



Steven Abbott Associates LLP
Chartered Town Planners

PLANNING SUPPORTING STATEMENT

Millbrook Developments

Erection of 1 no. Detached Dwelling Following the Demolition of the
Existing Agricultural Building

Laneside Barn, Grindleton Road, Grindleton, BB7 4QH

March 2023



REPORT DETAILS

Contact: **Claire Wilkinson** BA (Hons) MCD MRTPI
Associate

Tel: 01257 251177

E-mail: clairew@abbott-associates.co.uk

Office address: **Steven Abbott Associates LLP**
Balmoral House
Ackhurst Business Park
Foxhole Road
Chorley
PR7 1NY

Ref: 3825

Date: March 2023



CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	4
2. THE PROPOSAL	5
3. PLANNING HISTORY	6
4. RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY	7
5. PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS	8
6. CONCLUSION	19

APPENDICES

Appendix 1 – Pre-application response RV/2021/ENQ/0006

Appendix 2 – LCC Pre-application response

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1. We are instructed by Millbrook Developments to prepare a planning application for the erection of 1 no. dwelling following the demolition of the existing agricultural building ('the barn') on the site.
- 1.2. The barn has an extant Class Q prior approval (3/2021/0307) for its conversion into one dwelling.
- 1.3. The application site is located approximately 500m to the south-west of Grindleton village centre within the Open Countryside.
- 1.4. The barn is located right on the frontage of the southern side of Grindleton Road. Located almost opposite the site is a detached property known as 'Lane Side'.
- 1.5. To the west of the barn is a gateway in the roadside wall leading to an adjoining yard, and to the east is a more informal opening to a concrete yard, which until recently contained a modern agricultural shed (now demolished as part of 3/2021/0307 prior approval).
- 1.6. To the south of the barn is open agricultural land.

2. THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1. This planning application seeks permission for the demolition of the existing stone barn and its replacement with a new detached dwelling which retains a traditional barn type appearance.
- 2.2. The new dwelling will comprise of a two-storey stone-built property with a cat-slide single storey addition to the rear of the new dwelling, at its western end.
- 2.3. The internal layout will provide 4 beds at first floor level, with an open plan kitchen/dining/living space and separate dining and lounge area at ground floor level.
- 2.4. The demolition of the existing barn and the proposed rebuild will allow for the new dwelling to be set back from the roadside by approximately 3.6m.
- 2.5. The proposed residential curtilage incorporates the existing hardstanding area to the east and south and the small yard area to the west.
- 2.6. Access to the site will be provided via the previously approved access under 3/2021/0307, located to the east of the dwelling.

3. PLANNING HISTORY

3.1. Listed below is the most recent and relevant planning history on the site:

- 3/2019/0760 - Change of use of existing agricultural building to a dwelling under class Q (a) and (b) – **PRIOR APPROVAL GRANTED.**
- 3/2021/0307 - Conversion of stone barn to one two-storey dwelling; re-siting of existing gateway, closing existing western gateway; installation of new sewage treatment plant; removal of adjacent steel framed shed. Class Q (a) and (b) – **PRIOR APPROVAL GRANTED.**
- 3/2019/0389 - Change of use of existing agricultural building to a dwelling under class Q (a) and (b) – **PRIOR APPROVAL REFUSED.**

3.2. Along with the above planning history, a pre-application enquiry has been undertaken with the Council (RV/2021/ENQ/0006 – Appendix 1) regarding the principle of the demolition of the existing barn and a new build dwelling in its replacement. This is discussed in more detail in section 5 of this Planning Statement.

3.3. Pre-application advice has also been sought and received from the LCC Highways Department in respect of the proposed development (Appendix 2), and again this is discussed in more detail in section 5 of this Planning Statement.

4. RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

4.1. Planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the local development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The development plan consists of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy (2008-2028). Nationally, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) dictates planning policy.

4.2. The following local plan policies are considered relevant to this application:

Key Statement DS1 – Development Strategy

Key Statement DMI2 – Transport Considerations

Policy DMG1 – General Considerations

Policy DMG2 – Strategic Considerations

Policy DMG3 – Transport and Mobility

Policy DMH3- Dwellings in the Open Countryside and AONB

5. PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Location for a New Dwelling

- 5.1. The location of the site is within the Open Countryside and therefore outside of any settlement boundary within the borough. Policies contained within the Core Strategy would not normally support the erection of a new dwelling in this location.

Heritage Value

- 5.2. As the existing building is a traditional stone-built barn a heritage assessment has been undertaken and submitted with this planning application. It confirms the building is neither a designated nor a non-designated heritage asset.
- 5.3. The assessment explains that the barn's heritage significance is limited for a number of reasons, including –
- The barn's former visual and functional association with the farmhouse has been very much reduced;
 - The barn is an example of a locally common building type; and
 - The nineteenth century additions to the east and south side conceal much of the original building and so diminish its architectural interest. Previous replacement of stone slate by modern tiles over much of the building markedly reduce its aesthetic value and the loss or degradation of many original external and internal features, including the roof structure, shippon, and stable, all restrict the archaeological and historic interest.
- 5.4. Based on this assessment, the barn is of no particular heritage value and later alterations and additions to it have reduced its aesthetic value. Within the assessment there is nothing to suggest that any element of the barn is worthy of retention greater than the safety benefits of the proposed development (discussed in more detail below).

Extant Class Q

- 5.5. A material planning consideration of this planning application is that the existing barn has an extant consent for its conversion to residential use (1 no. dwelling) under prior approval reference 3/2021/0307.
- 5.6. Subsequent to this prior approval, our client engaged in the Council's pre-application procedure to gauge the LPA's views on the demolition of the existing barn and its replacement with a new dwelling, utilising the prior approval consent as a fallback position.
- 5.7. The pre-application response provided by the Council (RV/2021/ENQ/006), included the following comments regarding the principle of the development–
- *“The application building to which your enquiry relates has consent for conversion to residential use under Class Q ref 3/2019/0760. This relates to the conversion of an existing building, not the erection of a new-built, and work to convert the building has not yet commenced. Therefore, as discussed at our meeting the proposed development would not be considered a replacement dwelling as the property does not currently benefit from a residential C3 use.”*
 - *“The potential conversion of this barn to residential use under the Class Q approval would not be considered a fall-back position as the approval makes use of an existing agricultural building and not the erection of a new dwelling”.*
 - *“Nevertheless, the fact that prior approval to convert the building has been granted would be a material planning consideration in the determination of a formal planning application for an alternative conversion scheme. The Council would have to consider firstly whether there is a realistic possibility of the fall-back position being implemented and then secondly whether the proposed scheme of conversion (NB- we think this is a typo and should say ‘the new*

dwelling' rather than 'conversion') would provide any improvements /enhancements compared with the fall-back".

- 5.8. Caselaw is clear that a Fallback Position is a material consideration in the decision-making process. The weight to be afforded to that fallback position is for the decision-maker, although the decision-maker must follow the tests set out through established caselaw.

As stated in the case of *R. v Secretary of State for the Environment and Havering Borough Council* [1998] Env. L.R.189:

"The requirement to have regard to the consideration imports a requirement on the decision-maker to have before it sufficient material so that the consideration can be assessed. In the context of fall-back cases this all reduces to the need to ask and answer the question: is the proposed development in its implications for impact on the environment, or other relevant planning factors, likely to have implications worse than, or broadly similar to, any use to which the site would or might be put if the proposed development were refused? By "might" I do not mean a mere theoretical possibility which could hardly feature in the balance...For a fall-back suggestion to be relevant there must be a finding of an actually intended use as opposed to a mere legal or theoretical entitlement".

In ***Simpson v SSCLG*** [2011] EWHC 283 (Admin), Mr George Bartless QC (sitting as a Deputy High Court Judge) held as follows:

"The essence of any fall-back contention is that, although the proposed development might have an adverse effect, nevertheless if planning permission were to be refused other uses or operations also with adverse effects but not requiring planning permission would or might be carried on or carried out; so that in the final evaluation the proposed development ought to be judged to be acceptable in view of what would or might occur if

permission for it was refused: see Snowden v Secretary of State for the Environment [1980] JPL 749 . A fall- back position clearly has two elements that need to be established before it can be brought into the evaluation. The first is the nature and content of the alternative uses or operations. These need to be identified with sufficient particularity to enable the comparison that the fall-back contention involves to be made. The second element is the likelihood of the alternative use or operations being carried on or carried out. This has to be established for two reasons: see South Buckinghamshire District Council v Secretary of State for the Environment CO/184/98, 22 June 1998 . Firstly, unless the alternative uses or operations are a realistic possibility, it would be Wednesbury unreasonable to treat the harm that would result from them as a reason for granting planning permission for the proposed development. Secondly the degree of likelihood of the alternative uses or operations being carried on or carried out will, or at least may be, a material consideration, to be weighed along with the harm that they would cause and the other pros and cons of the development proposed. If the harm that would result from the fall-back uses or operations would be very serious, it may well be that a lower degree of probability of their realisation would be sufficient to justify the grant of permission than in the case of less serious harm.”

In **Gambone v SSCLG** [2014] EWHC 952 (Admin), Mr Ian Dove QC (then sitting as a Deputy High Court Judge) held as follows:

“The fallback argument is in truth no more or less than an approach to material considerations in circumstances where there are, or may be, the opportunity to use land in a particular way, the effects of which will need to be taken into account by the decision-maker. That involves a two-stage approach. The first stage of that approach is to decide whether or

not the way in which the land may be developed is a matter which amounts to a material consideration. It will amount to a material consideration on the authorities, in my view, where there is a greater than theoretical possibility that that development might take place. It could be development for which there is already planning permission, or it could be development that is already in situ. It can also be development which by virtue of the operation of legal entitlements, such as the General Permitted Development Order , could take place.

Once the question of whether or not it is material to the decision has been concluded, applying that threshold of theoretical possibility, the question which then arises for the decision-maker is as to what weight should be attached to it. The weight which might be attached to it will vary materially from case to case and will be particularly fact sensitive. Issues that the decision-maker will wish no doubt to bear in mind are as set out in the authorities I have alluded to above such as the extent of the prospect that that use will occur. Allied to that will be a consideration of the scale of the harm which would arise. Those factors will all then form part of the overall judgment as to whether or not permission should be granted. It may be the case that development that has less harm than that which is being contemplated by the application is material applying the first threshold, and then needs to be taken into account and weight given to it.

However, the question of whether or not there is more or less harm applies at the second stage of the assessment and not at the first stage when deciding whether or not such existing land use entitlements, as may exist in the case, should be regarded as material. In short, there is nothing magical about a fallback argument, it is simply the application of sensible

legal principles to a consideration of what may amount to a material consideration, and then the application of weight to that in context in order to arrive at the appropriate weight to be afforded to it as an ingredient in the planning balance.”

In **Mansell v Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council** [2017] Lord Justice Lindblom and Lord Justice Hickinbottom held that

“The status of a fallback development as a material consideration in a planning decision is not a novel concept. It is very familiar. Three things can be said about it:

- (1) Here, as in other aspects of the law of planning, the court must resist a prescriptive or formulaic approach, and must keep in mind the scope for a lawful exercise of planning judgment by a decision-maker.*
- (2) The relevant law as to a “real prospect” of a fallback development being implemented was applied by this court in Samuel Smith Old Brewery (see, in particular, paragraphs 17 to 30 of Sullivan L.J.’s judgment, with which the Master of the Rolls and Toulson L.J. agreed; and the judgment of Supperstone J. in R. (on the application of Kverndal) v London Borough of Hounslow Council [2015] EWHC 3084 (Admin), at paragraphs 17 and 42 to 53). As Judgment Approved by the court for handing down (subject to editorial corrections) Mansell v Tonbridge and Malling BC Sullivan L.J. said in his judgment in Samuel Smith Old Brewery, in this context a “real” prospect is the antithesis of one that is “merely theoretical” (paragraph 20). The basic principle is that “... for a prospect to be a real prospect, it does not have to be*

probable or likely: a possibility will suffice” (paragraph 21). Previous decisions at first instance, including Ahern and Brentwood Borough Council v Secretary of State for the Environment [1996] 72 P. & C.R. 61 must be read with care in the light of that statement of the law, and bearing in mind, as Sullivan L.J. emphasized, “... “fall back” cases tend to be very factspecific” (ibid.). The role of planning judgment is vital. And “[it] is important ... not to constrain what is, or should be, in each case the exercise of a broad planning discretion, based on the individual circumstances of that case, by seeking to constrain appeal decisions within judicial formulations that are not enactments of general application but are themselves simply the judge’s response to the facts of the case before the court” (paragraph 22).

- (3) *Therefore, when the court is considering whether a decision-maker has properly identified a “real prospect” of a fallback development being carried out should planning permission for the proposed development be refused, there is no rule of law that, in every case, the “real prospect” will depend, for example, on the site having been allocated for the alternative development in the development plan or planning permission having been granted for that development, or on there being a firm design for the alternative scheme, or on the landowner or developer having said precisely how he would make use of any permitted development rights available to him under the GPDO. In some cases that degree of clarity and commitment may be necessary; in others, not. This will always be a matter for the*

decision-maker's planning judgment in the particular circumstances of the case in hand."

- 5.9. The weight to be attributed to the Fallback Position is therefore determined in accordance with the following tests:
- a. whether there is a fallback (i.e. a lawful ability to undertake the development);
 - b. whether there is more than a theoretical possibility of the fallback occurring; and if so,
 - c. a comparison must be made between the proposed development and the fallback;
 - d. a consideration of the weight to be afforded to the fallback.

a. Is there a fallback?

- 5.10. The extant Class Q permission 3/2021/0307 expires on 7 December 2024 and this constitutes a fallback position.

b. Is there more than a theoretical possibility of the fallback occurring?

- 5.11. Implementation of the extant Class Q permission has commenced, therefore it is more than a theoretical possibility of this occurring.

- 5.12. Should this planning application prove unsuccessful, our client has a clear intention to further implement and complete the extant Class Q permission within the requisite timescales. Therefore, there is realistic prospect of the Class Q being fulfilled and that scheme represents a realistic fallback position which should be afforded substantial weight by the LPA in the determination of this planning application.

c. A comparison between the fallback and the proposed development

- 5.13. **Amount of development** – The proposed development will result in one new dwelling – the same amount of development as the Class Q approval for one dwelling.
- 5.14. **Design and Appearance** – Compared to the Class Q fallback scheme, the proposals do incorporate some larger window openings to those on the existing barn. These are however, set back and in a non-standard arrangement. When viewed from the road frontage, the proposed dwelling has limited openings on its front elevation and would appear simplistic in form and certainly no more prominent than the relatively plain appearance of the existing barn. Overall, the number of openings on the building has been reduced.
- 5.15. Regarding the proposed layout, this adopts a similar layout to the existing barn, retaining the catslide addition to the rear elevation which incorporates floor to ceiling glazing so to seamlessly join the main part of the new dwelling with this rear adjunct.
- 5.16. We consider that the overall design and character of the proposed development retains a broadly traditional, unfussy design using stonework to the elevations and natural slate to the roof. This traditional appearance is also achieved by the form of the roof which is consistent with the existing barn and others within the area.
- 5.17. The proposed new dwelling is of high-quality design, will continue to reflect its rural surroundings and would not appear incongruous or out of character within this area. Its visual impact would be no worse than the fallback scheme. We would therefore contend that this proposal is acceptable on design and visual amenity grounds.
- 5.18. **Positioning on the site** – A fundamental difference between the extant Class Q and this proposed scheme is the positioning of the dwelling on the site. Currently, the front elevation of the barn sits directly on the roadside. This proposed scheme positions the new dwelling 3.6m back into the site, away from the road frontage.

- 5.19. The purpose of this repositioning is to increase the safety of the site for future occupants of the property and for the safety of highway users. Grindleton Road is a C classified road subject to a 60mph speed limit. It is single lane width in parts and immediately in front of the barn lies a pinch point. The barn has recently been hit by a tractor and trailer, dislodging a large corner quoin off the front elevation.
- 5.20. This proposed scheme has been presented to the Local Highway Authority (LHA) through its pre-application facility. The response received from the LHA is fully supportive of the proposals and states that –
- “While the LHA are unsure regarding the full details associated with the collision, removing the building from the highway and setting back the proposed dwelling further into the site **is likely to benefit highway safety, especially for the occupants of the proposed dwelling. This is because the barn will not block the accesses visibility splays**”.*
- 5.21. Clearly, the set back of the new dwelling away from the road frontage would undoubtedly improve safety for future occupants of the dwelling and for all highway users. This would result in betterment when compared to the fallback position and should be afforded significant weight in the determination of this application.
- 5.22. **Volume** – Turning now to the volume comparisons, the fallback scheme (i.e. the existing barn) has a volume of 1185m³. This proposed scheme has a lesser volume at 1173m³. Whilst a small reduction in volume, it nevertheless will result in betterment in this respect.
- 5.23. **Curtilage** – The proposed curtilage of the new dwelling is identical to the Class Q scheme aside from the inclusion of a small, cobbled yard area located to the west of the barn. This area is currently separated from the land further west and to the south and probably once acted as a small holding area for livestock between the barn and the surrounding land. It is bound by stonewalls, a gateway and fencing. Its inclusion within the curtilage of the new dwelling is logical and will not result in encroachment given its current appearance.

d. Weight to be afforded to the fallback position

- 5.24. The above demonstrates that significant weight should be afforded to the fallback position – this has already been implemented and is no longer a theoretical prospect.
- 5.25. Through the implementation of the Class Q permission, whether planning permission is granted for this current proposal, a dwelling will be created on the site.
- 5.26. Therefore, we contend that the fallback scenario is realistic and thus, a material consideration which should be afforded significant weight.

6. CONCLUSION

- 6.1. Although the proposed development would introduce a residential use in an area of the borough where housing is not directed towards, so too would the fallback scenario. Fundamentally, the **same amount** of housing will be delivered in the **same location**. Either scenario would create a dwelling in a location the LPA do not encourage.
- 6.2. The implemented Class Q application on the site represents a realistic fallback position and should be afforded significant weight in the determination of this planning application.
- 6.3. The design and layout of the proposed dwelling would not be significantly different to the approved Class Q conversion which ultimately, would have a similar presence and appearance associated with its domestic use.
- 6.4. The proposed development will deliver significant benefits in terms of highway safety compared to the fallback position through the set back of the dwelling away from the road frontage – this is endorsed by the LHA. This should carry significant weight in the consideration of this planning application. This outweighs any conflict with the development plan and justifies the granting of planning permission.
- 6.3. The appearance, scale and layout will all be akin to the fallback scheme and therefore there will be no further impact upon the character of the area.
- 6.4. Accordingly, we would contend that the planning application when compared to the fallback position of the Class Q permission will result in overall betterment and should be supported by the LPA and determined without undue delay.



Steven Abbott Associates LLP
Chartered Town Planners

Appendix 1

Pre-application response RV/2021/ENQ/0006





RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL

Officer:	Rebecca Bowers	Direct Tel:	01200 414502	Council Offices Church Walk Clitheroe Lancashire BB7 2RA
Email:	Rebecca.bowers@ribblevalley.gov.uk			
Our Ref:	RV/2021/ENQ/0006			
Proposal:	Demolition of barn and erection of new dwelling.			
Location	Laneside Barn, Grindleton Road, Grindleton, BB7 4QH			
Date of site visit	27/01/2021			
Date:	23/02/2021			

Pre-Application Enquiry Response

Dear Ms Johnson,

Thank you for engaging in the pre-application service and for your submission of a request for pre-application advice at Laneside Barn, Grindleton. The enquiry seeks the Council's views on the likelihood of permission being granted for the demolition of the agricultural barn and erection of a new dwelling. Following my site visit and the pre-application meeting held on the 8th February, I now submit the following written observations.

Relevant Core Strategy Policies:

Key Statement DS1 – Development Strategy
Key Statement DMI2 – Transport Considerations
Policy DMG1 – General Considerations
Policy DMG2 – Strategic Considerations
Policy DMG3 – Transport and Mobility
Policy DMH3- Dwellings in the Open Countryside and AONB
Policy DMH4- Conversion of Barns and Other Rural Buildings to Dwellings.

Principle of Development:

The application building to which your enquiry relates has consent for conversion to residential use under Class Q ref 3/2019/0760. This relates to the conversion of an existing building, not the erection of a new-built, and work to convert the building has not yet commenced. Therefore, as discussed at our meeting the proposed development would not be considered a replacement dwelling as the property does not currently benefit from a residential C3 use. As such the advice given at this stage is for the likelihood of planning consent being granted for the erection of a new dwelling following the demolition of the barn in its existing state.

New dwelling:

The erection of a new dwelling in this location would not be supported by the Council. This is due to the site being located outside of any settlement boundary and as a result it falls within the Open Countryside. Key Statement DS1 of the Core Strategy seeks to direct the majority of new housing towards the principal settlements such as Clitheroe, Longridge and Whalley.

Further to this, Core Strategy policies DMG2 and DMH3 have the combined effect of restricting new residential development in Open Countryside areas unless the development is essential for the purposes of agriculture (or other essential worker), is the appropriate conversion of an existing building or is a replacement dwelling (subject to criteria contained in the Policy). As such it is considered that given the location of this site within the Open Countryside the provision of a single unrestricted open market dwelling would be contrary to the development strategy for the Borough, Key Statement DS1, and policies DMG2 and DMH3.

In assessing any housing proposal regard must be given to whether the Council has a five-year housing supply. On the basis that the Council has a proven five-year supply of housing land (as demonstrated by the Five Year Supply Statement March 2020) it is considered that the housing policies contained within the Core Strategy are relevant to decision making and therefore the aforementioned policies carry significant weight in the determination of such proposals.

The potential conversion of this barn to residential use under the Class Q approval would not be considered a fall-back position as the approval makes use of an existing agricultural building and not the erection of a new dwelling.

Conversion:

As discussed at the pre-app meeting the fall-back position of this site is for the conversion of the building through a prior approval application which has certain limitations such as size of curtilage, floor space and any proposed structural changes. New structures such as a detached garage falls outside of the scope of a Class Q application.

Furthermore, an assessment of the location of proposed dwelling is not undertaken through the prior approval process. Despite prior approval being granted, the conversion of the building under a full planning application would not meet local planning policies. This is due to the building not falling within a defined settlement and it does not form part of group of buildings contrary to Policy DMH4 of the Core Strategy.

Nevertheless, the fact that prior approval to convert the building has been granted would be a material planning consideration in the determination of a formal planning application for an alternative conversion scheme. The Council would have to consider firstly whether there is a realistic possibility of the fall-back position being implemented and then secondly whether the proposed scheme of conversion would provide any improvements/enhancements compared with the fall-back.

Design:

It noted that the design of the proposed new dwelling to mimic an agricultural barn however this would result in a false sense of history. The proposed site plan shows a significant extension of curtilage beyond that approved under class q and this is considered to be harmful to the character of

the barn and wider area. As well as this the erection of a detached garage would have a detrimental impact on the character of the building and visual amenity of the area.

Conclusion:

On the basis of the submitted information it is considered that the location is unsuitable for open market residential development. This is due to the erection of a new dwelling in the Open Countryside directly conflicting with Policies DS1, DMG2 and DMH3 of the adopted Core Strategy and as such it would be unlikely to receive a positive recommendation.

Other Matters:

If you intend to submit a planning application it is important that you submit all relevant information. The Council's validation checklist is provided in the following link, however I'm sure you appreciate that requests for further technical information may be made by third party consultees during the application which cannot necessarily be anticipated at this stage.

https://www.ribblevalley.gov.uk/downloads/file/12209/draft_validation_checklist_march_2019

Lancashire County Council provides a separate, chargeable pre-application service for highway related matters and drainage matters. You should contact the County Council directly to discuss any such issues - <https://www.lancashire.gov.uk/business/business-services/pre-planning-application-advice-service/pre-planning-application-highways-advice-service>

The above observations have been provided on the basis of the level of information submitted and the comments contained within this response represent officer opinion only, at the time of writing, without prejudice to the final determination of any application submitted. Should you wish to discuss any of these matters further please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours Sincerely
Rebecca Bowers
Assistant Planning Officer
Ribble Valley Borough Council



Steven Abbott Associates LLP
Chartered Town Planners

Appendix 2

LCC Pre-application Response



Judith Johnson
Judith@millbrookhomes.co.uk

Phone: 01772 531035
Email: Ryan.Derbyshire@lancashire.gov.uk

Ref No: Pre-app
Officer: Ryan Derbyshire
Date: 24th March 2023

PRE-APPLICATION ADVICE

Location

Laneside Barn, Grindleton Road, Grindleton, BB7 4QJ

Description of proposals

This pre-application advice request has been prepared by Judith Johnson for Millbrook Homes, seeking advice on a proposed planning application to demolish the existing agricultural building and replace with a single dwelling. The access to the site will be altered and any redundant accesses being permanently closed and stopped up.

Highway Advice

Introduction

The Local Highway Authority (LHA) are in receipt of a pre-application for the proposed demolition of an existing agricultural building and replacement with a single dwelling at Laneside Barn, Grindleton Road, Grindleton.

The LHA are aware of the most recent planning history at the site with it being listed below:

3/2021/0307- Conversion of stone barn to one two-storey dwelling; re-siting of existing gateway, closing existing western gateway; installation of new sewage treatment plant; removal of adjacent steel framed shed. Class Q (a) and (b). Permitted 23/03/2022.

3/2019/0760- Change of use of existing agricultural building to a dwelling under class Q (a) and (b). Permitted 17/10/2019.

3/2019/0389- Change of use of existing agricultural building to a dwelling under class Q (a) and (b). Refused 17/07/2019.

Site Access

The LHA are aware that the proposed dwelling will be located off Grindleton Road, which is a C classified road subject to a 60mph speed limit.

Lancashire County Council

Phil Durnell
Director of Highways and Transport
PO Box 100, County Hall, Preston, PR1 0LD



The LHA have reviewed MCK drawing number SP-01 Rev A titled "Proposed Site Plan" and are aware that the proposed access will be 5m wide. This complies with the LHAs guidance when serving a single dwelling.

The LHA are aware that the access will be gated, and the gate will be setback 4.6m from the adopted highway. For the access to fully comply with the LHAs guidance, the gate is required to be setback a minimum distance of 5m from the adopted highway. This is to ensure that there is adequate space for vehicles to wait when the gate is being operated without obstructing the adopted highway.

The LHA have further reviewed MCK drawing number SP-01 Rev A and are aware that the proposed access can provide visibility splays of 2m x 60m in both directions. These visibility splays do not comply with the LHAs guidance, with the LHA requiring visibility splays of 2m x 214m in both directions given the speed of Grindleton Road.

Despite this, the LHA will accept the shortfall in visibility. This is because the visibility splays were seen as acceptable by the LHA during application references 3/2021/0307, 3/2019/0760 and 3/2019/0389 due to the proposal taking potentially slow moving, large agricultural traffic off the highway network should the barn be reinstated to its original agricultural use. Therefore, it would be seen as unreasonable to request that a traffic survey is undertaken to determine the true 85th percentile speeds, should the minimum visibility for a 60mph road not be achievable.

Highway Safety

There have been no reported personal injury collisions within the vicinity of the site in the last five years. However, in the Planning Statement, it was stated that a collision occurred between a tractor towing a trailer conflicting with the existing barn, which fronts and acts as a retaining structure to Grindleton Road.

While the LHA are unsure regarding the full details associated with the collision, removing the building from the highway and setting back the proposed dwelling further into the site is likely to benefit highway safety, especially for the occupants of the proposed dwelling. This is because the barn will not block the accesses visibility splays.

Off-site Highway Works

Should the application be permitted by the Local Planning Authority, during the demolition of the barn, some form of Traffic Management will be required along Grindleton Road, protecting road users from the demolition. The types of traffic management which could be used during the demolition of the building could range from temporary traffic lights being erected which will only allow one-way movements to occur along Grindleton Road when passing the development to a full road closure, should this be possible and needed due to the narrowness of the adopted highway.

The LHAs Streetworks team will assess which option is the best, but should you require further information please contact the team at lhsstreetworks@lancashire.gov.uk.



Once the building is demolished, the LHA will require a kerb line to be erected where the proposed grass verge will be located at the back of the carriageway. This is to ensure that surface water from the highway does not enter the site due to the gradient of the adopted highway. A gully is also likely to be needed so that the water from the highway can drain naturally. These works will all be at the cost of the Applicant and the works will need to occur immediately once the building is demolished due to the building acting as a retaining structure to the highway.

Internal Layout

The LHA have reviewed MCK drawing number SP-01 Rev A and are aware that 3 car parking spaces will be provided for the proposed 4 bed dwelling which complies with the LHAs parking guidance as defined in the Joint Lancashire Structure Plan.

The LHA will likely condition that a minimum of one car parking space provides an electric vehicle charging point and that some form of cycle storage provision is provided at the site.

Informative

The Council's advice is current on the date it is given. Whilst every attempt will be made to identify reasonably foreseeable future influences the Council cannot guarantee that its advice will take these into account. This may extend to matters such as changes in planning policy or planning precedent. The advice in any event will expire 12 months after the date on which it is given.

Yours faithfully

Ryan Derbyshire
Assistant Engineer
Highway Development Control
Highways and Transport
Lancashire County Council

