



Steven Abbott Associates LLP
Chartered Town Planners

PLANNING STATEMENT

Outline Planning Application for:

1040 residential dwellings;
Local retail, service and community facilities;
Employment (Class B1);
A primary school site;
Public open space including green corridors;
An improved (roundabout) junction between Pendle Road and A59;
New vehicular, pedestrian and cycle accesses;
Roads, sewers, footpaths, cycleways, services and infrastructure

Trustees of the Standen Estate

Higher Standen Farm and Part Littlemoor Farm, Clitheroe

October 2012



CONTENTS

1.	INTRODUCTION.....	3
2.	BACKGROUND.....	5
3.	THE NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK (NPPF) MARCH 2012.....	9
4.	HOUSING GROWTH STATEMENT – SEPTEMBER 2012 (ISSUED BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE).....	31
5.	THE DEVELOPMENT PLAN.....	33
6.	THE CORE STRATEGY 2008 – 2028 ‘A LOCAL PLAN FOR RIBBLE VALLEY’ REGULATION 19 CONSULTATION DRAFT AS SUBMITTED TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE.....	37
7.	THE RIBBLE VALLEY DISTRICTWIDE LOCAL PLAN (1998) – SAVED POLICIES (2007).....	65
8.	OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS.....	71
9.	COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT.....	75
10.	CONCLUSIONS.....	76

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. This Statement has been written to support an outline planning application for a development on land at Higher Standen and Littlemoor farms, Clitheroe as well as related land concerning a proposed junction improvement on the A59 where it meets Pendle Road.

1.2. The Statement is a comprehensive overview of material planning policy considerations which we believe should be taken into account by the Council in determining the application.

1.3. The application is also supported by the following documents which are being lodged at the same time:

- Environmental Impact Assessment by AMEC – An Environmental Statement (ES) (with input also from IBI Taylor Young, Durham University, Berrys and ERAP);
- A Transport Assessment by SBA;
- A Design and Access Statement produced by IBI Taylor Young incorporating a Parameters Plan;
- A Design Code Framework produced by IBI Taylor Young;
- Application ‘red edge’ plan to identify the site;
- The parameters plan shows various parameters and also includes the location of the proposed accesses into the site.

1.4. Apart from ourselves and the above parties this submission has also been supported by the Trustees of the Standen Estate who, from the outset, have played a very involved role in seeking a high quality and sensitive development on land which the Standen Estate has owned for hundreds of years. Furthermore, the Estate’s local involvement

will continue into the future as it owns substantial land holdings in the Clitheroe area, including land to the south and beyond) . This ensures that it has a real interest in facilitating development which is truly sustainable for the local area.

- 1.5. In addition other professional practices in education, commercial surveying and law have also assisted and will continue to do so as the matter progresses.
- 1.6. A separate statement on community involvement is appended to this one.
- 1.7. We hope that this Statement will be helpful to the Council, consultees and anyone else who has taken an interest in this very exciting proposal.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1. Three years ago (2009) the Applicants became aware that the Council needed to identify strategic options for housing within its proposed Core Strategy.
- 2.2. One of the areas of land identified by the Council as a potential 'Strategic Site' was the application site. The Applicants (through us) made the Council aware that the land is in single ownership and is available including the land needed to provide a new junction between Pendle Road and the A59.
- 2.3. The Applicants decided to commission an environmental impact assessment. Such exercises are comprehensive, lengthy and look at all aspects of the environment – it has shown that there are no constraints which would prevent a sensitive development.
- 2.4. Rather than rushing ahead with planning applications for all or part of the site, it was decided to await the emergence of the Council's Draft Core Strategy.
- 2.5. Successive draft versions of that have shown the Standen site as a strategic site option and the more recent versions have specifically proposed it. Most recently, the Full Council resolved (28 August, 2012) to submit the Draft to the Secretary of State as its submission document. Accordingly, the Submission document has been lodged with the Secretary of State.
- 2.6. At the same time, Proposed Changes, are being sent out for consultation, which will be reported at the Examination In Public (EIP) to be held in the next few months. The Proposed Changes do not have any effect on the application site.
- 2.7. The number of houses proposed has been reduced by 360 (over a quarter) to meet a request from the Council which reflected local opinion (expressed as responses to the Core Strategy's consultation process).
- 2.8. It is a fact that the Council is under enormous and unprecedented pressure to grant planning permission for various new residential developments. The background to this (a major material consideration in its own right) is that, unfortunately, the Council does

not have deliverable sites identified to meet its five year housing supply obligations. This issue is explained in the context of NPPF below.

- 2.9. Many of the other sites being promoted are large, are just for housing and are in places not favoured by the Council. They are incapable of delivering the infrastructure, quality of environment and the community facilities this site has.
- 2.10. The grant of planning permission will help the Council to resist opportunistic planning applications as it will deliver a strategy which involves a planned and sensitive expansion of Clitheroe as its largest settlement and a key service centre.
- 2.11. With the completion of the environmental impact assessment and the Council's decision to submit the Submission Core Strategy to the Secretary of State now is the right time to make an application.
- 2.12. The site provides the opportunity for an extension to the southern edge of Clitheroe up to defined and sustainable boundaries (woodland belt along Pendleton Brook, Pendle Road and Worston Old Road).
- 2.13. The site adjoins the existing urban area.
- 2.14. It has excellent proximity to the A59 without the need for traffic to travel through the existing built up area.
- 2.15. The site has relatively few ecological or other physical site constraints and those which exist do not prevent appropriate and sensitive development from taking place.

Benefits

- 2.16. The development would address identified housing need in the Ribble Valley by means of a sustainable urban extension.
- 2.17. It would provide a significant number (over 300) of affordable homes.
- 2.18. The development would provide homes (including some affordable ones) specifically designed for elderly needs.

- 2.19. It would include a site for a new primary school.
- 2.20. Access to the site, and its recreational potential, will be greatly improved.
- 2.21. The new roundabout on the A59 would be in the broad interest of road users and not just mitigate the impact of the development.
- 2.22. The development would provide new employment opportunities.
- 2.23. It would provide new local facilities.
- 2.24. The development principles and objectives are explained in the accompanying Design and Access Statement but key to the approach from the outset is the aim to establish principles which ensure that it will be of a high quality and sensitive to the context.
- 2.25. In the course of the Council's consultation exercises on the CS a number of development issues were raised. These related to the following:-
- School provision
 - Health services
 - Roads and traffic
 - Utilities
 - Drainage
 - Leisure and recreation
 - Environment and wildlife
 - Character and identity
 - Employment opportunities
 - Archaeology

- 2.26. All of these matters are covered in this document or others supporting the application. A summary of them appear on the 'Story Boards' used in the public exhibition/examination which appear in the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI)
- 2.27. Access and traffic has been a topic raised by local people and the Transport Assessment deals with them comprehensively.
- 2.28. The SCI describes a number of changes which have been made to the proposals (many substantive) before the submission of the application, as a response to consultation exercises on the proposed development.
- 2.29. The rest of this document relates the proposals to national, regional and local planning policy and current issues. It sets out what we believe are the material considerations.

3. THE NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK (NPPF) MARCH 2012

- 3.1. The NPPF sets out the Government's planning policies and how these are expected to be applied. It is a framework within which local people and councils can produce their own distinctive local plans to reflect the needs and priorities of their communities.
- 3.2. The NPPF must be taken into account in the preparation of local plans, and is a material consideration in decisions on planning applications (paragraph 2 in NPPF).
- 3.3. In Ribble Valley, the Submission version of the Draft Core Strategy (CS) is one such Local Plan and has been updated to align with the NPPF. The importance of the CS is described in the next section.
- 3.4. The relationship between the NPPF and the development plan is inextricable. Paragraph 12 in the NPPF states that proposals which accord with up-to-date local plans should be approved. Furthermore, it is seen as 'highly desirable' that local planning authorities should have an up-to-date plan in place. The Council, is very aware of this, and has been keen to pursue its programme for a Core Strategy. It is a long process and has already taken 3 years to get to the Submission stage (see below).
- 3.5. The NPPF is based on a presumption in favour of sustainable development.
- 3.6. Paragraph 14 in the NPPF describes this as the 'golden thread' running through plan-making and decision-taking. There is a presumption in favour of granting permission for sustainable development which is being reflected nationally in appeal decisions. We return to this factor later in the Statement. The NPPF states that for decision-taking this means that development proposals which accord with the development plan should be approved 'without delay' unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The proposals are wholly consistent with the CS. It is accepted that the CS is (at the time of writing) still to be scrutinised by the EIP Inspector. However, given the Council's need to meet its housing responsibilities (see below) the CS has more weight now than the saved

Local Plan. In the context of paragraph 14 in the NPPF the saved Local Plan is largely 'out of date' at least in terms of this case.

3.7. The position is reinforced by what is stated in paragraph 15 of the NPPF, ie as a sustainable development it should be approved without delay.

3.8. The NPPF has a section entitled 'Core Planning Principles' (paragraph 17). With regard to those we comment as follows:-

- As we show later there is a presumption in favour of granting planning permission for the development on the basis that is sustainable development and the Council does not have a supply of housing sites to meet its obligations. However, the proposals are consistent with the emerging development plan being a key element in the CS.
- The proposals are highly creative. From the outset the Applicants and their extensive team have approached the proposals with the context in mind. The aim has been to establish principles which would counterbalance the loss of countryside by replacing it with an attractive extension to Clitheroe which would provide many benefits to the local community. Fundamentally, this would create a sensitive transition between town and country which is woefully lacking where the built up area meets the countryside now. The approach has absolutely not been a 'tick box' scrutiny processes as can be the case on such projects. The Applicants team has taken a positive, design led approach to what can be created and will continue to work with the Council and local community. The approach being promoted through this application would enhance Clitheroe as a place in which people live their lives.
- The proposals would deliver much needed homes, businesses and infrastructure and create a thriving, sensitive extension to Clitheroe.
- The proposals would make a significant contribution towards meeting the housing, business and the development needs of the area. The scheme is a very

positive response to wider opportunities for growth. The development is a function of the Council's strategy for development in its area – taking account of the needs of the residential and business communities.

- The proposals have embraced the benefits of high quality design and a good standard of amenity.

3.9. The role and character of this site – existing and future – has informed the master planning. In terms of particulars:-

- It is not Green Belt land
- The intrinsic character of the tract of countryside involved has been respected from the outset (e.g. an EIA was commissioned, trees and hedgerows are being retained where possible, there would be no net loss of biodiversity)
- Issues concerning the promotion and vitality of main urban areas are not involved given the location of Clitheroe some distance from them and Ribble Valley's own community's needs.

3.10. In terms of the desired low carbon future – the site is in a sustainable location (there are insufficient brownfield sites available); the illustrative master plan has sustainable considerations built into it, e.g. integral pedestrian, cycling and public transport provision; mixed land use; a SUDS drainage system; extensive green space and planting. Details on sustainable construction and design can be controlled by conditions and thus by reserved matters applications.

3.11. Given the quality of the landscape in the Ribble Valley opportunities for sustainable development are limited and particularly so where strategic sites are concerned. The land affected is of relatively lesser landscape value as is proven by the accompanying EIA. This is also true when measured in terms of agricultural land quality, ecology/biodiversity, landscape form or cultural heritage. In Ribble Valley terms it is a unique opportunity.

- 3.12. It is accepted that it is not a brownfield site. However, the reality is that to meet the minimum provision for housing shown in the CS (4000 homes between 2008 and 2028) there are insufficient brownfield sites. This is not surprising given that Ribble Valley is predominantly rural and relatively unscarred by industrial development.
- 3.13. The proposals are for a mixed use development.
- 3.14. The site contains the line of a Roman Road. The EIA included an archaeological assessment which not only examined its implications but included a 100% geophysical survey of the site. The assessment revealed no surprises such that the EIA recommends conditions on the planning permission concerning access for record keeping by archaeologists in a few locations. A corridor along the axis of the Roman Road has been planned since the outset of the design work as an interesting facet of the history of the area. This contrasts with the existing estate developments to the north which took no account of the line of the Roman Road.
- 3.15. The CS speaks of actively managing patterns of growth and making the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling – any focus of significant development to be in locations which are or can be made sustainable. The Standen site is a key element in that strategy and more particularly is a unique strategic opportunity for bringing forward sustainable development for the period through to 2028.
- 3.16. By bringing the strategic site through the NPPF's final core principle it will assist well being for all by delivering community facilities and services to meet local needs in a planned manner.
- 3.17. Section 2 in the NPPF deals with ensuring the vitality of town centres and – it refers to office development.

- 3.18. Paragraph 26 of the NPPF states that where applications for retail, leisure and office development outside of town centres, are not in accordance with an up-to-date Local Plan, local planning authorities should require an impact assessment if the development is over a proportionate, locally set floorspace threshold (if there is no locally set threshold, the default is 2500m²).
- 3.19. This is within the context of the sequential approach set out in paragraph 24.
- 3.20. In this case, the proposals do involve over 2500m² of employment floorspace which is envisaged as being offices.
- 3.21. However, there is no up to date Local Plan provision relating to this subject. The saved Ribble Valley Local Plan was originally adopted in 1998 (now 14 years old) and was written well before then. The housing supply figures behind it pre-date even the RSS. What is more important is the Submission Draft version of the Core Strategy which proposes the Strategic Site at Standen – to include employment development and specifically B1 uses. This planning application is consistent with that emerging policy.
- 3.22. Paragraph 32 in NPPF states that all development which generates a significant amount of traffic movement should be supported by a transport statement or transport assessment. This application is supported by such an assessment (produced by Savell, Bird and Axon).
- 3.23. In accordance with paragraph 34 in the NPPF the proposed development is located where the need to travel will be minimised and the use of sustainable modes can be facilitated. The location is on the edge of Clitheroe, an urban area, and close to principal routes – the A59 in particular. Clitheroe has a bus service system and a train station. The development would be integrated with existing footpaths and cycle routes and would introduce a new (internal) network of them. The illustrative master plan and access locations take account of buses.
- 3.24. The relationship between the site and potential destinations is provided in the TA.

- 3.25. A condition can be imposed on any planning permission granted for the provision of a travel plan.
- 3.26. Paragraph 47 in the NPPF requires the Council, amongst other things, to use its evidence base to meet the full objectively assessed needs for housing. This is in order to ‘boost significantly’ the supply of housing.
- 3.27. The same paragraph in the NPPF also requires the Council to identify and update annually a supply of specific, deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years worth of housing against their housing requirements with an additional buffer of 5% (moved forward from later in the plan period) to ensure choice and competition in the market for land. Where there has been what NPPF calls a ‘record of persistent under delivery of housing’, as is the case in the Ribble Valley, the Council has to increase the buffer to 20%.
- 3.28. The annualised requirement going forward will thus have to be adjusted to rectify the historic shortfall and to add the 20% required by the NPPF to provide a realistic prospect of achieving the planned supply and to ensure choice and competition in the market for land.
- 3.29. In terms of housing land requirements RVBC has utilised a report called “Headroom Report” produced by Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners (NLP) in July 2011. The report/study sets out the potential scale of future housing requirements in Ribble Valley Borough based upon a range of housing, economic and demographic factors, trends and forecasts.
- 3.30. The NLP report represents an up-to-date assessment of housing requirements. In terms of demographic based forecasts the NLP report included a number of scenarios. The baseline scenario was for 220 dwellings per annum (dpa). Whilst that figure was based on the most recent 2008 ONS/DCLG demographic data, it was based on ONS assumptions for natural change, using projected fertility and mortality rates. The alternative 2008 ONS/DCLG based scenario in the NLP report utilised sub-national population projections to estimate the household growth in each local authority area

and was, therefore, based on the most up-to-date local demographic factors, trends and projections. The sub-national projections based household resulted in a housing requirement of 280 dpa. The NLP report also considered economic growth led forecasts across a range of scenarios (e.g. past trends growth; forecast job growth) resulting in a range of annual dwelling requirements between 315- 539 dpa.

- 3.31. The NLP report also indicates that, based on the evidence provided by the Ribble Valley SHLAA (2009) *“there are no specific housing land supply issues that would prevent any of the housing scenarios presented in Section 3.0 from being met.”*

The NLP report also states that:

“the delivery of housing below 200 units per annum has the potential to have major adverse labour force implications, as there will be insufficient residents of working age to meet the Borough’s aspirational job forecasts without substantial levels of in commuting.”

- 3.32. The NLP report suggested that employment led and reduced migration scenarios should be excluded, leaving a broad range of 190-260 dwellings per annum. The NLP report then went on to suggest a more limited range of between 190-220 dwellings per annum due to *“core constraints on development delivery and policy choices”* –that reduced range is not based on housing land supply issues or physical and environmental constraints.
- 3.33. It is the case, therefore, that the proposed Core Strategy requirement of 200 dwellings per annum is at the very low end of the broad range of requirements/scenarios suggested by the NLP report. There are some question marks, therefore, as to whether the 200 dwellings per annum figure proposed in the Core Strategy will meet in full the objectively assessed needs of Ribble Valley Borough, as required by paragraph 47 of the NPPF. If RVBC is to utilise the 200 dwellings per annum figure then it must be seen as an absolute minimum figure to be achieved.

- 3.34. It is clear that RVBC has faced a challenge in terms of housing supply/delivery over recent years. Paragraph 49 of the NPPF confirms that “relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date if the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites”. Absence of a five-year supply of deliverable sites will engage para 14 of the NPPF by virtue of para 49 (The former involves a presumption in favour of sustainable development. The latter links the lack of a five year supply of deliverable housing sites with the presumption in favour of sustainable development).
- 3.35. We have reviewed the current housing supply position of RVBC in the light of the most up-to-date information provided in the Housing Land Availability Survey Files (July 2012) and the reports to the Planning and Development Committee on 16th August 2012 and 13th September 2012.
- 3.36. Our review takes account of recent appeal and Secretary of State decision’s which deal the correct approach to be adopted in considering how historic shortfall of delivery is to be dealt with. Recent pre-NPPF Secretary of State decision’s and post-NPPF appeal decisions confirm that the “Sedgefield” approach is to be preferred to the residual method¹. Those decisions confirm that it is inconsistent with the NPPF paragraph 47 to meet any housing shortfall by spreading it over the whole of the remaining plan period. The Sedgefield approach brings any shortfall into the first five years.
- 3.37. The application of the Sedgefield approach has the impact on the RVBC’s five year supply position shown in the tables below. Table 1 is the five-year supply position based on the currently adopted RSS figures (at the time of writing) and Table 2 is the five year supply position based on the proposed Core Strategy requirement.

¹ DCLG – Land Supply Assessment Checks (May 2009)

Table 1

Five-year supply (2012-2017) based on previously adopted RSS figures – Planned Provision.

(a)	Housing provision 2003/2021	2900	161 p.a.
(b)	Net dwellings completed 2003-2012 (9.2 years)	1200	130 p.a.
(c)	Shortfall	-281	
(d)	Five-year requirement		
(i)	Shortfall	-181	
(ii)	5 x 161	-805	-1066
(e)	Add buffer of 20% (281 + 805 = 1086; 20% of 1086 = 1303; 1303 / 5 = 260/261)	1303	260/261p.a.

- (a) Strategic housing provision based on previously adopted RSS figures.
- (b) Actual completions in monitoring period divided by number of years.
- (c) Shortfall of dwellings delivered since 2003 (i.e. 9.2 yrs x 161 =1481 less 1200 = 281)
- (d) Five-year requirements incorporating shortfall.
- (e) Buffer to allow for previous years under delivery 20% - para 47 of the NPPF.

Identified Supply (Housing Land Availability Survey July 2012)

Supply of deliverable sites over 5 years	
Sites subject to S106 obligations	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 5.28 years supply at 01/07/2012 (1352 / 256 = 5.28	
– see Table 1 above)	

Table 2

Five-year supply (2008-2028) based on proposed Core Strategy requirement – Planned Provision.

(a)	Housing provision 2008-2028	4000	200 p.a.
(b)	Net completions 2008-2012 (4.2 years)	402	96 p.a.
(c)	Shortfall 2008-2012 (4.2 years) (4.2 x 200 = 840 – 402 = 438)	-438	
(d)	Five-year requirement		
(i)	Shortfall	438	
(ii)	5 x 200 = 1000 + shortfall of 438 = 1438	1000	1438
(e)	Add buffer of 20% 1438 x .20 = 288; 1438 +288 = 1726; 1726 / 5 = 345	1726	345 p.a.

- (a) Strategic housing provision based on proposed Core Strategy requirement.
- (b) Actual completions in monitoring period divided by number of years.
- (c) Shortfall of dwellings delivered since 2008.
- (d) Five-year requirements incorporating shortfall.
- (e) Buffer to allow for previous years under delivery 20% - para 47 of the NPPF.

Identified Supply (Housing Land Availability Survey July 2012) (please refer to Table 1 above)

TOTAL SUPPLY **1352**

Equates to **3.92 years supply** at 01/07/2012 (1352 / 345)

(see Table 2 above)

3.38. The most up-to-date analysis on behalf of RVBC indicates that the 200 dwellings per annum figure is the absolute minimum required to meet the objectively assessed needs for housing. This is not a figure derived from the Core Strategy but one produced to inform its evidence base. Notwithstanding its relatively low number it is this figure that must be utilised now in considering the current 5 year supply position and not one identified some years ago now to inform RSS.

- 3.39. Table 2 above sets out the 5 year supply position on the basis of the 200 dwellings per annum requirement figure and adopting the Sedgefield approach to deal with the historic shortfall. The outcome is that currently RVBC is only able to show a 3.92 years supply of deliverable sites. **Consequently, in terms of paragraph 49 of the NPPF there is a presumption in favour of granting planning permission for this application regardless of the Core Strategy's proposals.**
- 3.40. The Secretary of State is taking this issue very seriously as has been proven by decisions familiar to the Council in Clitheroe and Whalley - but also elsewhere in the UK including those in Winchester and Bishop's Cleeve. Copies of those are attached as Appendices 1² and 2³.
- 3.41. An application of this type should be considered favourably in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development which underpins the NPPF (see paragraph 49 in the NPPF).
- 3.42. The NPPF has a section (7) on Good Design. It starts by emphasising the importance of design in the built environment as a key aspect of sustainable development. From the outset the Applicant has set his proposals up on the basis that the development must embrace good design. The application proves that to be the case.
- 3.43. With regard to paragraph 58 in the NPPF we can observe the following:-
- The development will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but for the lifetime of the development;
 - It would most certainly establish a strong sense of place, (and as the Design and Access Statement shows) would use streetscapes and buildings to create attractive and comfortable places to live, work and visit;

² PINS reference: APP/L1765/A/10/2126522 (Winchester)

³ PINS reference: APP/G1630/A/11/2146206 and APP/G1630/A/11/2146206 (Bishop's Cleeve)

- The development does (sensitively) optimise the potential to accommodate development, create and sustain an appropriate mix of uses (including incorporation of extensive green and other public open space as part of developments) and support local facilities and transport networks.
- The care taken in formulating these proposals (more particularly by commissioning an EIA) ensures that the development responds to local surroundings and materials. The proposals would not prevent or discourage appropriate innovation as the project moves forward.

3.44. This is an outline planning application albeit supported by a considerable amount of assessment, confirmatory principles and illustrative material. One key objective is to assist the Council as much as is possible in terms of securing design quality, permanently. Paragraph 59 in the NPPF is relevant as it promotes the use of design codes by local planning authorities. To assist with this process such a framework design code is lodged with the application.

3.45. Local distinctiveness is important, as paragraph 60 in the NPPF recognises. The approach taken to the master planning of the proposals, compiling the DAS and framework design code all take account of that factor.

3.46. The features which have been taken into account include:

- the existing hedgerows;
- trees;
- woods;
- the line of the Roman Road;
- the farm buildings complex;
- the existing footpaths;

- the Pendleton Brook valley;
- respecting the setting of listed buildings in Littlemoor;
- local architectural and townscape features typical of historic Ribble Valley settlements;
- The use of existing landscape features within a spacious layout to soften the relationship between the built up area and beyond.

3.47. Paragraph 61 in the NPPF charges local planning authorities with the responsibility of addressing the connections between people and places and the integration of new development into the natural, built and historic environment. In this case the development would be integrated with the existing built up area and enhance it because of its environmental qualities, land use mix and recreational benefits. The approach taken from the outset has been to facilitate the respect of the natural, built and historic environment. The components of the application prove how the utmost care has been taken on all fronts.

3.48. Paragraph 66 in the NPPF states that Applicants are expected to work closely with those directly affected by their proposals to evolve designs that take account of the views of the community. Furthermore, proposals which can demonstrate this in developing the design of the new development should be looked at more favourably. This application is an outline one with all matters reserved. Consequently, it would be inappropriate to engage with the community on detailed design. However, as we have explained, our client and we are keen to establish sound design principles to ensure that the development of the site is of a high quality which respects the context and, indeed, enhances it. With this in mind a great deal of work has been put into considering a realistic and sensitive illustrative master plan backed up by a design code. As part of the consultation exercise, conducted by the Applicant (a public exhibition held on 20 and 22 September 2012), members of the local community were invited to let us have their comments on the approach evolving. In addition, a dialogue about a design framework and approach to the development of the site with the Council's officers has run in

parallel with the emergence of the Core Strategy since an illustrative master plan was first lodged with the Council in 2010.

3.49. With regard to paragraph 69 in Section 8 in the NPPF 'Promoting Healthy Communities' we make the following observations:-

- The proposals (as proposed in the CS) are for a mixed-use development, with a local neighbourhood centre (plus a school site) and active street frontages which would bring those together who work, live and play in the vicinity.
- The illustrative master plan takes account of the need to plan for a safe and accessible environment where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion.
- The proposals show particularly clear and legible pedestrian routes, and genuinely high quality public open space, which encourage the active and continual use of public areas.

3.50. In terms of paragraph 70 in the NPPF the Council has, when coming to a decision, the comfort that:-

- It can plan positively in the knowledge that the Standen Site will provide for shared space, community facilities and other local services to enhance the sustainability of communities and residential environments.
- No existing community facilities or services would be lost – quite the reverse – new ones would be created.
- Established facilities and services based beyond the site would be supported including shops and including those in Clitheroe Town Centre.

3.51. From our first discussions with Council officers about this site in the context of the CS (going back to 2009) they stated that educational infrastructure was likely to be an issue.

- 3.52. Initially, our client was requested to make provision for a primary school site. Our clients agreed to that and it has formed a feature of the proposals ever since.
- 3.53. In addition a specialist in education was commissioned to advise on the ‘big picture’ in terms of school places etc. He has an ongoing dialogue with Lancashire County Council (The Local Education Authority).
- 3.54. Whilst this action predated the NPPF by some time, we note paragraph 72 in it and in particular:
- The great weight to the need to create, expand or alter schools;
 - Work with schools promoters to identify and resolve key planning issues before applications are submitted.
- 3.55. The involvement of an education expert to assist the Applicant is consistent with that policy.
- 3.56. The importance of access to high quality open space and opportunities for sport and recreation have been recognised from the outset and our client’s professional team have liaised with the Council over them as the CS has emerged and the proposals have been formulated. The Applicant fully recognises the important contribution which can be made to the health and well being of communities.
- 3.57. With regard to paragraph 74 in the NPPF – the proposals do not prejudice any public rights of way and access. This is consistent with the approach to policy set out in paragraph 75 in the NPPF. In addition, the proposals demonstrate how links to the existing rights of way including an exercise/and or nature trail can be provided.
- 3.58. There is extensive open green space shown on the illustrative master plans. There is an opportunity to designate Local Green Spaces should the local community favour such an approach – as described in paragraphs 76 and 77 of the NPPF.
- 3.59. Section 10 in the NPPF refers to the need to meet the challenge of climate change and flooding.

3.60. As a consequence, paragraph 96 in the NPPF is a material consideration. In terms of this application we can comment as follows:-

- The application is in outline and detailed design will be reserved.
- The proposals are compliant, as far as can be the case with the CS and relevant Saved Local Plan 1998 (albeit now not an up-to-date Local Plan).

3.61. With regard to paragraph 103 in the NPPF (on flooding) we can assist as follows:-

- The EIA includes a Flood Risk Assessment
- The illustrative proposals show a Sustainable Urban Drainage System (SUDS) which would result in no net increase in surface water leaving the site
- The SUDS system is a functional device but in this case has been integrated into the landscape design of the development to maximise the opportunities to use water as an aesthetic feature. The master planners, IBI Taylor Young, took the initiative to introduce that dimension having taken account of the character of the settlements in the Ribble Valley.

In any event, the site is (of course) proposed to be allocated in the CS and thus a sequential test on this subject is unnecessary.

3.62. Paragraph 111 in the NPPF states that planning decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed (brownfield land), provided it has no high environmental value. The Council has, of course, applied such an approach for many years as have others in the North West and beyond. , There is insufficient brownfield land to meet the now dire need for land for new homes for the period through to 2028. Consequently, the Council has had no choice but to plan for the release of green field sites through its local development framework of which the CS is the key. It is a matter of fact that this application site is not a brownfield one but in itself that is clearly not a justification for refusing planning permission.

- 3.63. The quality of agricultural land (in terms of its production value) is relevant when sites such as this are considered by local planning authorities. More particularly, planning authorities are urged by the NPPF (paragraph 112) to release poorer quality land and not what is known as the 'best and most versatile agricultural land'. As assessment of the land involved here was undertaken by experts –Berrys of Shrewsbury. Their findings are behind that part of the EIA. We can advise that none of the site is of the type which is the best and most versatile agricultural land. Consequently, the development of the site is not constrained by paragraph 112 in the NPPF.
- 3.64. Paragraph 113 in the NPPF refers to protected wildlife, geodiversity and landscape areas. The EIA examines these issues in considerable detail, as it must. We can advise that the site is not affected by any site specific protection in any of the areas listed. Consequently, the decision-maker does not have to counterbalance any of those sensitivities against the need to release the land for homes and the other uses involved in this application. However, in line with the very careful approach which has been taken towards this site the illustrative proposals show that the maximum effort has been shown towards mitigation. This is consistent with paragraph 117 in the NPPF even though none of the site is affected by a designation. For the avoidance of doubt, and particularly given the characteristics of the Ribble Valley, it is a fact that the site is not in or adjacent to an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). Thus, paragraph 116 in the NPPF does not apply.
- 3.65. Notwithstanding the above, but given paragraph 118 in the NPPF we can offer the following comments:
- As the EIA shows, impacts can be more than adequately mitigated.
 - There is no relationship with any SSSI requiring special measures.
 - Whilst the primary objective of the proposals is to provide a sustainable extension to Clitheroe with the emphasis on new homes – biodiversity can be enhanced (see EIA).

- There would not need to be any undue loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats, including ancient woodland or veteran trees outside them.
- There are no SPAs or possible SACs affected.
- There are no listed or proposed Ramsar sites affected.
- There are no sites identified as compensatory locations for any of the above involved.

With regard to paragraph 119 in the NPPF there are no implications for land being assessed under the Birds or Habitats Directive.

3.66. On the matter of paragraphs 120-125, in the NPPF, as we have explained, a comprehensive EIA has been undertaken. It sets out a detailed explanation of how any adverse side effects can be mitigated. As paragraph 123 points out it is open to the Council to impose conditions. The Applicant is cooperating with the Council on these matters (clearly, from the Council's point of view) without prejudice to the Council's deliberations on the planning application.

3.67. Section 12 in the NPPF refers to conserving and enhancing the historic environment. The first point to make about this is that the site does not contain any listed buildings, ancient monuments or conservation areas. However, it does contain the line of a Roman Road which is an established feature of detailed ordnance survey mapping. In addition, there are listed buildings in the wider area including Standen Hall, The Old Bothy and in Littlemoor. Consequently, very early on it was decided that:

1. The master planning would leave a generous corridor of land along the axis of the Roman Road graphic on OS maps;
2. The EIA's Environmental Statement (ES) chapter on cultural heritage would be informed by an archaeological assessment.

3.68. Whilst the latter did not throw up any unexpected results the Applicant commissioned a 100% geophysical survey of the 'main' application site and sample areas of the smaller

part of the application site affected by the proposed roundabout on the A59. The results appear in the EIA. What archaeological results emerged from the assessment do not require any further action ahead of a decision on the application. A condition or conditions can deal with the relevant issues.

3.69. In terms of paragraph 128 in the NPPF the Applicant has exceeded what is necessary given the proportionate approach advised.

3.70. Turning to paragraph 131 in the NPPF the Applicant proposes:

- Protection of the Roman Road corridor (not done with previous development to the north);
- Condition(s) re recording of geophysical anomalies (few in number);
- The re-use of the core farm buildings at Higher Standen Farm as part of the business centre (noting that they are not listed or in a conservation area);
- Respecting the setting of a group of listed buildings in Littlemoor and The Old Bothy in terms of a standoff distance in the parameters plan; and also shown in the design of the illustrative master plan.

3.71. The NPPF has a section on Decision-Taking which is a material consideration. We comment as follows here:

- With regard to paragraph 186 – the proposals are a sustainable development and recognised as such by the express inclusion of the site as a strategic development one in the Submission CS, following a number of consultation cycles.
- With that in mind – significant, in the context of this case is what paragraph 186 in the NPPF states about the ‘seamless’ relationship between plan-making and decision-taking.

- 3.72. Fundamentally, paragraph 187 states that local planning authorities should look for solutions not problems and applications for sustainable development, such as this, should be approved wherever possible.
- 3.73. The Applicant's professional team, led by us, has complied with paragraphs 188 to 195 in the NPPF on the subject of pre-application engagement and 'front loading'. The decision by the Applicant early on to commission an extensive team of advisers from different disciplines is further proof of that approach as was their decision to have an EIA produced.
- 3.74. Paragraph 196 in the NPPF states that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In this case, this amounts to:
- The 2012 Submission Core Strategy
 - RSS (which despite its 'numbered days' remains policy)
 - The saved 1998 Local Plan – where still relevant
- 3.75. The NPPF is a material consideration itself.
- 3.76. Paragraph 197 states that in assessing and determining a planning application of this type for sustainable development, local planning authorities should apply a presumption in favour.
- 3.77. This application is an outline one and affects a relatively large site. The Applicant appreciates that in accordance with paragraph 203 in the NPPF conditions and planning obligations will be necessary in the event of planning permission being granted.
- 3.78. There are tests for conditions and obligations. For both they can only be used where the permission would be refused without them. In terms of obligations (and consistent with the 2010 Community Infrastructure Regulations) they can only be sought where they meet all of the following tests:

- necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
- directly related to the development;
- fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development

3.79. Conditions can only be applied where they are:

- necessary;
- relevant to planning;
- relevant to the development to be permitted;
- enforceable;
- precise;
- reasonable in all other respects.

3.80. We will be cooperating with the Council's officers on both with those legal constraints – clearly on the Council's behalf, without prejudice to the Council's decision-making on the application.

3.81. Annex 1 in the NPPF 'Implementation' is an important material consideration. Some of its points have been covered above.

3.82. Paragraph 215 states that from March 2013 policies (such as those in the saved Local Plan [1998]) will be given due weight according to their consistency with the NPPF.

3.83. Most significantly, paragraph 216 in the NPPF means that:

- The Council may give weight (unless material considerations indicate otherwise) to relevant policies in the Submission Core Strategy (as an 'emerging plan') according to:

- the stage of preparation of the emerging plan (the more advanced the preparation, the greater weight that may be given);
 - the extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies (the less significant the unresolved objections, the greater the weight that may be given);
 - The degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the Core Strategy to the policies in the NPPF (the closer the policies in the Submission Core Strategy to the NPPF, the greater the weight which may be given).
- In our view there are no material considerations of any acknowledged importance to justify overriding the CS in the case of the subject site. The latter is a key and essential component of the CS to ensure that homes are delivered in a sustainable way over the period to 2028. This is particularly pertinent given the NPPF presumption in favour of sustainable development and the additional NPPF presumption in favour where (as here) there is not an identified supply of housing sites to meet the Council's obligations (these presumptions are earlier in this Statement).

3.84. One material consideration which is worthy of mention is that the Council has formally resolved to use RSS housing figures pending the introduction of the higher CS ones. The RSS figures mean 161 PA and the CS, 200. It should be stressed, as some members of the Council have done in their meetings, that those figures are not maximum but the minimum to ensure that its housing provisions are met. They do not represent a cap on development.

3.85. It is also a fact, also described earlier, that the Council's own consultants (Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners [NLP]) recommended a higher minimum figure.

4. HOUSING GROWTH STATEMENT – SEPTEMBER 2012 (ISSUED BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE)

4.1. The following statements should be noted:

- The Government see building homes as an important component in local economic growth.
- It seeks a thriving, active and stable housing market.
- The need for affordable housing remains high (this proposal would deliver 312 by 2028).
- Funds are being provided for infrastructure and first time buyers.
- Crucially – the need for new homes is acute, and the supply remains constrained. We have drawn attention to the fact that, unfortunately, the Council does not have an identified supply of housing land to meet its obligations.
- The Government will work in partnership with local authorities, scheme promoters and communities to deliver locally-supported, major housing sites. These will be sites where there is local support for growth, strong demand for new homes and good prospects for early delivery.
- The Council has approved their Core Strategy for submission to the Secretary of State in which Standen is the key policy regarding the delivery of new homes. The proposal thus has local support for growth by those elected to represent the local community (Ribble Valley).
- There is clearly demand for new homes in Clitheroe. The single owned and constraint free nature of the land means that early delivery of the development and a continuity for years after is wholly realistic.

- Local authorities have a responsibility to meet its needs for development and growth (as clearly set out in the Submission CS). The Secretary of State expects the Council to deal quickly and effectively with proposals that will deliver homes, jobs and facilities as the proposed development will. As we have shown he is demonstrating his commitment to this in the decisions he and his Inspectors are taking on appeals elsewhere in the UK (and in the Ribble Valley itself)...
- The Council has to make a timely decision on the application.
- To support locally-led development (such as this proposal), the local community would share in benefits from the New Homes Bonus, Community Infrastructure levy contributions towards local infrastructure, and the financial benefits of business rates discounts and forthcoming business rates retention from April 2013.

4.2. Taking the NPPF and The Secretary of State’s recent statement together it is clear that the Applicant’s proposals are in accordance with both. Thus, there is a strong presumption in favour of granting planning permission for this sustainable development.

5. THE DEVELOPMENT PLAN

NORTH WEST OF ENGLAND REGIONAL SPATIAL STRATEGY TO 2021

- 5.1. Whilst, at the time of writing, the Government's clear intention is to extinguish this part of the development plan it remains a material consideration.
- 5.2. Given the weight now being attached to the NPPF and the relatively advanced nature of the CS our reference to the RSS is relatively concise.
- 5.3. Policy RDF2 states that Plans and Strategies should identify certain towns (like Clitheroe) as Key Service Centres (The Council recognises Clitheroe as a Key Service Centre – see later about its Settlement Hierarchy in the context of the CS's evidence base). Development in rural areas like Ribble Valley should be concentrated as such Key Service Centres and should be of scale and nature appropriate to fulfil the needs of local communities for housing, employment and services, and to enhance the quality of rural life. Clearly, the subject proposals are consistent with this policy.
- 5.4. Policy L2 is about understanding housing markets. It refers to Strategic Housing Market Assessments (SHMAS). The Council's CS, of which the site is a key proposal, has been informed by a SHMA as has been its decision to use RSS's housing provision figures as a minimum.
- 5.5. Policy L4 – Regional Housing Provision set an average annual requirement for housing. In the case of Ribble Valley this amounted to 2,900 homes (161 per year to 2021). As we have pointed out it has been found by The Council's consultants (NLP) and Secretary of State on appeal to be inadequate.
- 5.6. Policy L4 has a number of criteria which are material to this application as follows:
- The Council has been liaising with our client in establishing the potential of the site – in the context of the Core Strategy (on a without prejudice basis).

- The decision to promote the site in the CS is based on the SHMA and Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) i.e. to inform the allocation of and development management decisions on specific sites.
- The code for sustainable homes and lifetime homes standards can be met.
- The Council has, by allocating the site in its CS, adjudged that the development would not have an adverse cumulative impact on the existing stock and market.
- We know that with adequate coordination with the statutory undertakers (by phasing conditions) adequate water supply and sewage management facilities will be provided.
- In liaison with the Council phasing policies will secure the orderly and managed release of housing land over the period of the plan in line with the sequential approach and the need for the coordinated provision of necessary infrastructure and the overall availability of land for housing.
- The TA with this application shows how the transport network will be affected by the additional demand generated by the proposed development.

5.7. Paragraph 12.10 in RSS confirms what we stated above about the role of Key Service Centres within what is described as the Central Lancashire City Region.

5.8. Policy W1 seeks to strengthen the regional economy. Part of the strategy was to support the development of the rural economy and new enterprise. The proposed business centre is consistent with that policy.

5.9. Policy W3 promotes a range of sites, mixed use development particularly in centres and on larger sites. It also notes the role of Key Service Centres and the benefits of the re-use of agricultural buildings to facilitate growth and diversification of the rural economy. The need to provide for B1 uses is noted in paragraph 6.9.

5.10. Policy DP1 set spatial principles some of which are pertinent including:

- Policy DP2 – Promoting Sustainable Communities

Clitheroe is such a place and the development would reinforce its credentials.

- Policy DP3 – Promote Sustainable Economic Development

The development would facilitate appropriate economic development within a mixed use scheme in a sustainable location.

- Policy DP4 – Making the best use of existing resources and infrastructure.

Given current circumstances and the realities of development opportunities in Ribble Valley, the site is well-located in relation to housing, jobs, other services and infrastructure (existing and necessary).

- Policy DP5 – Managing Travel Demand – reducing the need to travel and improve accessibility.

The location is well placed when compared to others in the context of Ribble Valley to minimise trips and their routing to destinations (please see the TA).

It is genuinely accessible by public transport, walking and cycling.

It stated that:

'In rural areas accessibility by public transport should also be a key consideration in providing services and locating new development – emphasising the role of Key Service Centres'

- Policy DP7 – Promote environmental quality.

This remains highly pertinent as:

-The proposals clearly reflect the local context;

-Care has been taken over the historic environment (see above);

- The proposals wholly embrace good quality design principles;
- The impact of traffic has been carefully considered;
- The proposals include integrated green infrastructure;
- They maintain and enhance biodiversity and habitat (see the ES);
- The application is supported by a volunteered EIA.

5.11. The conclusion on RSS is that given the weight which has to be attached by the NPPF and the advanced, emerging CS the fact remains that the proposals (by virtue of their sustainable and sensitive nature) are consistent with the RSS. Fundamentally, they are consistent with its principles.

6. THE CORE STRATEGY 2008 – 2028 ‘A LOCAL PLAN FOR RIBBLE VALLEY’ REGULATION 19 CONSULTATION DRAFT AS SUBMITTED TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE

6.1. We have referred above to the weight which can be attached to emerging core strategies as they go through the due process through to adoption.

6.2. On 28 August, 2012 the Council resolved (subject to various proposed changes on details) to submit the document to the Secretary of State so that it can be examined in public by a Planning Inspector. As such the CS has reached a relatively advanced stage and is a material consideration of some weight for decision-makers and particularly in the context of what the NPPF, RSS and other Governments pronouncements state about the need to plan for homes and stimulate economic growth.

6.3. At the outset of this section we should note that the application proposals are wholly in accordance with the CS.

6.4. It is also important that, regardless of the CS, the proposals are in accordance with the NPPF, RSS (when the NPPF is taken into account) and even the saved Local Plan where relevant (see below).

6.5. Turning to the specifics of the Core Strategy the following commentary refers to the policies endorsed by full Council on 28 August, 2012 with reference to the Proposed Changes to be put before the EIP Inspector following the consultation period planned.

Key Statement (KS) DS1: Development Strategy

6.6. DS1 states that the majority of new housing development will be concentrated within the application site, i.e. as a strategic site.

6.7. The narrative under the policy records (at paragraph 4.7) that the number of units proposed for the strategic site has been reduced to 1040 dwellings (it was originally 1400).

6.8. Given the changes proposed to the CS to reflect the NPPF Key Statement DS1 is now underwritten by Policy DS2 which makes express references to sustainable development principles. As we have pointed out above the proposals are that type of development by virtue of the location of the site, its scale (and thus ability to deliver so many elements over the next 15 years or so) and the particulars being favoured by this application including:-

- A planned development which derives from a draft Core Strategy, the sustainable credentials of which have been tested within that due process – fundamentally, the location as an extension of a town is a relatively sustainable option compared to other locations;
- The mixed land use pattern;
- Opportunity to use modes other than cars;
- Sustainable drainage system;
- Extensive areas of open land – not just retaining most trees and hedgerows but enhancing biodiversity;
- The design code framework lodged in line with the DAS (which can form the subject of conditions on any planning permission).

6.9. The proposed development meets policy EN3 in the CS as far as is possible for an outline planning application. We say this for the following reasons (in the context of Policy EN3):-

- The approach to the master planning of the site and liaison with infrastructure providers and other agencies has enshrined best practice in terms of bringing a sustainable development site forward;

- Conditions can be imposed on the planning permission our clients seek which would ensure that all development on the Standen site meets recognised sustainable design and construction standards (where viable to do so).
- With regard to sustainable drainage – even at this outline stage a great deal of work has gone into designing a sustainable drainage regime for the site such that there is a ‘real’ scheme (which would work) behind the illustrative proposals.
- Energy efficiency can be enshrined in good design in accordance with policy – and, again, reasonable conditions can affect the situation.
- The development will be able to deliver a proportion of low carbon energy by using energy efficient technology in the design. It is not an appropriate location for renewable energy devices separate from the development itself. The extent of the low carbon proportion will be a function of detailed design work at the reserved matters stage.
- With regard to the Proposed Changes (number 16) the Applicant has demonstrated from the outset, and through this application, that a very sensitive and informed approach (following the EIA) has been taken towards biodiversity, the improvement of ecological networks and the provision of given infrastructure. The illustrative master plan takes account of and provides for all of them and extensively.

6.10. Policy EN4 concerns biodiversity and geodiversity. The following comments relate to it and take account of the Council’s proposed changes to it.

- The Council’s aim is to seek, wherever possible, to conserve and enhance the area’s biodiversity (geodiversity is not relevant on the subject site) to avoid fragmentation and the isolation of natural habitats; and help develop green corridors. The Applicants support these objectives as stewards of the wider area in which the site sits – as well as other land in the Ribble Valley. Their approach to the assessment of development possibilities on the land and work undertaken

since (including the EIA) prove that to be the case. The conclusion of the ecology section in the ES is that biodiversity would be enriched not reduced.

- With regard to the second paragraph under Key Statement EN4, the site is not one of recognised environmental or ecological importance. It is unaffected by any designations. However, the Applicants have volunteered an EIA and it shows that the negative effects of the proposed development can be satisfactorily mitigated. Fundamentally, there is no net loss of biodiversity.

6.11. Key Statement EN5 in the CS is entitled 'Heritage Assets'. In terms of its policies the following comments are pertinent:-

- The EIA examined cultural and heritage aspects and a section under that name is in the ES. This is despite the fact that there are no designated assets of that type in the site. However, there are listed buildings in the locality – to the south and west of the land.
- The Design and Access Statement also refers to these features and explains how the parameters plan and illustrative master plan has taken account of them.
- In particular, here, Standen Hall is a listed building but set in a clearly defined extended curtilage beyond woods to the south of the site.
- Otherwise, there are listed dwellings in Littlemoor to the west and 'The Old Bothy' at Higher Standen to the south. In the former case, the illustrative layout has been altered as a consequence of the ES to protect their setting – in group value terms. In the latter, the setting is not harmed given the juxtaposition between it and open land in the site. Key Statement EN5 (in line with the NPPF) seeks a proportionate response to heritage assets and these settings. The proposals are consistent with that approach.
- The line of the Roman Road is a graphic on Ordnance Survey maps and not a reflection of the presence of any designation.

- Despite the above Durham University's archaeological team was commissioned to undertake field work so that the ES includes a comprehensive archaeological assessment. The work included a geophysical survey of the site on advice received from the University. This highlighted potentially interesting anomalies which are described in the ES. These are invisible at surface level. The Applicant has no problem with a condition being imposed on any planning permission requiring that access be given to archaeologists for recording purposes during the construction phase. Again, it is important to note that this initiative came from the Applicants and ourselves and again reflects the careful approach which has been taken to the site.
- The Applicants are very conscious of local character, distinctiveness and sense of place (as long standing, major local land and property owners). Whilst the suburban style areas to the north and west paid little regard to historic local vernacular the Applicants do wish to promote development on the Strategic Site which does. This has been part of our brief from the outset. The Design and Access Statement, elements of the illustrative master plan and the Framework Design Code all demonstrate how the aim is to assist the Council in granting an outline planning permission which requires subsequent applications to conform with its design principles and local features.
- It is clear from the above that the Applicants have very carefully considered the impact the development has (or does not have) on what heritage assets are local. We deal later with development management policies.

6.12. Key Statement H1 (Housing Provision) in the CS states that land for residential development will be made available to deliver 4000 dwellings, estimated at an average annual completion rate of at least 200 dwellings per year over the period 2008 to 2028 in accordance with baseline information. As we have explained above Key Statement DS1 states that the majority of that part being proposed for Clitheroe will be located at the Standen site. Thus, it is clear that the application proposals are consistent with the

strategy and, as we will explain below, important now in bringing forward land for housing (and which has been planned for it).

- 6.13. Key Statement H1 refers to the relationship between the relevant Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) site and deliverability over a five year period. When the last SHLAA was produced the Council was unaware of the availability of the subject site. However, as it has made the site its specific preference for a strategic one, there is no need to await that process. The decision to allocate Standen in the CS was very much in the knowledge that it is in single ownership (the Applicant's), unconstrained in general terms, readily accessible and genuinely available now. The issue with Standen is not whether infrastructure can cope but in planning it in parallel with the development over the next 15 years or more.
- 6.14. Key Statement H1 also refers to the need to identify land for the 'full 15 year period' and beyond. The Strategic Site is unique in its ability to show land which is available now but is large enough to enable the 'organic' growth of Clitheroe over that 15 year and beyond period of time.
- 6.15. On advice our client's professional team has received, it is likely that, in accordance with current economic conditions, the development will comprise a build rate of say 75-90 houses a year. This assumes 3 builders on site, each building between 25 and 30 homes a year. With the former figure this would take 14 years, with the latter 12 years. With this in mind it should be noted that the size of the site is large enough to accommodate several builders. Their ability to deliver homes and infrastructure (or contribute to the latter) is not something which other sites could generally provide because of scale.
- 6.16. The subject site is one which has the backing of the Council and is an important proposal in the submission version of the CS for Clitheroe.
- 6.17. As explained above, the NPPF makes it clear that with each stage an emerging LDF document assumes more weight - in this case the CS has been endorsed by the Full Council as its submission document. In addition, when other material considerations of acknowledged importance are taken into account – in this case the housing supply

shortage national Government policy is seeking to address and the local housing land available shortage – there are particularly good reasons why the Council would be correct in supporting our client’s proposals now.

6.18. Indeed, the Council’s ability to deflect proposals which are not part of its strategy – often in less sustainable locations or formats is better.

6.19. Key statement H2 (Housing Balance) in the CS states that planning permission will only be granted for residential development if it provides a mix of housing which accords with the projected future household requirements and local need across the Ribble Valley as a whole as evidenced by the Strategic Housing Market Assessment. The subject application proposals proposes a mix of housing as follows:

- ‘Market’ housing : 70% (728 homes)
 - Affordable housing : 30% (312 homes)
- Total: 1040 ⁴**

6.20. Within those figures, 15% would be for the over 55s (156 homes). Of those, 50% would be for market sale and 50% for affordable (78 in each case).

6.21. Of the affordable homes, the Council has requested that 50% of them (156) are social rented and 50% are shared ownership.

6.22. In terms of the split of house types, based on the SHMA and advice from the Council it is expected that most will be houses fit for families and the homes for the over 55s would be bungalows or within a dedicated ‘retirement living’ development.

6.23. The illustrative masterplan also makes assumptions about the merit of different housing formats as a response to the local context.

⁴ as per the Submission version of the Core Strategy

- 6.24. For example, some parts of the site are better suited to bungalows (to take account of existing properties); others a more intimate layout (e.g. the Littlemoor end because of the character of existing buildings); and others a lower density (e.g. the outer edges of the site, to feather its impact visually).
- 6.25. The application is in outline and so the dialogue with the Council about the composition of dwelling types can continue as matters progress.
- 6.26. Key Statement H3 (Affordable Housing) states that the Council will seek affordable housing provision at 30% of units on residential sites of 10 units or more in Clitheroe. Our clients have stated, from the outset, that they would comply with the policy.
- 6.27. There is sufficient space on the Standen Site to provide land for such homes and thus enhancing the mix of housing involved.
- 6.28. Key Statement EC1 (Business and Employment Development) states that the Council seeks to allocate 9 ha of land for employment purposes in appropriate and sustainable locations. The proposed business centre and local services in the Standen Site are separate to those as part of a sustainable extension to the town of Clitheroe. However, the presence of the employment uses in the proposals being submitted here are not only consistent with the Standen Strategic Site policy but with EC1 too – the Community section in the ES demonstrates that employment on the site could ultimately generate approximately 500 jobs. This is a significant contribution and in terms of the offices element is based on advice received from commercial surveyors who understand the local market.
- 6.29. It is also worth pointing out that the part of the Strategic Site chosen for the business centre is based on the current group of farm buildings at Higher Standen Farm. Whilst this is not, by definition⁵, previously developed land it is re-using land on which buildings and yards stand. Furthermore, the aim is to convert the older buildings in the complex such that the business area would comprise conversions and new build. Given that the

⁵ NPPF definition of Previously Developed Land in its Glossary.

business centre will become part of the town this is not diversification in the way Key Statement EC1 means. However, it is clearly desirable to utilise the farm complex this way in preference to new build elsewhere.

6.30. Key Statement EC2 (Development of retail shops, community facilities and services). Apart from the obvious benefits in providing space for local shops and services on site (as is proposed), a development of the scale proposed would clearly have significant benefits for the economic and social prosperity of Clitheroe Town Centre as a consequence of the obvious potential for increased activity associated with those resident or working at the Strategic Site.

6.31. Any business needs to plan and certainly those with interests in Clitheroe Town Centre will need to take account of its planned growth. The Strategic Site will give them some confidence that the town will be able to expand to the extent proposed on this site over the next 20 years.

6.32. These benefits are consistent with Key Statement EC2.

6.33. Key Statement DMI 1 concerns planning obligations. From the outset our clients have accepted the advice from the Council that their proposals would involve obligations concerning the following subjects:

- Affordable housing
- Highways
- Open space
- Education

Discussions on all of these subjects are ongoing and involve the Council and Lancashire County Council in its capacity as both highways and education authority.

6.34. We note the reference to the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) 'approach'. It is essential that any planning obligations set against the proposed development are

consistent with the NPPF and the statutory CIL Regulations of 2010 which set tests for such obligations.

- 6.35. Whereas many sites rely on planning obligations to deliver infrastructure off site, this site is large enough and has the capability of providing facilities on site. For example, land has been set aside for a primary school and related play space. In addition, a very extensive area of open space is being proposed. As well as that, land is also being set aside for a local convenience store, services and community facilities. Furthermore, as explained above over 300 affordable homes are being proposed on the site. Finally, the proposals include a new road junction between Pendle Road and the A59. This would involve a new roundabout. Very often the delivery of such infrastructure requires a planning obligation as often developments involve land outside application sites. In this case all of the requisite highways works can be accommodated on land within the application site in the Applicant's control as they own the land. Again, this reduces uncertainties over timing. All these aspects show how relatively easy it would be to deliver the development.
- 6.36. A draft 'heads' planning obligations document produced by the Estate's legal advisers (Naphthens) accompanies this Statement.
- 6.37. With regard to Key Statement DMI 2 on transport considerations, the proposed development is on the edge of Ribble Valley's largest settlement with good connections with the areas it abuts and into Clitheroe town centre. At the same time it is very accessible to and from the A59 meaning that traffic does not need to travel through the town centre (Conservation area) to get to the proposed properties. This, of course, gives it an advantage over sites on the west side of the town centre (and railway).
- 6.38. The proposals do incorporate good access by foot and cycle, have convenient links to public transport and facilitates the use of modes other than cars.
- 6.39. They do this by utilising existing footpaths (the routes of which are retained) and opening up new access points as follows:

- Littlemoor (restricted)
- Shays Drive (footway and cyclists only)
- Pendle Road (all)
- Worston Old Road (temporary vehicular access to business centre if required by the Council as a contingency, footways and cycleways definitely).

6.40. It is important to note that the illustrative layout demonstrates how the existing footpaths can be integrated with an enhanced network of footpaths and cycleways within the site which then link to footpaths and cycle routes beyond. This will give both existing and new residents/people considerably more permeability through the site (with extensive, retained open space) than now.

6.41. A transport assessment, produced by SBA, together with a travel plan framework supports this application and expands on the above points.

6.42. The Core Strategy has a unique policy for the application site entitled 'The Strategic Site'. It states expressly that:

A strategic site at Standen, to the south east of Clitheroe will be developed in a comprehensive and sustainable manner as a mixed site to meet a significant proportion of the Borough's housing requirement in the plan period. The range of uses will include housing (including affordable housing), employment, community uses, local retail and service provision to serve the site, open space and recreational uses.'

6.43. This application is wholly in accordance with that policy in every respect of it as it proposes:

- housing
- affordable housing

- employment (business centre, school site, local retail /services and community uses)
- open space for recreational use (as well as landscape benefit)

The narrative under the policy, whilst not policy in itself, is also important as it is within the CS document submitted to the Secretary of State and reflects the Council's view of the site. The following features of this are noteworthy:

1. The site is central to the delivery of the Core Strategy.
2. It is in close proximity to the town and all its amenities.
3. It is in close proximity to the strategic highway network.
4. It provides a major opportunity to develop a site for a mix of uses in a highly sustainable and comprehensive manner within a high quality landscaped setting.
5. In terms of how the proposals translate the vision described we can observe that:
 - Uses will be predominantly residential (including affordable housing to the extent required by other policies in the Plan).
 - An employment use and specifically B1 (as suggested) is included (as well as employment to be generated by the school site, local retail, services and community uses). As stated above the ES shows that this could amount to approximately 500 jobs.
 - Open space/recreational uses are integral to the illustrative master plan and represent an extensive area of green corridors and space.
 - The illustrative master plan contains extensive footways and cycleways; and has been designed to accommodate buses – including a connection from Pendle Road to Littlemoor.

- Fundamentally, the proposed development would facilitate trips by a variety of modes and maximises connections to the Clitheroe urban area where these are within the Applicant's control. However, the juxtaposition of the site with the urban area offers exceptional linkages as:
 1. It has a frontage on to Littlemoor.
 2. It has existing footpath links into it from Langshaw Drive and Pendle Road (which connect to Worston Old Road and beyond).
 3. It abuts the end of Shays Drive which can be connected up as a foot and cycle link (there is no access through there at present).
 4. It has a frontage onto Pendle Road.
 5. It has a frontage on to Worston Old Road.

These features offer very exciting opportunities to open up the site such that it would offer existing and new people choices in terms of walking and cycling between the existing urban area, the new developments and the countryside beyond. It should be noted that in the case of the latter element there are highly attractive footpath routes and designated cycle routes involved. Altogether these opportunities are of considerable merit in planning terms, will cement the community, reinforce the sustainable credentials of the site and help to create a sense of place.

- Land is being proposed for a primary school within the site. The narrative qualifies this by stating '*...if this is required to meet the need for educational provision, taking into account the capacity of schools that would serve the development.*'

As explained above, discussions with Lancashire County Council over these issues and other education issues are continuing.

- The Applicant has responded to the scope provided by the extensive area involved to achieve the highest quality design. He has employed an extensive team of professional advisers with a track record in producing sensitive and high quality design – typified by the approach which IBI Taylor Young have taken to the master plan. The Applicant has a very long established and major involvement in the local area which will continue. The Trustees have thus had a major input into these matters from the outset and will continue to do so.

- 6.44. With regard to views across the site and strategic planting, the illustrative master plan has been shaped specifically to accommodate these features. For example the green corridor running along a north west to south east axis took account of views of Pendle Hill beyond the site. The green corridors take account of potential strategic planting locations such as the area in the south west corner.
- 6.45. The narrative states that work undertaken by the Council on infrastructure planning as part of the Core Strategy process has shown, in principle, that there are no significant barriers to the development and that the site is deliverable in the plan period. On infrastructure this concurs with work undertaken on behalf of our client over the past few years. The site is deliverable in the plan period.
- 6.46. The Proposed Changes to the Core Strategy states that appropriate phasing of the development will be needed to allow infrastructure enhancements to be coordinated and delivered. The Applicants are liaising with the Council and other bodies on these matters which should inform any phasing conditions should planning permission be granted – in parallel with discussions about the timing of the delivery of other aspects such as affordable housing, the improved road junction on the A59, the business centre and so on.
- 6.47. The Applicants do expect the Council to give infrastructure which may be needed to support its Key Core Strategy proposals priority over unallocated site proposals. Clearly, one of the key benefits of the development plan system is to plan properly such that

investments in infrastructure coordinate with developments coming forward – particularly given the extent of the merits of the subject site.

- 6.48. The Applicants are aware of the matters raised by United Utilities (UU) which affect Clitheroe generally and are not specific to the site. Our client's team is in contact with them, the discussions are ongoing with them and the Council. The issue is simply about coordinating the phasing of the development with the investment UU need to make. With that in mind, it is important to remember that this site is a strategic one – to be delivered in the period to 2028 – even though it is available now – such that a start could be made (subject to planning permission) in the short term.
- 6.49. The narrative refers to a minimum of two access points from the existing local highway network with a through route for public transport. The parameters plan and illustrative master plan do meet this aim. However, the master plan was changed from the one originally lodged with the Council to support representations about the Core Strategy. The original one had an unrestricted vehicular access to Littlemoor (albeit a secondary access). In the course of the EIA it emerged that the Council's Environmental Health Officer did not want cars to use the Littlemoor access due to an Air Quality Management Area close to the town centre. As a consequence the master plan was changed. The current proposal is for the Littlemoor access to be restricted to use by emergency vehicles, buses, cyclists and pedestrians.
- 6.50. The proposals have taken account of the presence of the Roman Road since the outset and this is clearly visible from the illustrative master plan. The archaeological assessment undertaken as part of the ES endorsed that this approach was correct. There is evidence of the Roman Road line, (although it was missed or ignored when development took place to the north). The layout will highlight its presence and there is an opportunity here to refer to it by signage and information about it. Clearly, that would have good educational value locally and further enhance the sense of place in the local context.
- 6.51. The ES, the parameters plan and DAS have taken account of heritage assets in the vicinity of the site. The site does not contain any listed buildings. It is not in nor does it

contain any conservation area, nor is there one close by. The illustrative layout (and thus the parameters plan) was revised such that space would be left behind a group of listed buildings in Littlemoor in accordance with the ES's recommendations and near the Old Bothy to the south of the site. The ES contains a comprehensive Cultural Heritage section.

- 6.52. Paragraph 9.1 in the CS states that the boundary shown is a 'general' site area. It acknowledges that the final site area is still subject to determination having regard to the need for structural planting, the approach to density and land uses within the site and mechanisms for achieving delivery. The Applicants have kept to the boundary shown with the exception of the land containing the proposed roundabout.
- 6.53. As explained, this is owned by the Standen Estate so it can be included as part of the application site avoiding the need for a planning obligation or 'Grampian' style condition precedent.
- 6.54. The boundary for the rest of the site is consistent with the core of Higher Standen Farm and the adjoining Littlemoor Farm which has enabled the master planners to design a layout which meets the Council's and our clients' requirements for a high quality, sensitive development which meets the criteria described above.
- 6.55. Fundamentally, it provides extensive areas of open space in the form of green corridors which would frame the site and minimise its impact on countryside beyond the site. It is important when viewing the masterplan to appreciate the width and length of those green corridors – they would be very significant spaces. This includes, incidentally, the one where the site abuts Littlemoor.
- 6.56. Key Statement DMG 1 (General Considerations) is also met by the proposals, as follows:
- The development should be of a high standard of building design and this application seeks to ensure that the Council is able to insist on that through any subsequent applications. A considerable amount of work has gone into the plans and information submitted to assist that process.

- The 8 'building in context' principles (from the CABE/English Heritage Building In Context tool kit – as referred to in Proposed Change 41) have all been followed (see the Design and Access Statement) and should be.
- Accepting that the development will change the character of the site from a farm to an extension of Clitheroe – the proposals are as sympathetic as possible.
- Again, the way the application has been put together seeks to enable the Council to control subsequent applications effectively in terms of scale, massing, style, features and building materials.
- Traffic and parking implications are addressed by the TA.
- Similarly, the TA deals with the safety of the access points and their ability to cope with the scale and type of traffic likely to be generated.
- Daylight and privacy distances would be dealt with at reserved matters stage.
- A full EIA addressed environmental implications.
- There are no heritage assets on the site. The EIA addressed the settings of listed buildings in the vicinity.
- The EIA deals with the natural environment and mitigation. The illustrative layout is informed by it.
- Coal mining is not an issue on this site.
- The proposals seek an efficient use of land – a balance between contributing to the need for housing land and other complimentary uses; and other material considerations. It is efficient to provide for a large element of the necessary housing provision on this single site given the broad benefits described elsewhere.

- The illustrative master plan has taken into account public safety and secured by design principles. The DAS deals with these aspects.
- Similarly, it has taken account of the density, layout and relationship between buildings – which is indeed of major importance. Again, the idea is to assist the Council as much as possible to set down a robust framework which can be used to control subsequent applications.
- From our first involvement with this site 3 years ago to now the Applicants and their advisers have placed particular emphasis (as the policy requires) on visual appearance and the relationship to surroundings (including impact on landscape character) as well as the effects of development on existing amenities.
- The development will adversely affect the amenities of the surrounding area to an extent as any proposals on a greenfield site and with neighbours will do. However, an EIA has been produced and great care taken to set up a framework of proposals which will minimise the impact as far as possible. Conditions on the planning permission we seek and subsequent reserved matters approvals (on detail) can ensure that this is delivered.
- The ES has a Community section which considers the impact on social infrastructure (Proposed Change 40). In any event the proposals include:
 - A site for a primary school
 - Space for community and local service facilities
 - Extensive public open space

We expect various bodies to react to this application which should assist in establishing the situation e.g. health facilities.

- The development would provide significant environmental and amenity improvements (accepting that it is an urban extension). More particularly, for

example, it would (as explained earlier) improve permeability through the site, provide new, extensive areas of new public open space, and enhanced biodiversity (see ES).

- There are no public or private playing fields affected by this application.
- The approach to this whole development is a sustainable one and reasonable conditions for reserved matters approval on construction techniques (where enforceable) would be expected by developers nowadays.
- The EIA considered air quality.
- The proposals assume that the Code for Sustainable Homes and Lifetime Homes would be incorporated into schemes.
- The need to have regard to key infrastructure is recognised and (as explained above) so is the relationship with phasing – on the basis that (as the Core Strategy states – see above) the subject site is ‘central’ to the Core Strategy.
- With regard to playing facilities in the area our client’s team have been in discussion with the Council’s Head of Cultural Services on these matters.

6.57. Key Statement DMG 2: Strategic Considerations deals with material issues also. We have the following comments to make in terms of its criteria:

- The proposals are wholly in accordance with the Core Strategy’s development strategy and do support the spatial vision.
- The proposals constitute a major expansion of Clitheroe but in a way which rounds it off along the crescent shaped space between Littlemoor and Pendle Road and contained by the Pendleton Brook valley and related trees. It is a logical extension to the built up area which would have a defensible outer boundary.

- The scale is large but given the physical characteristics of the subject site its juxtaposition with the built up area and the likely time period for implementation (say 75-90 homes per year) it is appropriate. The nature of the development proposed – as shown on the parameters plan and the relatively spacious nature of it (when compared to the existing built up area) are other features material to the situation.
- As explained above the Applicant seeks to set down principles to assist the Council in ensuring that when details come forward in any later planning applications they are in keeping with the existing settlement - in this case the aim is not to reflect the appearance of some of the estate developments locally as they do not reflect the local vernacular. The aim is to secure development more in keeping with the character of the Ribble Valley. This is explained in much more detail in the DAS.

6.58. With regard to Key Statement DMG 3 on Transport and Mobility we make the following comments:

- The issues raised are addressed by the TA – i.e. the availability and adequacy of public transport and associated infrastructure to serve those moving to and from the development. In summary:
 - The site is in very close proximity to the A59.
 - Its main access is direct from Pendle Road.
 - Provision for pedestrians and cyclists is being catered for by design and can be enforced at reserved matters stage.
 - The location of the site on the edge of a town (a key service centre) is relatively good for those with mobility constraints. The development would comprise a mix of land uses such that it would be possible to work, live, shop (basic items) and be outdoors in an attractive environment – all on the site. Furthermore, for those of school age and

able to attend non-special schools – there is a school site planned for too. Such people are much more likely to be able to meet their daily needs on a development of this type than smaller ad hoc schemes – particularly those in smaller settlements or beyond.

Some mobility impaired people are restricted because of their age. As explained above 15% of the proposed homes could be for people over 55 and a number of properties would be bungalows.

- Noting the proposed change to this policy – the site would be an extension to an existing developed area of some size – Clitheroe.
- The proposals would enable people to walk, cycle or catch public transport rather than drive between homes and facilities which they need to visit regularly.

Furthermore, the proposals would offer the possibility for the increased use of, or provision of, bus and rail services. Clitheroe has a network of bus services and the site can facilitate its expansion. In addition Clitheroe also has a railway station such that people can readily travel to or from their homes using trains as part of their journeys.

- 6.59. The railway station is conveniently located for most trips likely to involve trains.
- 6.60. With regard to the proposed changes (46 in particular) the TA includes an account of the impacts on the existing bus and rail infrastructure. There are no level crossings affected by this proposal.
- 6.61. The Applicants appreciate that contributions towards public transport provision and infrastructure will form a feature of the negotiation on planning obligations.
- 6.62. Key Statement DME 1 (Protecting trees and woodlands) is a material consideration given that there are hedgerow trees and woods on the site and nearby. A full tree survey was undertaken by the Applicants early on in the process. The illustrative master plan has

specifically taken account of the trees on the site such that very few are affected. The layout pays regard to the existing field boundaries (although not all are hedgerows). None of the woodland areas are proposed to be cleared nor would there be any need to do so by subsequent applications.

6.63. It should be borne in mind that the long history of the site as a farm means that the site is relatively free of tree cover and vegetation.

With regard to the criteria under this policy:

- The density of the development in the illustrative layout (which varies) takes account of trees and woodland nearby.
- Detailed tree protection plans should be required for any subsequent planning applications (should they be full or reserved matters).
- Site-specific tree protection conditions should be imposed should planning permission be granted for this application.

6.64. Key Statement DME 2 (Landscape and Townscape Protection) concerns ‘important’ landscape features and protects them from significant harm. With regard to this site:

- There are no ponds affected.
- There are no herb rich meadows and pastures affected.
- There are no woodlands affected such that significant harm is involved.
- There are no copses affected such that significant harm is involved.
- Hedgerows and individual trees are affected to an extent. However, there are exceptional circumstances in that the site is proposed as a strategic one for development. Furthermore, the submission of an ES, and the demonstrably clear evidence submitted that great care has, and is, being taken towards hedgerows and individual trees proves that the impact has been minimised

given the constituency of the policy mix. Furthermore, the ES shows the extent of mitigation. Fundamentally, this involves very extensive areas of open space which utilise the existing hedgerows, trees and woods and there is clearly a major opportunity to enhance them by further planting. The open areas proposed offer more scope for sustained and attractive planting than farm land which, of course, is not conducive to amenity planting.

- There is only a short length of a traditional stone wall to the north of the farm buildings which could be affected.
- As explained above this application is designed to assist the Council and the Trustees in ensuring that townscape elements such as the scale, form and materials of the development proposed contribute to the characteristic townscapes of the area. The DAS in particular deals with this matter.

6.65. Key Statement DME 3 (Site and species protection and conservation) is material simply on the basis that the site is farm land and with various natural features within it and on its peripheries. As explained above the site has been the subject of an environmental impact assessment and in the consequential environment statement there is a section which deals with ecology. The ES is comprehensive and was done over an extensive period of time. In terms of the bullet points under policy DME 3 we can state that:

- There are no SSSIs affected.
- There are no priority habitats or species identified in the Lancashire Biodiversity Action Plan affected.
- There are no local nature reserves affected.
- There are no County Biological Heritage sites affected.
- There are no Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) affected.
- There are no Special Protected Areas (SPAs) affected.

- 6.66. With regard to protected species, the ES shows very limited evidence of them locally e.g. the bullhead fish in Pendleton Brook.
- 6.67. The site does have parts which have a nature conservation value.
- 6.68. What the ES concludes is that mitigation means that no harm needs to be caused. Indeed, the conclusion is that there will be a net benefit to biodiversity. Again, this is to do with the fact that some farm land and areas beyond it will become areas of open space which can be managed and enhanced as amenity areas. These will range from the green corridors akin to informal park land to the Pendleton Brook Valley where public access will not generally be encouraged or would be practical – for its most part.
- 6.69. We have already explained that there are no designated heritage assets on the application site but there are some in the locality. In terms of Key Statement DME 4 (Protecting Heritage Assets) we comment as follows:
- There are no conservation areas affected by the proposals.
 - There are no listed buildings on the site. The ES and DAS refer to listed buildings beyond. Those in Littlemoor are relevant as that end of the development does affect their setting. As a response to the ES the illustrative master plan has been amended to clear an extensive area of open land behind them. Care has also been taken with regard to The Old Bothy, again by using open space to protect its setting. No visual harm to any of the listed buildings locally arises.
 - No other buildings of significant heritage interest are involved. However, as a consequence of the cultural heritage part of the ES the Applicants aim to retain the older part of the Higher Standen Farm buildings to form part of the proposed business centre.
 - There are no registered parks or gardens of special historic interest or other gardens of significant heritage interest affected.
 - There are no scheduled monuments affected.

- 6.70. However, because the relevant ordnance survey maps for the area show the line of a Roman Road across the site our client has accepted our advice from the outset that this axis should be kept clear of development (apart from open space, the 'spine' road footpaths and cycleways). Furthermore, as part of the EIA they agreed to commission an archaeological assessment by Durham University. This assessment ultimately resulted in a geophysical survey of the whole of the larger part of the application site as far north as Worston Old Road and appropriate 'sampling' of the four fields in which the upgraded junction between the A59 and Pendle Road would be constructed i.e. the smaller part of the application site. The results are described in the cultural heritage section of the ES.
- 6.71. The proposed development does not raise archaeological issues but the Applicants recognise that a planning condition on any planning permission granted would be sensible to enable archaeologists to record the few localised anomalies found, but particularly along the Roman Road Line.
- 6.72. The approach taken is consistent with the spirit Proposed Change 56 for although the proposed development is not a redevelopment – the archaeological assessment has already revealed some potentially interesting characteristics.
- 6.73. Key Statement DME 6 (Water Management) is also important. In terms of this application we can comment as follows:
- The development would not be affected by an unacceptable risk of flooding or exacerbate flooding elsewhere.
 - The development would be designed to prevent the pollution of surface or groundwater.
 - The development can be designed to so that properties use water efficiently.
 - The application, whilst in outline, has been designed to incorporate a sophisticated SUDS system.

- Pendleton Brook would be protected as a water course of local biodiversity value.

6.74. As we have explained above affordable housing forms a significant part of the proposed development. Indeed, 30% of the proposed homes (312 of them) would be affordable. Key Statement DMH 1 (Affordable Housing Criteria) is thus a material consideration. In terms of the criteria cited all of them will be met by way of planning obligations (under Section 106 of the Act).

6.75. There is also reference in this policy to elderly provision. We have confirmed above that this aspect of policy would also be met – in accordance with the percentages set out.

6.76. Key Statement DMB 1 is about supporting business growth and the local economy. As the ES demonstrates the proposed development has considerable benefits for the latter (see above). In terms of this policy we can state that:

- The proposed development includes a proposal for employment development in the form of a business centre for B1 uses. This would be located on the farm buildings complex at Higher Standen Farm. The idea is to provide accommodation which supports businesses in the locality.
- The proposal is wholly consistent with the Core Strategy's approach to the Standen Strategic Site – as described above.

6.77. The aim is to re-use some of the buildings at Higher Standen Farm as part of the business centre. Consequently, whilst a specific application is not being made at this juncture to convert those buildings, the principle is consistent with Key Statement DMB 2 (Conversion of barns and other rural buildings for employment uses). However, the reality is that the buildings would become part of the built up area should planning permission be granted. Thus, this is of general interest to the policy merits of the proposals rather than a main point.

6.78. Key Statement DMB 4 (Open Space Provision) is clearly of importance to the decision-maker. The application proposals are consistent with it, as follows:

- The illustrative layout would provide adequate and usable public open space.
- The proposed green infrastructure would be multi-functional and encourage walking and cycling opportunities.
- The proposals do not involve the loss of any existing public open spaces, including private playing fields.
- On the contrary, the proposed development would include extensive tracts of public open space which would be of benefit to the existing and extended community.

6.79. As we have indicated before the site is crossed by two public footpaths and more would be introduced as part of the proposals. Key Statement DMB 5 (Footpaths and Bridleways) and Proposed Change 67 is a material consideration. On that policy we comment as follows:

- The proposals retain and improve the existing footpaths which cross the site.
- Because the land crossed by both of them (to the extent of the application site) will materially change, they could (in theory) become less attractive to certain types of walker. However, in accordance with Policy Change 67 they will benefit from compensatory enhancements such that there would be a net improvement to the Public Rights of Way (PROW) network. This would be achieved by their relationship with the proposed green corridors and connections into new routes. Fundamentally, the site would become much more permeable than now and large areas of it will become public open space.

6.80. With regard to the criteria in the policy we can state that:

- The footpaths (existing and proposed) would provide a link between the town/villages and attractive open land. The illustrative master plan shows more routes through the site than exist now.

- The existing are well used and more people will walk them and new routes.

6.81. In conclusion on the CS we can state that the application development is not just a central policy in it but it accords with the rest of the CS too.

6.82. Given the status of the CS now, and particularly in the context of NPPF and the Council's need to release land for housing – it is a material consideration of considerable weight.

7. THE RIBBLE VALLEY DISTRICTWIDE LOCAL PLAN (1998) – SAVED POLICIES (2007)

7.1. Apart from the fact that this Plan was adopted over 14 years ago (thus its drafting was even earlier) it was to run for the period 1991-2006. Consequently, its intended end date was 6 years ago. Clearly, the World has changed a great deal since its adoption and end date. This, in turn, has profoundly affected national and local planning policies.

7.2. The Plan had been drawn up under the strategic framework set up, in those days, by the Lancashire Structure Plan (2006) and not the extant RSS.

7.3. With the introduction of RSS, the NPPF this year (2012) and the Submission Draft Core Strategy (also 2012) the Plan has limited weight and only now in certain respects. However, in law, it remains part of the local development framework (albeit only until March 2013). Consequently, this section deals with those policies which have to be weighed in the balance with more contemporary ones now being used for decision making.

7.4. The following is a commentary on those policies:-

- Policy G1 (high standard of design and landscape quality) remains valid. It is clearly consistent with the NPPF, RSS and emerging Core Strategy. This application is consistent with its criteria, where relevant and bearing in mind its outline nature.
- Policy G2 (Settlements Strategy) remains relevant, in part. Clitheroe remains a 'main' settlement in Ribble Valley but it is not now feasible to restrict its growth to sites within the settlement boundary in terms of meeting its responsibilities for providing sufficient land for new homes.
- Policy G5 is similarly an anachronism as it restricted development outside the Plan's settlement boundaries to small scale development to meet local needs. As we have explained above in the absence of a 5 year supply of housing sites the Council was, in the recent past, unable to meet RSS derived housing provision

figures and is now in the position of being unable to show a supply in terms of current figures.

- The Applicant has already commenced a dialogue with the Council over the subjects and details to be covered by planning obligations.
- Policy G11 (Crime Prevention) – this policy remains valid. The proposals (although outline) have taken full account of the need to consider crime and the fear of it.

The Design and Access Statement refers to these issues.

- Policy ENV3 (open countryside outside the AONB and areas immediately adjacent to it).
- This policy remains valid in general terms. However, it is clear that the need to release greenfield sites to enable the Council to meet its housing obligations will mean that this policy has to be weighed against the RSS, the NPPF and particularly Core Strategy policies.
- In this case, there is a site specific policy to release the site for development and as a Strategic Site. This is a key proposal in the submission version of the Core Strategy.
- Clearly, a proposal of that type could not be strictly 'in keeping with the character of the landscape area' *per se*. However, in terms of the aim to reflect local vernacular, scale, style, features and building materials – those criteria can be met. Indeed, the sensitive approach taken by the Applicant and his team since the outset proves that this is so. The illustrative master plan and Design and Access Statement show how this approach can be realised. It would be enhanced by the framework design code, parameters shown and conditions the Council can impose on any planning permission.

- Policy ENV6 – Agricultural land – as explained above, the site is not classed as the best and most versatile and thus is not constrained that way.
- Policy ENV7 – Species Protection – the application is supported by an EIA which addresses this issue in detail.
- Policy ENV10 – nature conservation – conditions. As the EIA proved the development can be the subject of conditions of this type.
- Policy ENV12 – ancient woodlands – this policy remains valid. The proposals do not affect any such woodland. The ES deals with trees and landscape issues. The proposals seek to work with the landscape (trees and hedgerows included) rather than superimpose on it.
- Policy ENV13 – landscape protection. The overriding aims of this policy remain valid. However, the need to plan for new homes on the scale now necessary does mean that the criteria listed have to be weighed against other material considerations. In the subject case, whilst the site is shown as a Strategic Site in the submission Core Strategy this application has been informed by an EIA and reflects a very sensitive approach. The Applicant has aimed to retain as many of the landscape features as possible.
- Policies ENV14 - The Borough's Archaeological and Historic Heritage – this policy remains relevant. Again, great care has been taken over cultural heritage issues (as explained above) which is proven by the section in the EIA.
- For the avoidance of doubt, there are no heritage designations on the site.
- Policy ENV19 – Settings of Listed Buildings. This policy remains valid. Whilst there are no listed buildings on the site there are listed buildings in the vicinity including Standen Hall, The Old Bothy and in Littlemoor. The Cultural Heritage section of the ES and the Design and Access Statement deal with the subject. The Council was aware of those buildings when it designated the Strategic Site.

- Policy H2 – dwellings in the open countryside – is also obsolete in many respects. It is impossible for the Council to provide the number of houses it has to facilitate without involving land outside the settlement boundaries. Not only does the Submission Core Strategy show this but a number of decisions have now been taken by the Council and the Secretary of State which prove how times have changed.
- The subject site has been expressly designated as a Strategic Site by the Council in the full knowledge that it comprises open countryside – with the exception of the farm buildings which are a function of the countryside anyway.
- Clearly, in this case, the proposals are at odds with this policy but are compliant with the NPPF, RSS and the submission Core Strategy. Because of these much more recent extant and emerging policies the Local Plan policy should have little, if any, weight in decision-making.
- Policy H19 – affordable housing – this policy remains valid in principle – albeit the Council now has a policy requiring a particular percentage of homes to be affordable. The proposals are wholly compliant with current policy as explained above. Policy H20 is out-of-date given the need for green field sites outside settlements and the current policy position.
- Policy H21 – local needs housing – this policy has some relevance. The application meets the Council’s current policies but a dialogue has commenced with regard to the precise make up of the affordable homes envisaged.
- Policy EMP2 relates to an industrial estate and provides for general industrial and ‘large scale’ office developments. It is an employment allocation. This application is for B1 uses only on a relatively small part of the site and for small to medium sized offices in a ‘domestic’ scale setting appropriate to the context. Otherwise, employment would be in the local retail, services and community use area. There is also the prospect of jobs in any primary school built on the site.

- Policy EMP9 – conversion of barns and other rural buildings for employment uses – this policy remains valid. The proposals include an indication that some of the traditional farm buildings would be retained as part of a business centre for offices – which is consistent with this policy.
- Policy RT8 – Open Space provision – remains valid. A dialogue has commenced with the Council over the subject of contributions towards local sports and recreational facilities and public open space. The proposed layout does provide extensive (more than adequate) and usable public open space.
- Policy RT18 – Improvements of public rights of way, bridleways and byways/un-surfaced, unclassified roads in the plan area – this policy remains valid.

The subject proposals involve the use of existing PRoWs and their enhancement.

- Policy T1 (Transport and mobility) – development proposals – this policy remains valid. The proposals are consistent for, as the TA shows:
 - there is public transport nearby and the development is being planned to take it through the site;
 - it is on the primary route network;
 - provision is being made for pedestrians, cyclists and those with mobility restrictions;
 - the site is accessible by means other than the car;
 - the proposals would enable choice to be made between walking or catching public transport.
- Policy T7 – (Parking provision) - this policy remains valid in principle. There is sufficient space on the site to accommodate parking and servicing facilities for the proposed development.

- Policy S2 (Shopping) remains valid in principle. In this case, the retail element is to be small scale and would be only there to meet local shopping needs. This is thus not a case where the sequential test is relevant. The illustrative master plan shows an area of just 0.5 ha to contain ancillary retail/local services/community uses. Relevant is Policy S5 which states that applications for the provision of shops serving a local need will be permitted subject to conditions – all of which can be met and covered by conditions as necessary.
- Appendix 2 in the Local Plan refers to landscape character areas. The EIA has taken full account of this subject.

7.5. From the foregoing we can conclude that where the Local Plan's policies have not been overtaken by events, the proposals are generally consistent with them even though the Plan is now out-of-date in many key aspects.

8. OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Settlement Hierarchy (December 2008)

- 8.1. As part of the evidence base work for the Core Strategy Ribble Valley Council produced a Settlement Hierarchy document.
- 8.2. It states that Clitheroe 'stands out' as the most significant settlement in the Borough, with the best provision of services and facilities.
- 8.3. It also states that the position with regard to its status is clear as a Key Service Centre able to provide services to a wider area.
- 8.4. Whilst the RSS's days may be numbered, the facts about Clitheroe's critical mass and status are highly material.
- 8.5. This is regardless of the Core Strategy coming forward as proposed or not.

Addressing Housing Need in the Ribble Valley (January 2012)

- 8.6. This document was adopted earlier this year to take account of the 'radical changes' introduced by the current Government and the housing needs issues other than affordability.
- 8.7. Whilst this document is not part of the LDF it is nevertheless, Council policy.
- 8.8. With regard to Affordable Housing Thresholds (set out in 3.1) the application complies with the first bullet point as it would meet the 30% quota sought.
- 8.9. At the time of writing we do not know the extent of other planning obligations the Council and LCC are to seek – this will only become clear once the Council processes the application.
- 8.10. However, we note that the third bullet point accepts that the 30% figure can be reduced to 20% should a viability appraisal justify a lower level of provision. Our client's own appraisal will have to take account of all the obligations sought (assuming they comply

with the NPPF and CIL Regulations) as well as costs involved in delivering infrastructure directly, e.g. the school site, SUDS, open space and a new roundabout on to the A59.

- 8.11. With regard to phasing, discussions with the Council will be necessary as a requirement to build all of the 312 affordable homes by the time that 50% of the whole scheme (520 homes) are built first is infeasible on such a large site and given the time periods involved. It would make more sense to phase the affordable homes in parallel with the whole. This issue will be discussed further with the Council's officers together with many other aspects of mutual interest in the context of planning obligations which will be needed.

Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2008) (SHMA)

- 8.12. The SHMA is now 4 years old but is clearly an important contextual component of the LDF evidence base including the CS.

- 8.13. Of relevance to this application are the following matters:-

- The need for affordable housing;
- The need to increase the supply of market housing to meet the demand from a growing population;
- Meeting the needs and aspirations of the growing elderly population;
- Providing more housing for social rent;
- Supporting economic growth, by incorporating housing options for key workers and those on lower incomes.

- 8.14. The document also noted that the greatest need for affordable homes for key workers in Clitheroe.

Clitheroe Housing Need Surveys

- 8.15. The last published one (2008) showed a local need from 463 people/groups but their precise need was unknown.
- 8.16. A new survey is due to be released which should help in terms of fine tuning the proposals (in terms of house types).

The Planning System – General Principles (2005)

- 8.17. This document remains live despite the introduction of the NPPF and related extinguishment of PPGs and PPSs etc.
- 8.18. In the context of what we have described above about current circumstances for decision-making paragraph 14 is noteworthy. It states, as the NPPF does, that emerging policies can be regarded as material considerations. They may indicate that a policy is under review and the circumstances which have led to that review may need to be taken into account. In this case, the situation with regard to homes is one such matter. This is also pertinent to paragraph 15 insofar as the CS and the Saved Local Plan are weighed. On the same subject, paragraph 16 reinforces this situation.
- 8.19. Paragraph 17 states that in some circumstances, it may be justifiable to refuse planning permission on the grounds of ‘prematurity’ where a DPD is being prepared or is under review, but it has not yet been adopted. In this case, the current position on housing land supply is highly material. As we have explained above the Council currently is unable to identify a 5 year supply of sites and thus there is a clear presumption in favour of granting permission for this sustainable development. In the Bishop’s Cleeve case referred to earlier (and appended) the Secretary of State’s decision states (paragraph 20) that allowing local involvement in plan-making is not to be equated with putting off the obligation to identify and maintain a 5year supply (it should be noted that the Bishop’s Cleeve case is subject to a High Court challenge).
- 8.20. It would seem perverse to come to the conclusion that the subject site should be refused on the grounds of prematurity when hundreds of homes on sites in Clitheroe and

elsewhere, not allocated in the Local Plan or emerging Core Strategy have been granted permission by RVBC and the Secretary of State. It should also be borne in mind that the Council has undertaken extensive consultation over the past 3 years on different stages of the draft CS. Objections on the Core Strategy have not persuaded the Council that there are site specific problems with the site or with its delivery.

- 8.21. It should also be noted that the site is not a strategic one in sub-regional terms compared to sites such as Buckshaw Village in Chorley and South Ribble (for example) which is clearly at a much greater scale with much wider implications.

9. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

- 9.1. A separate Statement of Community Involvement has been produced by us which has been submitted with this application.

10. CONCLUSIONS

10.1. This Statement has demonstrated the following:-

1. The proposed development site is in single ownership and is available for development.
2. It is located on the edge of Ribble Valley's largest settlement, Clitheroe, which is a town and key service centre.
3. It is located next to the A59 and can be accessed direct from Pendle Road (with a secondary emergency access from Littlemoor).
4. A full environmental impact assessment has been produced which shows that there are no constraints to a sensitive development.
5. A Transport Assessment has been produced.
6. A realistic illustrative master plan has been produced which takes account of a SUDS system.
7. A parameters plan has been produced.
8. From the outset the Applicant's brief has been to secure a planning permission which ensures a high quality, sensitive extension to Clitheroe.
9. The Applicants own the land needed to build a new junction between the A59 and Pendle Road.
10. The Applicants have reduced the number of homes by nearly a quarter (a reduction of 360 homes) in response to comments made on the Core Strategy Consultation exercise.
11. The proposals are in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

12. The proposals are sustainable development as defined in paragraph 14 of the NPPF and as there is not a five year supply of deliverable housing sites there is a presumption in favour of granting planning permission now. There are no adverse effects which “significantly and demonstrably” outweigh the significant benefits of this proposal. The presumption is therefore not displaced and planning permission ought to be granted.
13. The Housing Statement (2012) states that – the need for new homes is crucial and acute; and the supply of housing sites remains constrained nationally. We have drawn attention to the fact that, unfortunately, the Council does not have an identified supply of housing land to meet its obligations. This site can play a significant role locally in remedying the situation in the short, medium and long term.
14. The proposals are in accordance with the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS).
15. They are wholly consistent with the Submission Version of the Council’s new Local Plan – the Ribble Valley Core Strategy as:
- 1040 homes are proposed
 - 312 (30%) will be affordable
 - 156 (15%) will be for people over 55 years of age (78 of them will be affordable)
 - Green corridors are proposed
 - Employment land is shown (a business centre based on the farm buildings)
 - Community facilities and local services are shown
 - Land for a primary school is shown

- A new junction between Pendle Road and the A59 is shown
- A very sensitive approach has been taken

16. The Core Strategy is at a relatively advanced stage and is a material consideration of some weight given NPPF and the age of the remaining Saved Local Plan – which expires in March 2013 anyway.

17. The proposals are consistent with the Saved Local Plan where it remains relevant. Much of the Saved Local Plan has become obsolete by virtue of decisions taken by the Council and the Secretary of State as a consequence of RSS and NPPF in turn – particularly with regard to the urgent need to find land for homes.

18. The Council does not have to await the outcome of the Core Strategy EIP before determining the application – it is at its discretion. Historic advice of uncertain status on prematurity has to be weighed against the more recent policies on the need for homes and economic growth.

19. The Applicants have commenced discussions with the Council on the subject of planning obligations. At the time of writing we expect these to relate to:

- * Education
- * Highways
- * Open space
- * Affordable housing

We have listed these horizontally as they are all important to the local community.

20. Cognisance has been taken of discussions with officers of the Council, the County Council and various people in agencies and bodies involved in planning applications including the Environment Agency, United Utilities and the County Archaeologist Unit.

21. The application has been explained, at the request of the Council, to the Council members and officers.

22. The application has also formed the subject of a public exhibition, held on two days in September 2012.
23. The Applicants are keen to work with the Council and local community in seeing an opportunity for a high quality development which will make a substantial contribution to meeting housing needs and deliver many benefits to the area.
24. Regardless of the emerging Core Strategy the residential development is needed to enable the Council to meet its obligations to provide sufficient land for homes.
25. This application provides the Council with such information even at this outline stage to enable it to impose conditions which would set design principles and parameters. This would assist in ensuring that subsequent permissions do not dilute what is being proposed here.
26. It remains for us to respectfully request the Council to grant planning permission for this unique opportunity for sustainable development which meets recognised housing needs at the earliest opportunity.

This will ensure that the growth of Clitheroe, in the context of contemporary needs, is done in a controlled, attractive and broadly beneficial manner.

No other site in the Ribble Valley offers this potential.