



RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL

Officer:	██████	Direct Tel:	██████████	Council Offices Church Walk Clitheroe Lancashire BB7 2RA
Email:	██			
Our Ref:	RV/2024/ENQ/00042			
Proposal:	Change of use from redundant barn to single dwelling.			
Location:	Lower Hud Lee Farm, Longridge Road, Hurst Green, BB7 9QP.			
Date of site visit	12/7/24			
Date:	9/8/24			

Pre-Application Enquiry Response

Dear Mr. Lloyd-Haydock,

I write further to your submission of a request for pre-application advice in relation to Lower Hud Lee Farm, Hurst Green. The enquiry seeks the Council's views in relation to the change of use of a redundant barn to a single dwelling.

Relevant Core Strategy Policies:

- Key Statement DS1: Development Strategy
- Key Statement DS2: Sustainable development
- Key Statement EN2: Landscape
- Key Statement DMI2: 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 DMH3: Dwellings In The Open Countryside And AONB
- Policy DMH4: The Conversion Of Barns And Other Buildings To Dwellings

- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Principle of Development

The proposal site lies outside of the defined settlement area of Hurst Green in an area of open countryside within the Forest Of Bowland National Landscape.

Policy DMH3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy states:

'Within areas defined as open countryside or AONB on the proposals map, residential development will be limited to the appropriate conversion of buildings to dwellings providing they are suitably located and their form and general design are in keeping with their surroundings. Buildings must be structurally sound and capable of conversion without the need for complete or substantial reconstruction.'

Whether or not a building is deemed an 'appropriate' conversion is dependent upon satisfying the relevant development plan policies including Policy DMH4 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy which states:

Planning permission will be granted for the conversion of buildings to dwellings where:

- 1. The building is not isolated in the landscape, i.e. it is within a defined settlement or forms part of an existing group of buildings, and*
- 2. There need be no unnecessary expenditure by public authorities and utilities on the provision of infrastructure, and*
- 3. There would be no materially damaging effect on the landscape qualities of the area or harm to nature conservations interests, and*
- 4. There would be no detrimental effect on the rural economy, and*
- 5. The proposals are consistent with the conservation of the natural beauty of the area*
- 6. That any existing nature conservation aspects of the existing structure are properly surveyed and where judged to be significant preserved or, if this is not possible, then any loss adequately mitigated.*

The building to be converted must:

- Be structurally sound and capable of conversion for the proposed use without the need for extensive building or major alternation, which would adversely affect the character or appearance of the building;*
- Be of a sufficient size to provide necessary living accommodation without the need for further extensions which would harm the character or appearance of the building –*
- The character of the building and its materials are appropriate to its surroundings and the building and its materials are worthy of retention because of its intrinsic interest or potential or its contribution to its setting, and*
- The building has a genuine history of use for agriculture or another rural enterprise.*

Having regard to criteria point 1 of Policy DMH4, the barn building in question lies within close proximity to both Adamson House and Lower Hud Lee Farm and as such is considered to be well related to existing built form. The proposal would therefore satisfy the requirements of criteria point 1 of Policy DMH4 and the locational requirements of Policy DMH3.

In respect to criteria point 2, access to the barn would be shared with the existing shared access which serves Lower Hud Lee Farm and Adamson House. The barn is currently accessed through a field access / grassed area therefore there would be a requirement to install an additional access track to the barn (approximately 30 metres in length) however construction of this would be at the applicant's own cost. It is further understood that foul water would be dealt with via a package treatment plant, the installation of which would also be at the expense of the applicant. Accordingly, it is not anticipated that the proposal would result in the provision of any unnecessary expenditure by public authorities and utilities on the provision of infrastructure.

Having regard to criteria point 3, the building subject to the proposed conversion comprises random rubble stone elevations and a slated gable roof with the building occupying a rectangular footprint. Notwithstanding this, Google Street imagery from June 2022 shows the presence of an entirely different building (consisting of stone and brick with a partially intact mono pitched roof) in the same area occupied by the existing building. As such, the aforementioned historic imagery appears to indicate that the original building on site has been subject to substantial reconstruction (and possibly complete demolition). Unlike the previous building on site which appeared to be largely rustic in appearance, the existing building subject to this enquiry comprises a somewhat domestic appearance (more akin to a detached bungalow property) by virtue of its modern slated gable roof, sequence of openings (Southern elevation) and timber fascia boards. As such, the existing building on site is not considered to be wholly in keeping with the rural vernacular of the former agricultural building or vernacular of agricultural buildings within the locality. Furthermore, the insertion of glazing into the building's

Southern openings (which do not reflect the randomised sequence of openings typically seen on agricultural buildings), in conjunction with the length of the proposed access track (approx 30 - 40 metres in length), parking area and domestic curtilage and associated paraphernalia would collectively have an urbanising impact on the site, with this impact being discernible in the public realm from Public Right Of Way FP0303003. Furthermore, given that the original building on site appears to have been significantly altered (or possibly completely demolished) it is not possible to fully assess the impact of the works undertaken upon nature conservation interests (bats / barn owls / nesting birds). In light of the above, the proposal would therefore fail to satisfy the requirements of criteria point 3 of Policy DMH4.

In respect to criteria point 4, it is assumed that the original building on site was previously utilised for agriculture and the Council has no evidence to suggest otherwise however the aforementioned Google Street imagery from June 2022 (and earlier aerial imagery) suggests that the agricultural use of the former building may have ceased some time ago. As such, detrimental impacts upon the rural economy from the loss of the original building are not considered to be an issue in this instance.

Having regard to criteria point 5, and as previously conveyed, it is considered that the proposed development as a whole would have an urbanising impact on the site and as such would fail to satisfy criteria point 5 of Policy DMH4 and the requirements of Policy DMH3 with respect to design / visual impact.

In respect to criteria point 6, and as previously conveyed, given that the original building on site appears to have been significantly altered (or possibly completely demolished) it is not possible to fully assess the impact of the works undertaken upon nature conservation interests. Having regard to the additional requirements of criteria point 6, and as previously conveyed, there is no evidence to suggest that the original building did not have a genuine history of use for agriculture or other rural enterprise. Notwithstanding this, the existing building subject to this enquiry comprises a somewhat domestic appearance (in comparison to the original building that was previously on site) which fails to make any discernible contribution to its immediate surroundings. It would therefore be difficult to argue a case for the retention of the existing building on the basis of its contribution to its setting. It remains unclear as to whether the original building on site would have been structurally capable of supporting any scheme of residential conversion however the fact that the original building on site appears to have been subject to substantial reconstruction (or possibly complete demolition) does raise doubts with respect to its structural integrity. In light of all of the above, the proposal would fail to satisfy criteria point 6 of Policy DMH4 and the requirements of Policy DMH3 with respect to structural requirements and extents of building work.

Policy DMG3 of the Core Strategy requires decision taking to consider the availability and adequacy of public transport and associated infrastructure to serve those moving to and from new developments. This is consistent with the NPPF which requires development proposals to promote sustainable transport. Due to the rural location of the site future occupants of the proposed development would likely be reliant on the use of private motor vehicles and this weighs against the proposal. Such issues can potentially be balanced against the sustainable benefits of re-using existing buildings as residential accommodation when the works in question amount to the conversion of a building however given that the original building on site appears to have been subject to substantial reconstruction (or possibly complete demolition), the sustainable benefits of re-using an existing building cannot be applied in this case.

Taking account of all of the above, the proposed development would fail to satisfy the requirements of Policies DMH3, DMH4 and DMG3 of the Core Strategy and is therefore considered to be unacceptable acceptable in principle. Moreover the above assessment makes reference to substantial alteration and possibly re-building works considered to have taken place. If the existing building on site that you are looking to convert is not lawful, then you would not be entitled to benefit from the policy allowance for a conversion and you would need to seek permission for a new dwelling.

Highways and Parking

Although the Local Highways Authority do not engage in pre-application enquiries made to the Local Planning Authority because they offer their own service, they would be consulted on a planning application. Due to the nature of the access track it is likely that passing places would be required.

Drainage

A sustainable urban drainage system will be required, in line with the SuDS hierarchy outlined in National Guidance. If this detail is not included in an application submission then this would need to be agreed as a pre-commencement condition in the event of a favourable decision.

Biodiversity Net Gain

This is a new legislative requirement for most development from 2nd April 2024. For further information, including on exemptions, please see:-

[Biodiversity net gain: exempt developments - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](#)

[Meet biodiversity net gain requirements: steps for developers - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](#)

[Biodiversity net gain: what local planning authorities should do - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](#)

Other Matters:

Due to recent changes in planning legislation the Council must now seek the formal agreement of the applicant (or their agent) to impose pre-commencement conditions, should it be minded to grant planning permission. Therefore, you may wish to consider providing a greater level of information at the outset for the Council to assess, in order to avoid the need for such conditions.

A validation checklist is provided below, 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. The below link is to the Council's recently adopted Validation checklist.

[adopted-validation-checklist-august-2023 \(ribblevalley.gov.uk\)](#)

Conclusion:

Historic imagery suggests that the original agricultural building on site has been subject to substantial reconstruction (and possibly complete demolition) and the impacts upon protected species from these works remains unclear. The existing building on site subject to this enquiry comprises a somewhat domestic appearance which fails to make any discernible contribution to its immediate surroundings and the scheme of residential conversion proposed for the building and application site would collectively have an urbanising impact on the rural character of the site and its immediate surroundings. Due to the rural location of the site future occupants of the proposed development would likely be reliant on the use of private motor vehicles and in this instance the sustainable benefits of re-using an existing building cannot be given due consideration in light of the unauthorised works falling within the realm of a new build development.

Taking account of all of the above, the proposed development would fail to satisfy the requirements of Policies DMH3, DMH4 and DMG3 of the Core Strategy. Moreover if the existing building on site that you are looking to convert is not lawful, then you would not be entitled to benefit from the policy allowance for a conversion and you would need to seek permission for a new dwelling. Either as a conversion or a new dwelling the proposal is considered to be unacceptable acceptable in principle and as such would not be supported by the Council if submitted as a formal planning application.

Should you wish to apply to regularise the building then you would need to make a case as to why it is needed and designed for the purposes of agriculture, or meets any of the other exception criterion listed in policy DMG2 of the Core Strategy.

Submission Requirements:

Should you proceed to submission of a formal application, based on the nature of the proposal / site constraints identified above, it is my opinion that the Local Planning Authority would require the following information to accompany such an application:

- Completed application form
- Red edged Location Plan (at a scale of 1:250 or 1:2500, showing North arrow)
- Existing site plan showing any site boundaries, existing vehicle parking, surface treatments and landscaping (at a scale of 1:100 or 1:200, including existing land levels)
- Proposed Site Plan showing site boundaries, vehicle parking, surface treatments and landscaping (at a scale of 1:100 or 1:200, including proposed land levels)
- Existing floor plans (at a scale of 1:50 or 1:100, dimensioned)
- Existing elevation drawings (at a scale of 1:50 or 1:100, dimensioned)
- Proposed floor plans (at a scale of 1:50 or 1:100, dimensioned)
- Proposed elevation drawings (at a scale of 1:50 or 1:100, dimensioned, showing details of proposed external materials)
- Proposed site section drawings (at a scale of 1:50 or 1:100, dimensioned)
- Planning (supporting) statement
- Bat survey
- Structural survey (to be undertaken by a qualified structural surveyor, structural engineer and/or timber-frame specialist if appropriate)
- Biodiversity Net Gain requirements – please see the following links:

[Biodiversity net gain - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk/guidance/biodiversity-net-gain)
- The appropriate application fee (applicant to confirm with RVBC admin)

There are three possible options for the submission of the above documents:

- Online through the Planning Portal (recommended)
- By post or in person to the following address:

Economic Development and Planning Department

Ribble Valley Borough Council
Church Walk
Clitheroe
BB7 2RA

- By email to planning@ribblevalley.gov.uk

Please note this aforementioned required information may not be exhaustive and is provided on the basis of the level of information submitted. Failure to provide required information is likely to result in an application being made invalid until such information is received or potentially refused on the basis of insufficient information.

Please also be advised that Lancashire County Council provide 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>

<https://www.lancashire.gov.uk/business/business-services/pre-planning-application-advice-service/pre-planning-application-flood-risk-and-land-drainage-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,

██████████

████████████████████