellings in garden area of existing house, demolition of outbuilding, realigning of vehicular access to Cherry Hall and removal of part of wall to site Cherry Hall Grindleton	WR	-	AWAITING DECISION

<u>Application No:</u>	<u>Date Received:</u>	<u>Applicant/Proposal/Site:</u>	<u>Type of Appeal:</u>	<u>Date of Inquiry/Hearing:</u>	<u>Progress:</u>
3/2011/0849 D	16.5.12	Mr K Kay Proposed new detached garage, boundary wall, gates and hard landscaping Great Mitton Hall, Mitton Road, Mitton	Householder appeal	—	APPEAL DISMISSED 21.8.12
3/2011/1001 D	30.5.12	Ms Pamela Oliver New detached dwelling within the curtilage of 1 Portfield Bar Whalley	WR	—	Awaiting site visit
3/2011/0025 O	25.6.12	J-J Homes LLP Outline planning application for residential development (ten dwellings) Land off Chatburn Old Road Chatburn	WR	—	Awaiting site visit
3/2012/0158 C	6.7.12	LPA Receiver for Papillion Properties Ltd Outline application for the erection of 73 open market detached dwellings and 31 social housing properties Site 2 Barrow Brook Business Village Barrow	—	Hearing to be held 9.10.12	
3/2011/0729 D	9.7.12	Mrs Joan H Porter Demolition of redundant agricultural sheds. Conversion and extension of existing barns to 1no. new dwelling and improvements to existing access Lawson House Farm Bolton-by-Bowland Road Sawley	WR	—	Awaiting site visit

<u>Application No:</u>	<u>Date Received:</u>	<u>Applicant/Proposal/Site:</u>	<u>Type of Appeal:</u>	<u>Date of Inquiry/Hearing:</u>	<u>Progress:</u>
3/2011/0893 D	10.7.12	Mr F P Cherry Outline application for one dwelling situated in the old car park at Hodder Place Old Car Park Hodder Place Stonyhurst	WR	-	Awaiting site visit
3/2012/0160 D	16.7.12	Mr Ian Scholey Proposed two-storey side extension incorporating kitchen, lounge, two further bedrooms and house bathroom. Single storey rear extension to include downstairs cloaks and utility room. Existing shippon to be demolished 74 Knowsley Road Wilpshire	Householder appeal	-	APPEAL DISMISSED 28.8.12
3/2012/0164 D	15.8.12	Mr J Shaw Proposed garage extension with accommodation in the roof to the Southern gable elevation with dormer to the front and rear roof slope. Proposed dormer to front elevation of main property and single storey lean-to extension to the rear 8 Rogersfield Langho	Householder appeal and Application for costs	-	Notification letter sent 21.8.12 Questionnaire sent 22.8.12 AWAITING DECISION
3/2012/0325 D	17.8.12	Mr Lee Dolman Retrospective application for the insertion of a window to the front gable elevation. Re-submission of application 3/2011/0779P Old Chapel Barn Preston Road Alston	Householder appeal	-	Notification letter sent 23.8.12 Questionnaire sent 24.8.12 AWAITING DECISION

<u>Application No:</u>	<u>Date Received:</u>	<u>Applicant/Proposal/Site:</u>	<u>Type of Appeal:</u>	<u>Date of Inquiry/Hearing:</u>	<u>Progress:</u>
3/2012/0390 O	28.8.12	Mr Julian Hindle, Haydock Developments Ltd Proposed erection of a dwelling Land between 52 & 54 Knowsley Road Wilpshire	WR	–	Notification letter and questionnaire to be sent by 7.9.12 Statement to be sent by 5.10.12

LEGEND

- D – Delegated decision
- C – Committee decision
- O – Overturn

RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL REPORT TO PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Agenda Item No.

meeting date: THURSDAY, 13 SEPTEMBER 2012
 title: EXTENSION TO THE DELEGATION SCHEME IN RELATION TO DETERMINATION OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND MINOR CHANGES TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PROTOCOL
 submitted by: DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY SERVICES
 principal author: JOHN MACHOLC – HEAD OF PLANNING SERVICES

1 PURPOSE

- 1.1 To request minor changes to the scheme of delegation in relation to the determination of planning applications and to clarify issues regarding.
- 1.2 Members may be aware that there have been some recent revisions to the delegation scheme with the most recent report on the 25 May 2012 which clarified issues regarding referral requests and minor changes to Section 106 requirements.
- 1.3 Relevance to the Council's ambitions and priorities:
- Council Ambitions - }
 - Community Objectives - } To be a well-managed Council providing efficient services based on identified customer need.
 - Corporate Priorities - }
 - Other Considerations - }

2 BACKGROUND

- 2.1 It is evident that the Government has continued to express concerns in relation to the possible delay that the present system has caused and its impact on driving the economy. Part of the impact has been the delay in the determination of planning applications. It is important to explore ways of enabling quicker decisions without significant harm to the planning process.
- 2.2 It remains important to explore whether or not it is possible to increase the level of delegation on planning applications so that more applications could be determined without the need to go to a Planning and Development Committee. It is clear that one issue relates to the need to take all 'major' applications to Planning and Development Committee. In some instances such as agricultural buildings or employment buildings it is often the case that they are not likely to involve any issues that would need to be considered by Committee and are relatively straightforward. I am of the opinion that all commercial and agricultural developments should be delegated to the Director of Community Services. The referral request and the 3 or more objections would still be subject to these proposals.

- 2.3 I also consider that decision whether to take minor proposals that are recommended for refusal to Planning and Committee should be commercial schemes that have employment implications given to the Director of Community Services. Currently the scheme suggests that any refusal that may have significant employment issues should be discussed with the Chairman of the Planning and Development. In practice this is not happening and in many instances the applications are taken to Committee by the officer. I consider that many of these involve minor employment issues and need not to be determined by Committee.
- 2.4 Planning Advisory Service previously identified how some planning authorities are achieving better planning outcomes by improving the effectiveness and efficiency of the way they make planning decisions by delegation. The common factors characterising this good practice were identified as:
- Maximising the number of delegated planning decisions – delegating higher than 90% of planning decisions, which gives planning committees more time to focus on complex and controversial applications.
- 2.5 In relation to the Development Management Protocol and as a result of the considerable amount of correspondence arising in part from major planning applications, it has been decided to no longer acknowledge correspondence in order to allow administrative staff to focus on other work and in particular the processing of planning applications. It is important to note that all correspondence is recorded in an electronic post book and this will continue.

3 ISSUES

- 3.1 In assessing the revisions proposed I do not consider this would have a significant detrimental impact on the planning process and key applications would still need to be determined by the Planning and Development Committee. I envisage that the proposed changes will speed up the determination of planning applications and in turn help to facilitate economic growth. As stated previously the “Referral request” procedure would still be possible on such applications.
- 3.2 Although I would not anticipate any significant increase in the level of delegation resulting from the changes it would the Council in progressing towards the national target of between 90%-95%. This change will bring us more in line with similar Councils and I hope will also free up officer time and member time to be available on key applications with the fact that less applications would need to go to Planning and Development Committee and also assist in a speedier determination which in turn may deliver a more prosperous economy.

4 RISK ASSESSMENT

- 4.1 The approval of this report may have the following implications:
- Resources – any changes could be met with existing staffing and it may also free up some member and officer time.
 - Technical, Environmental and Legal – No implications identified.

- Political – No implications identified.
- Reputation – No implications identified.
- Equality & Diversity – No implications identified.

5 RECOMMENDED THAT COMMITTEE

- 5.1 Endorse the minor alterations to the text of the report which gives further clarification as to the extent of the delegation scheme and approve the revised changes to the delegation scheme to include:
- Commercial and Agricultural applications in excess of 1000m² floorspace
- 5.2 Endorse the changes in Development Management Protocol and no longer acknowledge correspondence.

JOHN MACHOLC
HEAD OF PLANNING SERVICES

JOHN HEAP
DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY SERVICES

BACKGROUND PAPERS

- 1 Current Delegation Scheme.

For further information please ask for John Macholc, extension 4502.

P&D/JM/EL/130912

EXISTING DELEGATION SCHEME UPDATED 24 MAY 2012

- RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL
- PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
- SCHEME OF DELEGATION OF DEVELOPMENT CONTROL AND COUNTRYSIDE MATTERS

This note is designed to clarify when applications received by the Council in relation to planning, countryside and some other related matters will be decided by the Planning and Development Committee and when those decisions will be delegated to officers of the Council. Many of the delegated items date from the inception of Ribble Valley Borough Council. Where dates are known for later additions they are given. Details of planning decisions made under delegated powers will be reported to Committee for information.

From time to time legislative changes may rename or make minor amendments to some of the listed delegated items. Whilst the scheme of delegation will be amended to reflect these changes, there may be periods where the clear intention must be respected even if precise wording or legislative reference has changed.

These powers are delegated to the Director of Community Services.

1. GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL
 - (a) Determination as to whether applications are county matters or district matters under Schedule 1 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
 - (b) The statutory or the discretionary need to advertise various types of applications.
 - (c) What statutory or other consultations/notifications are required?
2. APPLICATIONS FOR A CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS AND DISCHARGE OF CONDITIONS
 - 2.1 There are two types of application for a Lawful Development Certificate.

These are:

 - (a) Determination of applications for a Certificate of Lawfulness of existing use or development under Section 191 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
 - (b) Determination of applications for a Certificate of Lawfulness of proposed use or development under Section 192 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
 - 2.2 Applications for the discharge of conditions placed on planning approvals.

2.3 Since all these types of application relate to issues of fact, both refusals and approvals are delegated to the Director of Community Services. **These applications remain delegated even if representations are received.**

3. DETERMINATION OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS

3.1 Applications submitted on behalf of family members of councillors and officers should be placed before the Planning and Development Committee even if they fall within the below categories.

Approvals

3.2 The following types of planning application are delegated to the Director of Community Services providing fewer than three objections from separate addresses are received by the date of consultation closure. The total of these includes statutory consultees.

- Applications for up to 3 new dwellings (14/1/12)
- Substitute dwellings on existing plots within an existing housing estate
- Applications for new access points wither on classified or unclassified roads.
- Applications for a change of use (26/5/94)
- Extensions or ancillary buildings within the curtilage of industrial or commercial buildings subject to the alterations not constituting a major proposals, ie it should be no more than 1000 square metres floor space (this includes temporary buildings). (6/3/03 then 18/12/08)
- New build commercial premises of less than 1000 square metres floor space (13/9/12).
- Proposals for new shop fronts on existing shops
- Applications for consent to display advertisements
- Applications for agricultural buildings of up 1000 square metres floor space (11/4/90 then 18/12/08)
- Proposals to reinforce existing overhead power lines.
- Applications for listed building consent
- Applications for conservation area consent (11/4/90 and 30/04/09)
- All applications about which the observations of the Council are requested (23/4/98 and 18/12/08)
- Renewals of previously approved schemes (23/4/98)
- Renewals of temporary consents (15/6/99)
- Applications for temporary buildings (15/6/99)
- Reserved matters applications
- Modification of conditions and minor alterations to Section 106 Agreements. (24/05/12)
- Minor material amendments (14/1/10)
- Non material amendments (14/11/10)
- Ancillary development within the curtilage of a dwelling house (for example, domestic garages, conservatories, porches, greenhouses and means of enclosure etc)
- Extensions to dwellings
- Revocation requests relating to Section 106 Agreements (24/05/12)

Refusals

3.3 Planning applications falling into these categories can be refused under delegated powers without prior reference to the Chairman (or if unavailable the Vice Chairman) of Planning and Development Committee.

- Household extensions and curtilage buildings
- Listed buildings
- New housing clearly contrary to Policy (To be interpreted by Case Officer in conjunction with Head of Planning Services 24/05/12)
- Applications raising design issues
- Advertisement proposals
- Buildings in the open countryside
- Change of uses that do not generate significant employment issues
- Reserved matters

Such delegated refusals can be issued with registered objectors.

Planning applications falling into the three categories below will normally be discussed with the Chairman (or if unavailable the Vice Chairman) or Planning and Development Committee to decide whether they can be refused under delegated powers or should be referred to Committee.

- Developments that may have significant employment issues
- Modification of conditions.
- Applications that may resolve bad neighbour developments

Section 106 Agreements

3.4 Negotiations leading to the satisfactory completion of Section 106 Agreements will be delegated to officers unless Committee have formally requested further involvement at the time of the original decision.

4. PRIOR NOTIFICATIONS

4.1 Proposals for agricultural buildings, demolition work and telecommunications apparatus within certain size and locational thresholds may benefit from permitted development rights. The developers are however required to serve a prior notification upon the Council.

This gives the local authority the opportunity to assess whether planning consent is required and also to seek technical alterations if appropriate. The Council has a limited time to respond; but as failure to issue a decision results in an automatic approval these items need to be delegated regardless of the decision reached.

5. ENFORCEMENT

- 5.1 In all cases where there is a breach of planning control, the Director of Community Services is authorised to take the necessary action to regularise the situation, including the service of notice on untidy sites.
6. BUILDING PRESERVATION NOTICES
- 6.1 In the case of an unlisted building that is of Special Architectural or Historic interest and is in danger of demolition or alteration, the Director of Community Services is authorised to serve a building preservation notice. (This is sometimes known as spot listing).
7. TREE PRESERVATION AND COUNTRYSIDE
- (a) The Director of Community Services is authorised to make provisional tree preservation orders where necessary because of the immediate threat to tree involved.
 - (b) Decisions on applications for work on protected trees.
 - (c) Confirmation of tree preservation orders when no objections have been received.
 - (d) Decisions on notifications under the Hedgerow Regulations.
 - (e) Confirmation of public rights of way diversion orders.
 - (f) Responses to Lancashire County Council on the consultation stage of footpath diversion orders in liaison with Committee Chairman (or if unavailable the Vice Chairman) and ward member(s).
8. OTHER MATTERS
- 8.1 Decisions on whether an application is needed for consent to demolish a building.
- 8.2 Decisions on whether an environmental impact assessment is required for any specific proposal and determination of scoping and screening requests.
- 8.3 The attachment of appropriate conditions to approvals following overturns of officer refusal recommendations to Committee (8/3/01).
- 8.4 Decisions whether or not to use consultants to prepare and present an appeal case is delegated but only following discussions with the Chairman (or if unavailable the Vice Chairman) of the Planning and Development Committee,
- 8.5 Delegation to Director of Community Services or Head of Planning Services to decide to take applications to Planning and Development Committee even if they fall within the Delegated procedure if it is deemed appropriate.
9. COUNCILLORS POWER TO REQUIRE A PLANNING APPLICATION TO BE DETERMINED BY COMMITTEE
- 9.1 The ward councillor will have the right to require that any application or revocation request appearing on the weekly list to be presented to Planning and Development Committee for decision providing that such an instruction is received by the Director of Community Services in writing within 14 days of the 'received week ending' of the relevant list.

PROPOSED DELEGATION SCHEME 13 SEPTEMBER 2012

- RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL
- PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
- SCHEME OF DELEGATION OF DEVELOPMENT CONTROL AND COUNTRYSIDE MATTERS
- LAST REVIEWED 24 MAY 2012

This note is designed to clarify when applications received by the Council in relation to planning, countryside and some other related matters will be decided by the Planning and Development Committee and when those decisions will be delegated to officers of the Council. Many of the delegated items date from the inception of Ribble Valley Borough Council. Where dates are known for later additions they are given. Details of planning decisions made under delegated powers will be reported to Committee for information.

From time to time legislative changes may rename or make minor amendments to some of the listed delegated items. Whilst the scheme of delegation will be amended to reflect these changes, there may be periods where the clear intention must be respected even if precise wording or legislative reference has changed.

These powers are delegated to the Director of Community Services.

1. GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL
 - (a) Determination as to whether applications are county matters or district matters under Schedule 1 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
 - (b) The statutory or the discretionary need to advertise various types of applications.
 - (c) What statutory or other consultations/notifications are required?
2. APPLICATIONS FOR A CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS AND DISCHARGE OF CONDITIONS
 - 2.1 There are two types of application for a Lawful Development Certificate.

These are:

 - (a) Determination of applications for a Certificate of Lawfulness of existing use or development under Section 191 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
 - (b) Determination of applications for a Certificate of Lawfulness of proposed use or development under Section 192 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
 - 2.2 Applications for the discharge of conditions placed on planning approvals.

2.3 Since all these types of application relate to issues of fact, both refusals and approvals are delegated to the Director of Community Services. **These applications remain delegated even if representations are received.**

3. DETERMINATION OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS

3.1 Applications submitted on behalf of family members of councillors and officers should be placed before the Planning and Development Committee even if they fall within the below categories.

Approvals

3.2 The following types of planning application are delegated to the Director of Community Services providing fewer than three objections from separate addresses are received by the date of consultation closure. The total of these includes statutory consultees.

- Applications for up to 3 new dwellings (14/1/12)
- Substitute dwellings on existing plots within an existing housing estate
- Applications for new access points wither on classified or unclassified roads.
- Applications for a change of use (26/5/94)
- Extensions or ancillary buildings within the curtilage of industrial or commercial buildings subject to the alterations not constituting a major proposals, ie it should be no more than 1000 square metres floor space (this includes temporary buildings). (6/3/03 then 18/12/08)
- All new build commercial premises irrespective of size
- Proposals for new shop fronts on existing shops
- Applications for consent to display advertisements
- Applications for agricultural buildings irrespective of size
- Proposals to reinforce existing overhead power lines.
- Applications for listed building consent
- Applications for conservation area consent (11/4/90 and 30/04/09)
- All applications about which the observations of the Council are requested (23/4/98 and 18/12/08)
- Renewals of previously approved schemes (23/4/98)
- Renewals of temporary consents (15/6/99)
- Applications for temporary buildings (15/6/99)
- Reserved matters applications
- Modification of conditions and minor alterations to Section 106 Agreements. (24/05/12)
- Minor material amendments (14/1/10)
- Non material amendments (14/11/10)
- Ancillary development within the curtilage of a dwelling house (for example, domestic garages, conservatories, porches, greenhouses and means of enclosure etc)
- Extensions to dwellings
- Revocation requests relating to Section 106 Agreements (24/05/12)

Refusals

- 3.3 Planning applications falling into these categories can be refused under delegated powers without prior reference to the Chairman (or if unavailable the Vice Chairman) of Planning and Development Committee.
- Household extensions and curtilage buildings
 - Listed buildings
 - New housing clearly contrary to Policy (To be interpreted by Case Officer in conjunction with Head of Planning Services 24/05/12)
 - Applications raising design issues
 - Advertisement proposals
 - Buildings in the open countryside
 - Change of uses that do not generate significant employment issues
 - Reserved matters

Such delegated refusals can be issued with registered objectors.

Section 106 Agreements

- 3.4 Negotiations leading to the satisfactory completion of Section 106 Agreements will be delegated to officers unless Committee have formally requested further involvement at the time of the original decision.

4. PRIOR NOTIFICATIONS

- 4.1 Proposals for agricultural buildings, demolition work and telecommunications apparatus within certain size and locational thresholds may benefit from permitted development rights. The developers are however required to serve a prior notification upon the Council.

This gives the local authority the opportunity to assess whether planning consent is required and also to seek technical alterations if appropriate. The Council has a limited time to respond; but as failure to issue a decision results in an automatic approval these items need to be delegated regardless of the decision reached.

5. ENFORCEMENT

- 5.1 In all cases where there is a breach of planning control, the Director of Community Services is authorised to take the necessary action to regularise the situation, including the service of notice on untidy sites.

6. BUILDING PRESERVATION NOTICES

- 6.1 In the case of an unlisted building that is of Special Architectural or Historic interest and is in danger of demolition or alteration, the Director of Community Services is authorised to serve a building preservation notice. (This is sometimes known as spot listing).

7. TREE PRESERVATION AND COUNTRYSIDE

- (a) The Director of Community Services is authorised to make provisional tree preservation orders where necessary because of the immediate threat to tree involved.
- (b) Decisions on applications for work on protected trees.
- (c) Confirmation of tree preservation orders when no objections have been received.
- (d) Decisions on notifications under the Hedgerow Regulations.
- (e) Confirmation of public rights of way diversion orders.
- (f) Responses to Lancashire County Council on the consultation stage of footpath diversion orders in liaison with Committee Chairman (or if unavailable the Vice Chairman) and ward member(s).

8. OTHER MATTERS

- 8.1 Decisions on whether an application is needed for consent to demolish a building.
- 8.2 Decisions on whether an environmental impact assessment is required for any specific proposal and determination of scoping and screening requests.
- 8.3 The attachment of appropriate conditions to approvals following overturns of officer refusal recommendations to Committee (8/3/01).
- 8.4 Decisions whether or not to use consultants to prepare and present an appeal case is delegated but only following discussions with the Chairman (or if unavailable the Vice Chairman) of the Planning and Development Committee,
- 8.5 Delegation to Director of Community Services or Head of Planning Services to decide to take applications to Planning and Development Committee even if they fall within the Delegated procedure if it is deemed appropriate.

9. COUNCILLORS POWER TO REQUIRE A PLANNING APPLICATION TO BE DETERMINED BY COMMITTEE

- 9.1 The ward councillor will have the right to require that any application or revocation request appearing on the weekly list to be presented to Planning and Development Committee for decision providing that such an instruction is received by the Director of Community Services in writing within 14 days of the 'received week ending' of the relevant list.

RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL REPORT TO PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Agenda Item No.

meeting date: 13 SEPTEMBER 2012
title: SITE ALLOCATIONS – INITIAL STAGES
submitted by: CHIEF EXECUTIVE
principal author: COLIN HIRST

1 PURPOSE

1.1 To consider the background and initial steps to undertake site allocations work in connection with the Core Strategy.

1.2 Relevance to the Council's ambitions and priorities:

- Community Objectives – site allocations support the delivery of the Core Strategy, the Council's housing and employment ambitions and the implementation of the vision for the Ribble Valley over the next 20 years. As a tool for delivering spatial policy, site allocations will help the Council ensure the proper planning of the borough.
- Corporate Priorities – the work supports the Council's priorities of protecting and enhancing the local environment, delivering housing needs, promotion of economic development and being a well run Council.
- Other Considerations – the Council has a duty to prepare planning policies to ensure the needs of the area are met.

2 BACKGROUND

2.1 Members are aware of the progress made with the preparation of the Core Strategy which has now reached submission stage. The Core Strategy establishes the principal strategic framework for the development of the borough up to 2028. It establishes amongst other things, the amount of, and patterns of new development to be planned for. The Core Strategy does not, in itself other than for the proposed strategic site include specific land allocations for housing and employment to meet the identified needs. The allocations will, particularly in regard to housing provide a key element of control for development coming forward to help implement the Core Strategy and is seen as an increasingly vital part of the Council's Planning Policy Framework. Clearly, the Government's advice is to encourage Local Planning Authorities to put in place the necessary development plan policies as soon as possible and therefore consideration needs to be given to bringing forward this key element of work.

2.2 Within the current Local Development Framework programme, the Council has previously identified the intention to prepare a supporting Development Plan Document (DPD) dealing with housing and economic development. This document was intended to be the policy tool through which site allocations would be made for housing and economic development and where necessary, any additional detailed policy coverage would be included. However, it should be noted that to a greater extent this latter

element has been superseded by the approach of the Core Strategy and the implications of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The DPD would also be the opportunity to review the existing settlement boundaries in the saved Local Plan accordingly as an integral part of that process. Work on the DPD would have progressed after the examination process for the Core Strategy.

3 HOUSING AND ECONOMIC DPD

- 3.1 The Housing and Economic DPD was a key part of the LDF programme devised to follow closely on from the preparation of the Core Strategy. Changing circumstances focused around the new NPPF and the increasing development pressures faced in the borough warrant the need to bring forward the preparation of the allocations in particular of housing sites.
- 3.2 The publication of the NPPF and new development plan regulations will need to be taken into account in dealing with site allocations with the resulting position complicated further by the stage and form of the Core Strategy and the Council's programmed approach that requires the associated DPD. Going forward in future years, there is a clear indication in the NPPF that the development plan process would move towards a single policy document approach where strategy and allocations were delivered together much like the old local plan or unitary plan system. Clearly, because of the stage the Council has reached and its previous approach, progress now needs to be made to bring together the Core Strategy and its subsequent allocations. It is also possible that the Inspector appointed to deal with the Core Strategy Examination may seek information on the Council's approach to allocations during the examination and it is helpful to have an identified course of action.
- 3.3 The focus of the housing and economic DPD will be towards the three basic elements of allocating land for housing, employment and revising the settlement boundaries. In reviewing the settlement boundaries, there will be a need to take account of land that may have an extant planning permission, (and therefore forms part of the existing supply), or to reflect development that has been previously completed. What should be noted however, is that the allocation process itself deals with allocating new land through this formal process, and establishing the principle of development, rather than simply reflecting sites with planning permission. The Council is in the situation where the rapid increase in planning approvals has superseded the settlement boundary in a number of places and whilst land will not need to be allocated as it has planning permission, settlement boundaries will need to be redefined to reflect those changes. This is likely to lead to some pressures to try and revisit for the longer term development sites. As a consequence of permissions however, in some instances, there will not be large numbers of new allocations needed as sites are already committed across the borough.
- 3.4 There are a number of preliminary stages to be undertaken which will be the subject of future reports as this work progresses. Initially a baseline will need to be established against which the proposed allocations will be generated. This is likely to be taken as the next quarter's housing land supply position (November), although this will need to be kept under review as time progresses to reflect any further planning approvals of significance. To help identify potential allocations that reflect the Core Strategy, reference will need to be made to a number of existing sources of information, including the adopted Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA), relevant submissions to the Core Strategy (where sites are identified) and records of sites that

owners, developers and their agents have notified the Council of. In addition, it is considered appropriate to publish a general 'call for sites' where an invitation is extended through the press and website to submit potential sites to the Council for consideration, normally over a defined 4-6 week period.

- 3.5 The intention will be to prepare an options paper on the proposed allocations that will be subject to public consultation and will inform the choice of proposed allocations. This would also provide a key vehicle for community engagement to obtain contributions to the process from the public, Town and Parish Councils together with a wide range of interested parties. This is viewed by Government as an important part of place shaping by the community and potentially could encourage neighbourhood planning initiatives. The work would also need to be subject to a range of supporting assessments, sustainability appraisal and subsequently to an Examination process. Although some of the costs involved in this will be contained within existing operational budgets at this stage, there will be additional costs to be met through future budget processes. It is anticipated however, that given the need to progress as soon as possible, Members should give consideration to a request that the Council's Budget Working Group identify a provisional budget of some £15,000 to progress work in the current financial year.
- 3.6 Clearly, detailed consideration needs to be given to the resources required to put in place the site allocations work. Existing staff resources will be heavily committed to the forthcoming Examination in Public leaving little scope to progress the allocations work, unless additional support is made. The initial stages could be addressed through extending existing temporary appointments, however this does not deal with the need to address the longer term view, including staff changes resulting from fixed term contracts ending. As an option work could be undertaken to review appointing consultancy support to undertake the work as an alternative. A further option would be to consider the appointment of an additional member of staff on a fixed term basis to provide the necessary policy support. As there is a considerable amount of work involved in exploring these options, especially the scoping and use of external consultancy, Members are asked to consider the principles of these options and to provide an initial steer to officers at this early stage.
- 3.7 The production of a site allocations DPD has to follow a series of statutory stages and will inevitably take time to put in place. It is anticipated that it could take up to two years to undertake the full process subject to approach and resourcing and of course the extent to which the delivery of planning permissions through the planning application process reduces the need for new land to be identified. It is for the Council, as Local Planning Authority however, to endeavour to establish the most expedient route to deliver the necessary allocations, in order to protect the area from inappropriate or less sustainable development and removing as far as possible uncertainty in terms of which areas are to be developed. This helps to enable other agencies to match their infrastructure delivery with a pattern of development on the ground. Given the existing significant development pressures being faced by the Council, it will clearly be expedient to keep the whole process under regular review.

4 RISK ASSESSMENT

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

- Resources – This report deals with a new area of work: costs for some preliminary work can be contained in existing budgets. A provisional, additional budget of £15,000 is sought to enable work to be brought forward to this current financial year ahead of the normal budgeting process. Work resulting from this report could give additional resource requirements that would be subject to further reports and Members' consideration.
- Technical, Environmental and Legal – The Council has to follow the statutory regulations in preparing a DPD. The site allocations work will be a key part of the implementation of the Core Strategy.
- Political – There is significant public interest in the development issues that will be raised by this work that will inevitably run parallel to the consideration of planning applications.
- Reputation – Decisions taken in connection with the site allocations DPD will help demonstrate the Council's obligations to fulfil its statutory role and meet the objective of being a well run Council demonstrating community leadership.
- Equality & Diversity – No implications identified.

5 RECOMMENDED THAT COMMITTEE

- 5.1 Agree to refer a request for the provision of £15,000 to Policy and Finance Committee and that it be considered in conjunction with the Budget Working Group to facilitate the early commencement of work on the DPD, including the appointment of temporary staff cover as necessary.
- 5.2 Ask the Chief Executive to investigate further the delivery of site allocations work using specialist consultancy support reporting back to this Committee as soon as possible with his findings.
- 5.3 Agree to publish a call for sites over a four week period to inform the development of site allocation options and a preliminary allocations report.

COLIN HIRST
HEAD OF REGENERATION AND HOUSING

MARSHALL SCOTT
CHIEF EXECUTIVE

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

CH/EL/130912/P&D

RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL REPORT TO PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Agenda Item No.

meeting date: THURSDAY, 13 SEPTEMBER 2012
title: HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY
submitted by: CHIEF EXECUTIVE
principal author: COLIN HIRST – HEAD OF REGENERATION AND HOUSING

1 PURPOSE

1.1 To provide Members with corrected information on the most recent results of the Housing Land Availability Survey.

1.2 Relevance to the Council's ambitions and priorities

- Community Objectives – The information in this report relates to a number of community objectives but is particularly relevant to the broad objective of conserving our countryside and enhancing the local environment.
- Corporate Priorities - This information is relevant to the local development framework which is the spatial expression of the Community Strategy.
- Other Consideration – None.

2 INFORMATION

2.1 At the previous Planning and Development Committee held on 16 August 2012, an information item was included in the agenda giving the latest housing land supply position. It has been identified that the appendices containing the relevant calculations had an error that over counted supply by some 48 dwellings. These schedules have been corrected and are attached to this report. This was as a result of double counting those dwellings that were conversions, under construction.

COLIN HIRST
HEAD OF REGENERATION AND HOUSING

MARSHAL SCOTT
CHIEF EXECUTIVE

BACKGROUND PAPERS

- 1 Housing Land Availability Survey files
- 2 North West of England Plan Regional Spatial Strategy to 2021 – GONW- Sept 2008

For details of the Housing Land Availability Schedule contact Sharon O'Neill extension 4506.

For further information on housing and strategic policy issues please ask for Colin Hirst, extension 4503.

Ref: CH/EL/130912/P&D

Five year supply (2012-2017) based on previously adopted RSS figures and including permissions, completions and commitments up until 1 July 2012

Planned Provision

a) Housing provision 2003/2021	2900	161/yr
b) Net dwellings completed 2003-2012 (9.2yrs)	1200	130 (1200/9.2)
c) Net dwellings required 2012-2021 (8.8 years) (adjusted to a revised annual rate)	1700/8.8	193/yr
d) Adjusted Net 5 yr requirement 2012-2017 (5yrs)	965	193 x 5 (annual equivalent smoothed over plan period)
e) Add Buffer of 20%	1158	20% NPPF guideline (193 + 20% = 232)

- a) Strategic housing provision based on previously adopted RSS figures.
- b) Actual completions in monitoring period divided by number of years.
- c) Residual requirements based on completions and plan period remaining. This figure gives the annualised requirement to attain planned figure.
- d) Five year requirements based on the revised/adjusted annualised rate.
- e) Buffer to allow for previous years under delivery 20% para. 47 – NPPF.

Identified Supply

Supply of deliverable sites over 5 years (Housing Land Availability Survey July 2012)	
Sites subject to Section 106 agreements	164
Affordable units	249
Sites with Planning permission	934
Deliverable sites	(1347)
(discounted by 10% slippage allowance)	1212
Sites under construction	140
Total Supply	1352
Equates to <u>5.82 yrs supply</u> at 5 year adjusted rate at 01/07/12	

supply: 5.82 yrs supply (1352 ÷ 232)

Five year supply (2008-2028) based on proposed Core Strategy requirement including permissions, completions and commitments up until 1 July 2012

Planned Provision

a) Housing provision 2008/2028	4000	200/yr
b) Net dwellings completed 2008/2012 (4.2yrs)	402	96 (402/4.2)
c) Net dwellings required 2012-2021 (15.8 years) (adjusted to a revised annual rate)	3598/15.8	227/yr
d) Adjusted Net 5 yr requirement 2012-2017 (5yrs)	1135	227 x 5 (annual equivalent smoothed over plan period)
e) Add Buffer of 20%	1362	20% NPPF guideline (227 + 20% = 272)

- a) Strategic housing provision based on previously proposed Core Strategy requirement.
- b) Actual completions in monitoring period divided by number of years.
- c) Residual requirements based on completions and plan period remaining. This figure gives the annualised requirement to attain planned figure.
- d) Five year requirements based on the revised/adjusted annualised rate.
- e) Buffer to allow for previous years under delivery 20% para. 47– NPPF.

Identified Supply

Supply of deliverable sites over 5 years (Housing Land Availability Survey July 2012)	
Sites subject to Section 106 agreements	164
Affordable units	249
Sites with Planning permission	934
Deliverable sites	(1347)
(discounted by 10% slippage allowance)	1212
Sites under construction	140
Total Supply	1352
Equates to <u>4.97 yrs supply</u> at 5 year adjusted rate at 01/07/12	

supply: 4.97 yrs supply (1352 ÷ 272)