

RECOMMENDATION FOR PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

**REFUSAL**

**DATE:** THURSDAY, 16 OCTOBER 2014

**REF:** CS/CMS

**CHECKED BY:**

APPLICATION NO: 3/2014/0592/P

(GRID REF: SD 371966 446630)

PROPOSED DEMOLITION OF THE MOORCOCK INN AND THE ERECTION OF 7 NO DWELLINGHOUSES INCLUDING ASSOCIATED DRIVES, GARDENS AND EXTERNAL LANDSCAPING WORK AT THE MOORCOCK INN, SLAIDBURN ROAD, WADDINGTON

PARISH COUNCIL: Has no objections to this application.

ENVIRONMENT  
DIRECTORATE  
(COUNTY SURVEYOR): Comments that the proposed parking provision for each dwelling is in accordance with the parking standards and comments that the proposal would result in considerably less traffic than the existing authorised use of this property. As such, there is no objection to the proposed development on highway grounds.

LANCASHIRE COUNTY  
COUNCIL (ECOLOGIST): Has no objections to the proposed development but stated that certain matters need to be addressed. In the event of planning permission being granted it is considered that these matters could be covered by appropriate conditions.

LANCASHIRE COUNTY  
COUNCIL (ARCHAEOLOGY): The 1<sup>st</sup> Edition Ordnance Survey (Yorkshire Sheet 182) surveyed in 1847 shows the site to comprise two much smaller buildings adjacent to the main road in the southeast corner of the site. Buildings of this date, if well preserved, might be considered to be of some limited archaeological interest where the preservation by record (building recording to English Heritage Level 2) would be appropriate. However in this instance, information contained in the Heritage Statement makes reference to the building having been badly damaged by fire in the 1970's and subsequently been rebuilt, and that little or no original features survived. Consequently LCAS has no objection to the proposed demolition nor does it consider it necessary to require the applicant to undertake any archaeological recording of the buildings.

**PRINCIPAL AONB OFFICER:** Comments that the proposal comprises 7 residential dwellings that are built to reflect the local building scale and stone vernacular. In order to facilitate the proposed development, the existing building and its car park would be removed – actions which, on their own, would have significant beneficial effects for the local landscape character. The building is relatively large scale, appearance, large car park in close proximity to Slaidburn Road emphasise its presence in the landscape and combined to create significant unacceptable landscape character impacts.

By virtue of the domestic building scale, simple building design using materials and a style which mimics that of the area, alongside mitigation planting, the AONB Officer is satisfied that there would be no significant adverse effects on the landscape character of the AONB. In fact, removal of the Moorcock Inn and its car park, together with the reinstatement of previously lost landscape fabric are clear positive outcomes of the proposed scheme. The AONB Officer stated that two detailed aspects of the landscaping elements of the proposal needed to be amended. (Those points have been satisfactorily addressed on an amended landscaping scheme submitted to address the points made by the AONB Officer.)

With those changes having been made, the AONB Officer is of the opinion that the likely landscape and visual effects of the proposed scheme would be acceptable in landscape terms and that the purposes of AONB designation would not be compromised.

**ADDITIONAL  
REPRESENTATIONS:**

Two letters have been received from nearby residents in which concerns and objections are raised about the proposal on grounds that are summarised as follows:

1. No objection to the conversion of the existing buildings but the new proposal is entirely out of place with the Forest of Bowland AONB and will change the character of Waddington for ever. Building 7 houses outside the village boundaries effectively creating a new hamlet in an elevated visible location on a site with no mains water or mains drainage is both unsustainable and detrimental to the character of Waddington Fell and the Forest of Bowland AONB.
2. A permission for this development could set a potentially detrimental precedent whereby developers could buy farmsteads and other rural buildings, demolish the existing buildings and build several houses throughout the farmyard where no buildings previously existed. The Wellsprings public house on Pendle Hill is in a similar elevated location within the AONB. If this were to fall into

disrepair would the Council allow its demolition and development of a small hamlet on its car park?

3. A previous permission included the preservation of the existing frontage of the Moorcock Inn and the original gable end on the grounds of heritage. Has anything changed regarding the Council's view of the preservation of parts of the existing building? Demolishing all trace of the historical public house and replacing it with 7 properties over a much larger site changes the character of the area for ever.
4. The application mentions that there would be a package treatment of sewage but no details have been provided. Are there to be multiple plants or communal plant for all the properties? Where will the plant/plants discharge to and have the correct permissions been obtained from the Environment Agency etc.
5. Adjoining property owners have concerns about the discharge of waste and top water as this will probably flow onto their land as it is down slope from the site.
6. The application recognises the access to the existing property Moorcock House along the existing track but there is no mention of a gate that gives access into the fields beyond.
7. The existing public house is served by a borehole drawing water from the ground water on Waddington Fell. Many properties in the locality are served by springs or boreholes from the same water source due to the lack of mains water. During a dry spell water supply could become a problem if 7 new permanently occupied properties were to draw water from this source.
8. The proposal could be detrimental to highway safety because the site is at the foot of a slope and slight bend in the road. This has always made it a difficult exit for traffic bearing right and left. The speeds of traffic, having just descended from the top of the fell itself, are quite considerable by the time they reach the current Moorcock exit.

Two further letters have been received in which the point is made that a clay pigeon shoot is held on nearby land every Sunday morning between 8am and 12pm. The point is made that the developers and any potential buyers of the properties should be made fully aware of this activity prior to any purchase of the dwellings.

## **Proposal**

The application seeks full planning permission for the demolition of the existing building and the redevelopment of the site (including the car park) to provide 7 dwellings.

There would be 2 larger detached houses on the western part of the site and 5 smaller dwellings (1 detached and 2 pairs of semi-detached) arranged around a courtyard on the eastern part of the site closest to Slaidburn Road. All the dwellings would have appropriate curtilages.

Plots 1 and 2 (on the western part of the site) are traditional two storey dwellings with integral garages and the garage roof to the west of Plot 1 had been extended along part of the house to create a cat slide which has kept the eaves height for the majority of the western elevation to a single storey.

Plot 3 is also a traditional 2 storey building with roof space and the scale of this building has also been reduced by creating stepped cat slides along the eastern side thereby minimising the scale of this elevation which is visible from Fell Road and also to reflect the detail of a barn.

A granary style building defines the northern side of the courtyard and provides 2 semi-detached 2 storey dwellings (Plots 4 and 5) that would be set into the sloping ground such that the building would appear as single storey from the northern side when travelling down Fell Road.

Plot 6 and 7 form the eastern edge of the site close to Fell Road and these have been designed to appear as converted piggery style semi-detached cottages set away from the road. This building has been stepped to follow the sloping ground and this is accentuated in stepping both the eaves and ridge levels on each of the dwellings, but also in plan and elevation to create a piecemeal appearance.

The proposed external materials comprise a mixture of appearance and details including reclaimed natural stone for walls and new dressed stone for quoins and surrounds. Roofs would be finished with natural slate and stone flags with cast aluminium rainwater goods supported by stone gutter corbels. Some roof structures would have exposed timber elements stained dark/black ash colour and external window and door frames would also be dark stained black ash coloured timber and door powder coated aluminium.

The existing vehicular access will be used to gain access to the new dwellings. New private drives would serve Plots 1 and 2 a shared drive would lead to the courtyard and provide access to Plots 3 to 7.

Ample off-street parking will be provided with Plots 1 and 2 each having a double garage and at least one private parking space on the drives and Plot 3 also having an integral single garage and 2 private car parking spaces. Plots 4 and 5 all have single integral garages with an external parking space and Plots 6 and 7 both have 2 external parking spaces.

The site will be well screened and landscaped in accordance with a scheme that has been formulated with the involvement of this Council's Countryside Officers.

## **Site Location**

The application relates to the former Moorcock Inn Public House and Hotel that is located on the northwest side of Slaidburn Road within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty approximately 2 miles north of Waddington Village. The buildings have not been in use since the business was ceased in the summer of 2010. The application site comprises the area upon which the buildings stand plus the large car park which, together, give a total area of approximately 1.8 acres. There are two dwellings relatively close to the application site, one to the west and one to the southwest, otherwise there are few other buildings or properties within approximately 500m of the site.

## **Relevant History**

3/2012/0356/P – Proposed conversion and redevelopment of the public house and hotel to form three private residential properties. Approved with conditions.

3/2012/0819/P – Proposed demolition of the redundant public house and hotel and the erection of three detached dwellings, three detached garages with annex accommodation over and the creation of garden and landscaped areas. Refused.

3/2013/0394/P – Proposed demolition of the redundant public house and hotel and the erection of three detached dwellings with three detached double garages with annex accommodation over and the creation of garden and landscaped areas (resubmission of 3/2012/0819/P). Withdrawn.

## **Relevant Policies**

### *Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan*

Policy G1 - Development Control.

Policy G5 - Settlement Strategy.

Policy ENV1 - Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

Policy ENV7 - Species Protection.

Policy EMP11 - Loss of Employment Land.

Policy H2 - Dwellings in the Open Countryside.

Policy T1 - Development Proposals - Transport Implications.

Policy T7 - Parking Provision.

### *The Core Strategy Submission version as proposed to be modified*

Key Statement DS1 – Development Strategy.

Key Statement DS2 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development.

Key Statement EN2 – Landscape.

Key Statement EN4 – Biodiversity and Geodiversity.

Key Statement EN5 – Heritage Assets.

Key Statement DM12 – Transport Considerations.

Policy DMG1 – General Considerations.

Policy DMG2 – Strategic Considerations.

Policy DMG3 – Transport and Mobility.

Policy DME2 – Landscape and Townscape Protection.

Policy DME3 – Site and Species Protection and Conservation.

Policy DME4 – Protecting Heritage Assets.

Policy DMH3 – Dwellings in the Open Countryside and AONB.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).  
National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG).

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

In the determination of this application I consider it appropriate to look briefly at the recent planning history of the site and then to consider whether the proposal is acceptable in principle in relation to the sustainability requirements of NPPF and compliance or otherwise with the relevant saved Local Plan Policies and emerging Core Strategy Policies.

#### **Planning History**

Permission was granted in August 2012 for the conversion and redevelopment of the public house to provide 3 residential dwellings (3/2012/0356/P). That approved development involved the demolition of the inappropriate recent extensions to the building and the retention and enhancement of the older and more important parts of the building in order to form 3 dwellings. The site of that application did not include the existing car park. No works have been carried out in respect of the implementation of this permission, but it will remain extant until 6 August 2015.

Permission was then sought for the total demolition of the existing buildings and the erection on a larger site (including the car park) of 3 large detached dwellings (3/2012/0819/P). As this was still for a development of 3 dwellings, it was considered that, purely in relation to sustainability, it would satisfy the overriding requirements of NPPF.

It was, however, considered that, by virtue of their size, the dwellings were not intended to meet a proven local need and the development was therefore contrary to saved Policy H2 of the local plan and Policy DMH3 of the Core Strategy; that the demolition of a non-designated heritage asset was contrary to the intentions of conserving the historic environment as contained in Section 12 of NPPF; and that the group of 3 dwellings by virtue of their size and height and the extent of their curtilages would form a development not typical of the locality that would appear as an incongruous development detracting from the appearance and character of the AONB contrary to saved Policies G1 and ENV1 of the Local Plan and Policies DMG1, DMG2 and DME2 of the emerging Core Strategy. Permission was therefore refused for those reasons.

A further application for the demolition of the existing building and the erection of 3 large detached dwellings (3/2013/0394/P) sought to overcome the objections to the previously refused application. As this intention appeared to be failing, that application was withdrawn by the applicants.

This current application again seeks to address the reasons for refusal of 3/2012/0819. It has been recognised that, in visual terms, 3 large detached dwellings would not be appropriate for this prominent and isolated location in the AONB. The application therefore details 7 dwellings of more appropriate design and scale including 2 larger detached dwellings on the western part of the site and 5 small dwellings arranged around the courtyard on the eastern part of the site.

#### **Principle of Development**

Since the previous decisions on the site were made, the Core Strategy has now reached a more advanced stage. The consideration of this application therefore needs to take this into account.

It is still, however, also appropriate to pay regard to the saved Local Plan Policies. I therefore look at the policy context below on this basis.

The site lies outside any settlement boundaries and falls within the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and as such Policy ENV1 within the saved Districtwide Local Plan is relevant. Within the AONB the landscape and character of the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty will be protected, conserved and enhanced. The environmental effects of proposals will be a major consideration and the design, materials, scale, massing and landscaping of development will also be important factors.

Policy G5 of the DWLP is also applicable to the proposals. The policy is intended to recognise the need to protect the countryside from inappropriate development but in doing so accepts that the countryside is a working area and a source of many Ribble Valley residents' livelihoods. Policy G5 states that, outside the main settlement and village boundaries planning permission will only be granted for local needs housing (subject to Policy H20 of the DWLP) or for other small scale uses appropriate to a rural area which conform to the policies of the plan.

Whilst the DWLP policies outlined above remain relevant, the 'Core Strategy 2008-2028: A Local Plan for Ribble Valley' continues to progress through the Examination in Public (EiP) and has now progressed through the formal hearing stages. Public consultation has recently taken place on a series of main modifications to the Core Strategy following these hearing sessions (The consultation period extended to 5 September 2014). This consultation followed on from Members of Ribble Valley's Planning and Development Committee ratifying these modifications (on 8<sup>th</sup> May 2014). The policies set out in the Core Strategy Submission Version, as proposed to be modified therefore represents the Council's proposed policy position. It is considered that the plan is at an advanced stage in the plan making process and the policies within the Core Strategy must therefore be afforded significant weight in the decision making process.

When assessing this proposal against the Core Strategy policies at this stage, a central issue for consideration is whether the proposals would cause harm to the Development Strategy. Main modification 21 and 25 of the Core Strategy Proposed Main Modifications (May 2014) outlines the proposed modifications to Key Statement DS1: Development Strategy. The current position is that zero additional dwellings are required outside of the 32 defined settlements and principal settlements. The only residential development considered appropriate in these locations is therefore local needs housing or development that results in regeneration benefits.

In addition to policy DS1, main modification 54 of the Core Strategy Proposed Main Modifications (May 2014) outlines the proposed modifications to Policy DMG2: Strategic Considerations. This policy states that *development should be in accordance with the Core Strategy Development Strategy and should support the spatial vision...within the less sustainable of the defined settlements (tier 2 villages) and outside the defined settlement areas development must meet at least one of the following considerations:*

- 1. The development should be essential to the local economic or social well-being of the area.*
- 2. The development is needed for the purposes of forestry or agriculture.*
- 3. The development is for local needs housing which meets and identified need and is secured as such.*
- 4. The development is for small scale tourism or recreational development appropriate to a rural area.*
- 5. The development is for small scale uses appropriate to a rural area where a local need or benefit can be demonstrated.*

6. *The development is compatible with the enterprise zone designation.*

*In protecting the designated Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty the Council will have regard to the economic and social well-being of the area. However the most important consideration in the assessment of any development proposals will be the protection, conservation and enhancement of the landscape and character of the area avoiding where possible habitat fragmentation. Where possible new development should be accommodated through the re-use of existing buildings, which in most cases is more appropriate than new build. Development will be required to be in keeping with the character of the landscape and acknowledge the special qualities of the AONB by virtue of its size, design, use of material, landscaping and siting. The AONB Management Plan should be considered and will be used by the Council in determining planning applications.*

*This policy assists the interpretation of the development strategy and underpins the settlement hierarchy for the purposes of delivering sustainable development. In establishing broad constraints to development the Council will secure the overall vision of the Core Strategy.*

This proposal does not comply with the basic intentions of policy DMG2 of the Core Strategy.

In addition, paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that to promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities.

Whilst accepting that the provision of three dwellings through a conversion scheme has been approved (and remains extant) this current proposal is for a higher number of units (7 in total). In addition, paragraph 55 states that Local planning authorities should avoid new isolated homes in the countryside unless there are special circumstances. Whilst one of these circumstances is "*where the development would reuse redundant or disused buildings and lead to an enhancement to the immediate setting*" these proposals would see the complete demolition of the existing inn with no retention (whereas the extant permission retained the best part of the building). Therefore, this proposal does not appear to be in compliance with the sustainability intentions of NPPF and the Core Strategy Development Strategy (policy DS1).

However, paragraph 12 of the NPPF states that the "*NPPF does not change the statutory status of the development plan as the starting point for decision making...and proposed development that conflicts should be refused unless other material considerations indicate otherwise*". This position is reiterated at para 150 of NPPF, which states that '*planning decisions must be taken in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise*'. As this proposal would lead to the creation of residential development outside of a defined settlement, it would be contrary to policy DS1 and DMG2 of the Core Strategy, the emerging local development plan. Whilst, accepting that there is an extant permission for three units, that decision was made prior to the proposed main modifications to the core strategy which has resulted in the settlement strategy, and this current proposal would increase this number by a further 4 units in a location which the current proposed development strategy does not support. Therefore, the proposal does not appear to be acceptable in principle as it would be contrary to aspects of NPPF, DS1 and DMG2.

However, I will now look at the question of sustainability in NPPF terms in more detail. Sustainability has the 3 dimensions of economic, social and environment (NPPF para 7).

The economic role involves contributing to building a strong, responsive and competitive economy by ensuring that sufficient land of the right type is available in the right places and in the right time to support growth and innovation; and by identifying and co-ordinating development requirements, including the provision of infrastructure.

The loss of this public house/hotel (that, if operating successfully would be beneficial to the local rural economy) has been accepted by the extant permission for the conversion and renovation of the building. The use of local services and facilities etc by the occupiers of 7 dwellings would provide some contribution to the local economy. It is, however, not accepted that this site is of the right type and in the right location for a development of 7 dwellings. Such a development also runs counter to the Development Strategy of the Core Strategy. I do not therefore consider that this proposal could be justified by its contribution to the economic role of sustainability.

The social role involves supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by providing the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by creating a high quality built environment, with accessible local services that reflect the community's needs and supporting its health, social and cultural well-being.

Looked at purely in terms of the scale, layout, massing, architecture, external materials and landscaping, it is accepted that this is a high quality proposed development. The site, however, is not close to local services. In my opinion, the proposal would contribute very little to the social role of sustainability.

The environmental role involves contributing to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment; and, as part of this, helping to improve biodiversity, use natural resources prudently, minimise waste and pollution and mitigate and adapt to climate change including moving to a low carbon economy.

The principle intention of this application has been to create high quality development that would be appropriate to its AONB location, and would address the reasons for refusal of the previous application 3/2012/0819/P. The Council's Planning (Urban Design) and Countryside Officers, and the Forest of Bowland Principal AONB Officer have played a part in this process. As a result of this, the design and layout of the development is considered to be acceptable; the Countryside Officer considers the proposed landscaping to be appropriate and to a high standard; and the AONB Officer has also confirmed that he considers the proposal to be acceptable in relation to its landscape and visual effects. With regards to addressing the "visual amenity" reasons for refusal of the previous application, it could be argued that the submitted scheme has probably satisfied its objective.

However, it has always been recognised that improving the visual aspects of the development by having a larger number of smaller, better designed dwellings, was going to run counter to other aspects of sustainability.

The other element of the environmental role involves using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change including moving to a low carbon economy. This intention of NPPF is incorporated into the Council's Development Strategy that involves concentrating development in the larger, more sustainable, settlements. As previously stated, the Core Strategy is now at a stage where a recent Appeal Inspector considers that it "carries considerable weight".

It could be argued that, purely in terms of vehicle movements, the proposed development is more sustainable than the existing authorised use of the building. However, that is only one element of sustainability. The proposal is for 7 new build dwellings in a location that is distant from facilities and services, access to which would be reliant on the private car. The proposal would not therefore assist in moving to a low carbon economy.

As previously stated, paragraph 12 of NPPF states that "NPPF does not change the statutory status of the Development Plan as the starting point for decision making. Proposed development that accords with an up to date local plan should be approved, and proposed development that conflicts should be refused unless other material considerations indicate otherwise". Therefore, irrespective of the high quality of the design of the proposed development, or the debate on sustainability, the fact is that the proposal is contrary to the Development Strategy and the relevant policies of the Core Strategy that now "carries substantial weight".

It is considered that the proposal to provide 7 dwellings in this isolated open countryside location would be contrary to, and would be harmful to, the Council's Development Strategy. It is also considered that a permission for this development would create a precedent for the acceptance of other applications for isolated dwellings, which would be further prejudicial to the implementation of the emerging Core Strategy policies. It is therefore considered that the application should be refused for these reasons.

**RECOMMENDATION:** That planning permission be REFUSED for the following reason(s):

1. The proposed development is contrary to Key Statement DS1 and Policy DMG2 and DMH3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy submission version as proposed to be modified as it would involve the construction of 7 dwellings in an isolated open countryside location that do not meet an identified local need. As such, the proposal would cause harm to the Development Strategy for the Borough as set out in the emerging Core Strategy leading to unsustainable development.
2. Permission for the proposed development would create a harmful precedent for the acceptance of other similar proposals without sufficient justification which would have an adverse impact on the implementation of the emerging planning policies of the Council contrary to the interests of the proper planning of the area in accordance with the core principles and policies of the NPPF.

## **RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL REPORT TO PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

Agenda Item No.

meeting date: 12 FEBRUARY 2015  
title: HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY  
submitted by: DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY SERVICES  
principal author: JOANNE MACHOLC, SENIOR PLANNING OFFICER

### **1 PURPOSE**

1.1 To provide Members with information on the results of the most recent Housing Land Availability Survey, which has a base date of 31 December 2014, and to outline amendments to the methodology for calculating the supply position.

1.2 Relevance to the Council's ambitions and priorities

- Community Objectives - The information in this report relates to the delivery of housing which is a key theme of the recently adopted Core Strategy.
- Corporate Priorities - This information is relevant to the adopted Core Strategy which is a spatial expression corporate priorities
- Other Considerations - Councils have a duty to update housing supply annually.

### **2 INFORMATION**

2.1 The Council has a duty to ensure a 5 year supply of deliverable housing land (NPPF paragraph 47). The issue of five year supply continues to be a key matter in the determination of planning applications and appeals.

2.2 Housing land surveys are conducted on a regular basis and reports produced which monitor housing development across the Borough and set out the latest supply position in relation to the relevant strategic requirement. On occasion updates are produced in the interim to inform major appeals.

2.3 From adoption of the Core Strategy, housing monitoring is to be undertaken half yearly. The most relevant date to be monitored is at 31<sup>st</sup> March which represents the end of the monitoring year for the purposes of producing a Monitoring Report (previously referred to as Annual Monitoring Reports). The latest published position is at 30<sup>th</sup> June 2014 so the 31<sup>st</sup> December survey provides information for the last six months. The next report will have a base date of 31<sup>st</sup> March and thereafter six monthly. This frequency is considered to provide best efficiencies in relation to the increasingly intensive monitoring role. It is noted that NPPF envisages annual updates.

2.4 The Survey provides information on the number of dwellings completed, information on sites with planning permission and their development status. It enables the Council to create a picture of construction trends and activity rates together with base line evidence on the amount of land that is available to be brought forward.

2.5 Outputs from the survey show that 1023 dwellings have been constructed since April 2008 (i.e. a 6.75 year period). In the monitoring year 2014-2015 to date (1 April – 31 December), 288 have been built. The activity in the current year represents a significant increase on previous years.

2.6 The supply position at 31 December 2014 can be summarised as:

	<u>No. dwellings</u>
• Units with full planning permission – not started	372
• Units with outline planning permission – not started	1803
• Sites commenced, units remaining but not started	335
• Units under construction	225
• Conversions - not started	88
• Conversions –under construction	45
• Affordable Housing Sites (not started)	892
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3760</b>

(note: planning permissions granted since 31 December are not included)

2.7 In addition, at 31 December, 387 dwellings were the subject of planning applications awaiting the completion of Section 106 Agreements. They are not included in the table above as the sites do not yet have planning permission. However given that development of these sites has been agreed in principle they are generally included in the supply. The Council has put in place measures to monitor progress on the completion of Agreements and their inclusion in the supply is regularly reviewed.

2.8 The relevant strategic housing requirement is set out in the Core Strategy which was adopted on 16<sup>th</sup> December 2014. H1 of the Core Strategy sets out a housing requirement of 5600 dwellings for the plan period 2008 to 2028. This equates to an annual average completion rate of at least 280 per year. Therefore the figure of 280 per year is used for monitoring purposes.

In addition to endorsing the overall housing requirement, the Inspector also considered in his report, based on the April 2014 Housing Land Availability Schedule that the Council could demonstrate a five year supply of housing. This was despite representations to the contrary. This endorsed the Council's approach to calculating housing supply, based on the Sedgfield method (as resolved in October 2013 - Minute 369). Therefore the Council will continue to use this method. In addition the Inspector considered that, "Moreover, the exclusion of windfall sites suggests that the present five year land supply may be a conservative estimate ...."

2.9 Sites with planning permission are normally considered deliverable in terms of the NPPF. Some work has been undertaken on deliverability and related issues have been discussed at various appeals. As a result some sites are considered undeliverable in

- the five year period and are excluded from the supply. The attached calculations include allowances for such sites (set out in Appendix 1). They are kept under review.
- 2.10 Some large sites are deliverable but due to their scale will not be fully developed in the five year period. In such cases only those elements considered deliverable in the five year period are included in the calculations. The remainder will be delivered in subsequent years. There are two such sites in the latest survey: Land at Higher Standen Farm and part Littlemoor Farm; and Land to the south and west of Whalley Road, Barrow as detailed in Appendix 1. The inspector explicitly considered the contribution of both sites in relation to housing land supply and considered that an allowance of 300 each was "broadly reasonable". A further large site, Land off Waddington Road, is subject of a resolution to grant planning permission at 31<sup>st</sup> December 2014 but the Section 106 was unsigned at that point. An estimate is made for the contribution the site will make to housing delivery in five years.
- 2.11 Following the Inspector's Report, consideration has been given to the inclusion of a windfall allowance based on definitions and advice in NPPF. This would not normally include residential gardens and, at this stage has been restricted to brownfield sites. Only the Principal settlements of Clitheroe, Longridge and Whalley and the nine Tier One settlements were considered as the development strategy (DS1) of the Core Strategy does not envisage significant new housing outside these settlements except in specific circumstances. Development rates were considered for development that has taken place or is under construction in them since 2008. Development outside the boundaries of these settlements or in relation to other settlements or open countryside is not included. Furthermore in order that any allowance is not skewed by a single large development, threshold of 10 dwellings in the Principal Settlements and 5 dwellings for the Tier One settlements were applied. The analysis shows that an average of about 23 dwellings a year has come forward in such circumstances. It is considered that this is a reasonable and realistic estimate of windfall to include in the supply (equating to 115 dwellings over the five year period). This will be kept under review especially in relation to greenfield sites and what contribution they make to supply.
- 2.12 The calculations continue to apply a 10% allowance for slippage. However this is to be kept under review as information on delivery becomes available in relation to actual development in the Ribble Valley context and specific sites. An immediate consideration is whether the 10% discount should apply to sites which are already under construction. It does not apply to dwellings which are actually under construction but it does apply to dwellings not commenced on sites under construction. 335 dwellings are not started on such sites. One site is already not included in the supply (Land at Dale View Billington) so 23 units are discounted. Of the remaining 312, 307 are on six large sites where development is in progress with some dwellings already completed and/or under construction. All are highly likely to be developed in 5 years. There are no further applications which seek a reduction in the number of dwellings and indeed an application has been considered on one of the sites to increase the number of dwellings by an additional three. On this basis, it is not necessary to apply the 10% discount.
- 2.13 Appendix 1 shows the calculation of the five year requirement. The five year requirement is for 2547 dwellings (equivalent to 510 per year). The identified supply including allowances is 2826 dwellings. On this basis there is a 5.54 year supply.

- 2.14 The Housing Land Availability Schedule January 2015 will be made available on the Council's website and a copy placed in the Members Room.
- 2.15 The Council will continue to keep matters under review and undertake regular monitoring of the housing land situation.

### 3 RISK ASSESSMENT

#### 3.1 The approval of this report may have the following implications

- Resources – the monitoring of housing land is undertaken within existing resources. Six monthly monitoring brings significant efficiencies to resource requirements.
- Technical, Environmental and Legal – the monitoring of housing land at least annually is a requirement of NPPF (para. 47)
- Political – the housing land position is a key consideration in the determination of applications and appeals
- Reputation – Regular updating and publishing of the housing land position demonstrates that the Council is fulfilling its duties.
- Equality & Diversity – no direct implications

### 4 RECOMMENDED THAT COMMITTEE

- 4.1 That the housing land position at 31 December 2014 is noted and that minor amendments to the methodology in relation to inclusion of a windfall allowance and the application of the 10% allowance for slippage are endorsed.
- 4.2 That authority is delegated to the Head of Planning Services in consultation with the Chairman of Planning and Development to make further adjustments to the calculations in the future as may be relevant in the light of further monitoring and analysis of trends.

JOANNE MACHOLC  
SENIOR PLANNING OFFICER

JOHN HEAP  
DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY SERVICES

#### BACKGROUND PAPERS

Housing Land Availability Schedule January 2015 (available on the website)  
NPPF

For further information please ask for Joanne Macholc, extension 3200.  
REF: JM/120215/P&D/EL

**Housing Land Position at 31<sup>st</sup> December 2014****Annualised requirement**

The Core Strategy was adopted on 16<sup>th</sup> December 2014. Policy H1 sets an overall requirement of 5600 dwellings for the plan period 2008 – 2028 which equates to 280 dwellings per year. The 5 year requirement is calculated as follows:

A	Planned provision 2008 - 2028	5600
B	Annual equivalent	280
C	Five year requirement (Bx5)	1400
D	Plus 20% buffer – NPPF para. 47 (B+C)	1680
E	Completions 1/4/2008 – 31/12/2014 (6.75 years)	1023
F	Shortfall [(6.75x B)-E]	867
G	Total five year requirement (D+F)	2547
H	Annual requirement (G÷5)	510

**Identified supply at 31<sup>st</sup> December 2014**

Sites subject to Section 106 Agreements	387
Sites with planning permission not started:	
Sites with full permission	372
Sites with outline permission	1803
Conversions not started	88
Affordable Units not started	892
	<i>Sub total:</i> 3542
Less sites not deliverable	48
Less dwellings on large sites deliverable beyond 5 year period	1069
	<i>Sub total:</i> 2425
Less 10% slippage	243
Less a further 31 dwellings in relation to Lawsonsteads (remainder of site with outline permission)	31
	<i>Sub total:</i> 2151
Plus sites under construction (225 + 45) less 22	248
Plus Dwellings not started on sites under construction (335 less 23 dwellings at Land off Dale View)	312
Plus windfall allowance	115
	<b>TOTAL</b> 2826

**Supply** = 2826 + 510  
= 5.54 years

**Deductions from the supply**

Sites with planning permission are usually considered deliverable in accordance with NPPF. The following sites have planning permission but are not considered deliverable and are excluded from the 5 year supply:

Sites with planning permission	Total no.	Market units	Affordable Units	Development status
Land off Dale View	23	23	0	Site under construction but 23 remain
Victoria Mill, Sabden*	30	7	23	Not started
Victoria St Garage, Clitheroe	9	9	0	Not started
Pack Horse Garage	9	9	0	Not started
<b>total</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>23</b>	

\* site at Victoria Mill has pp for 70 dwellings and is included in the overall figures. However the council has resolved to approve a further scheme for 40 dwellings which is subject to a section 106 agreement which is likely to be implemented in favour of the scheme for 70. Therefore 30 deducted.

A further site at Lawsonsteads has an extant outline planning permission for 206 dwellings. It has been indicated that the number of dwellings in the reserved matters application is likely to be about 155. This amounts to a reduction of 51 dwellings. Since the 10% slippage allowance would equate to a deduction of about 20 dwellings, a further 31 dwellings are deducted from the calculation to fully reflect this. Future surveys will pick up any variations.

**Small sites/conversions under construction**

A total of 22 units to be deducted.

**Large sites**

The Council considers that the following sites are deliverable but due to the scale, will not be fully developed in the five year period. The following allowances are made in the calculations:

Site	Reference	Status at 31/12/2014	Total dwelling capacity	Allowance in 5 year period	Remainder deliverable beyond 5 years
land at Higher Standen Farm & part Littlemoor Farm	3/2012/0942	Approved 17/4/14	1040	300	740
Land to the south and west of Barrow and west of Whalley Road, Barrow	3/2012/0630	Outline planning permission granted on appeal 20/2/2014	504	300	204
Land off Waddington Road, Clitheroe	3/2014/0597	Unsigned Section 106	275	150	125
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>1819</b>	<b>750</b>	<b>1069</b>