


Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.

Signed:	Officer:	MC	Date:	16/05/2025	Manager:	LH	Date:	16/5/25
----------------	-----------------	----	--------------	------------	-----------------	----	--------------	---------

Application Ref:	3/2024/1029			 Ribble Valley Borough Council <small>www.ribblevalley.gov.uk</small>
Date Inspected:	14/03/2025	Site Notice:	14/03/2025	
Officer:	MC			
DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:				REFUSAL

Development Description:	Proposed construction of two agricultural workers dwellings with access and parking.
Site Address/Location:	Bolton Fold Farm, Alston Lane, Longridge, PR3 3BN

CONSULTATIONS:	Parish/Town Council
No response received.	

CONSULTATIONS:	Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies
LCC Highways:	The Local Highway Authority (LHA) has made an assessment of the application and recommend a number of amendments to the scheme which includes modifications to the site access, field gate, visibility splays, private access road and Public Right of Way to meet appropriate safety requirements. Concerns regarding intervisibility and proximity of multiple access points have also been raised, with suggestions for mitigation. Additionally, sustainability measures such as secure cycle storage and electric vehicle charging points are recommended to be secured by way of planning condition.
Alan Jackson (BSc FRICS FAAV) for AG & P Jackson, Chartered Surveyors and Land Agents:	The Agricultural Advisor considers that at the present time, there is an established existing functional need in relation to the landholdings at Bolton Fold Farm. They consider that the provision of 2 additional dwellings is essential for the continued viability of the farming business through the farm succession process and the location of the proposed dwellings is reasonable to meet the existing functional need on this farm.
United Utilities:	No objections subject to compliance with standing advice.
Health and Safety Executive:	Do not advise against the development
RVBC Environmental Health Officer:	The Environmental Health Officer does not object to the proposal subject to conditions relating to the construction hours/delivery hours and the control of dust/noise/fumes/vibration.
RVBC Engineers:	Contamination condition suggested that would cover any remedial works.
RVBC Countryside Officer:	Countryside Officer recommends tree specific tree protection required for Penduculate Oak T1 – root protection 9,72m in accordance with BS5837 Trees in Relation to Demolition, Design and Development. Considers there is inconclusive evidence for Newts.

CONSULTATIONS:	Additional Representations.
No additional representations received.	

RELEVANT POLICIES AND SITE PLANNING HISTORY:

Ribble Valley Core Strategy:

Key Statement DS1: Development Strategy
Key Statement DS2: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
Key Statement EC1: Business and Employment Development
Key Statement DMI2: Transport Considerations
Key Statement EN4: Biodiversity and Geodiversity

Policy DMG1: General Considerations
Policy DMG2: Strategic Considerations
Policy DME2: Landscape and Townscape Protection
Policy DMG3: Transport And Mobility
Policy DMH3: Dwellings In The Open Countryside And AONB
Policy DMB1: Supporting Business Growth And The Local Economy
Policy DME3: Site and Species Protection and Conservation
Policy DME5: Renewable Energy
Policy DME6: Water Management

Longridge Neighbourhood Development Plan:

Policy LNPD3: Longridge Design Principles
Policy LNPD6: Landscape

National Planning Policy Framework

Relevant Planning History:

3/2024/0199

Prior notification of a roof over an existing agricultural block waste building.
Permission not required

3/2024/0055

Prior approval of a roof over an existing slurry store.
Permission not required

3/2023/0650

Erection of new agricultural building for cow cubicle.
Approved with Conditions

3/2023/0206

Proposed single storey side extension.
Approved with Conditions

3/2022/0208

Proposed new buildings Unit 1 and Unit 3 to provide storage of animal feed to include hay/straw and machinery.
Permission Required

3/2022/0094

Proposed new buildings Unit 1 and Unit 3 to provide storage of animal feed to include hay/straw and machinery.
Refused

3/2021/0090

Proposed new building to provide storage of animal feed to include hay/straw and also machinery storage.
Permission not required

3/2016/1084

Phase 2 additional cattle housing building. (Resubmission of application 3/2015/0621).
Approved with Conditions

3/2016/0896

Phase 2 extension of roof covering and walls to existing earth banked silo pit.
Approved with Conditions

3/2016/1083

Phase 1 extension to existing cattle housing and reconfiguration of orientation of existing building.
Resubmission of planning application 3/2015/0616.
Approved with Conditions

3/2014/0107

Erection of a new two-storey house with a basement on land to the rear of Bolton Fold Cottage.
Approved with Conditions

3/2013/0707

Outline application for proposed erection of a single dwelling
Approved with Conditions

3/2013/0268

Outline application for the erection of one two-bedroom detached single storey dwelling with new access onto Preston Road with parking space for two cars in land adjacent Bolton Fold Cottage.
Approved with Conditions

3/1991/0760 (within application site, not implemented)

Dwellinghouse and attached garage (reserved matters)
Approved

3/1988/0600 (within application site, not implemented)

Outline permission for agricultural workers dwelling
Approved with Conditions

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:**Site Description and Surrounding Area:**

The application site relates to an existing farmstead located off Preston Road and Alston Lane. The site is located within the Open Countryside, just beyond the settlement boundary of Longridge but is located within the adopted Longridge Neighbourhood Plan Area. The red line boundary relates to an area of grassland which is located to the west of Bolton Fold Farm and to the south-west of Alston Dairy Ltd. The wider area comprises of agricultural land with a cluster of dwellings along Alston Lane and Preston Road.

Proposed Development for which consent is sought:

The proposal includes the erection of 2 no. two-storey agricultural workers dwellings, located off Alston Lane. The dwellings would be located to the west of Bolton Fold Farm, in an existing field and would be set

back from access road by between 10.4 metres and 6.4 metres, with access from a new shared, vehicular driveway.

The dwellings would have a dual pitched roof with a height of approximately 8.4 metres and would each have a single storey, pitched roof garage, attached. There would be approximately 1.7 metres between the two single storey elements but the two storey roof ridges would be approximately 12 metres apart. The external materials of construction would comprise natural slate, timber stone and off-white render. Aluminium windows and doors are also proposed in RAL 7032 which is a light, warm grey colour and solar panels are proposed to the rear, single storey roof pitches.

The existing hedge to the front of the site would be retained and an additional hedge along the rear boundary would be planted, as well as additional shrubs and tree planting within the curtilages. The site would also include an agricultural access track to the adjacent to the western boundary which provides access to the field.

Principle of Development:

The application site is situated within an area of open countryside. Paragraph 84 of the National Planning Policy Framework states:

“Planning policies and decisions should avoid the development of isolated homes in the countryside unless there is an essential need for a rural worker, including those taking majority control of a farm business, to live permanently at or near their place of work in the countryside”.

In addition, Paragraph 84 of the NPPF states that:

“Planning policies and decisions should enable:

a) the sustainable growth and expansion of all types of business in rural areas both through conversion of existing buildings and well-designed new buildings:

b) the development and diversification of agricultural and other land-based rural businesses”.

In addition, Policy DMH3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy which states:

“Within areas defined as open countryside or AONB on the proposals map, residential development will be limited to development essential for the purposes of agriculture or residential development which meets an identified local need. In assessing any proposal for an agricultural, forestry or other essential workers dwellings a functional and financial test will be applied”.

Similarly, Policy DMG2 allows for development outside of the defined settlement areas on the basis of the development in question being necessary for the purposes of agriculture or forestry.

Accordingly, the current proposal shall be assessed in relation to the following issues:

- Evidence of the necessity for the applicant to live at, or in close proximity to, their place of work to ensure the effective operation of the existing agricultural enterprise
- Labour requirements of the existing agricultural enterprise
- The degree to which there is confidence that the agricultural enterprise is currently economically viable and will continue to be so for the foreseeable future
- Availability and suitability of existing dwellings on the agricultural holding

The proposal is for the erection of two dwellings for agricultural workers which could be considered to comply with the relevant criteria of Policies DMG2 and DMH3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy subject to an assessment against the above criteria and as such, an assessment has subsequently been carried out through consultation with the Council's Agricultural Advisor.

The Agricultural Appraisal infers that the applicant is S (Stephen) Forshaw, Father to Stuart and Andrew and that the main farmhouse is in ownership of the applicants mother, Anne Forshaw (Stuart and Andrew's grandmother) and not within ownership of applicant. However, the application form states the applicant is S & A Forshaw and the agent has confirmed this stands for Stuart & Andrew Forshaw. The agent has been asked to confirm this inconsistency but in the absence of any substantive response the application has been assessed on this basis.

The supporting agricultural appraisal states that Anne Forshaw owned the business and premises known as "Anne Forshaw – *Alston Dairy*" which was acquired by The James Hall Group in 2023 and is located to the north/north-east of the proposed agricultural workers dwellings and to the west of Bolton Fold Farm. It states that the Applicant's farming business remains unaffected by this sale and that the applicant has no connection with the "Anne Forshaw *Alston Dairy*" business other than a supplier of milk produced on Bolton Fold Farm."

Stuart and Andrew Forshaw do not live at the farm and the permanent residence on the farm of Stuart and Andrew would ensure they can continue to run the dairy farming business and remain employed by the family farm. The agricultural appraisal indicates that the applicant's father also does not live on the farm and is of reaching retirement age and reducing farming duties. As such, the working on the farm will fall to his sons Stuart and Andrew Forshaw.

The Council's Agricultural Advisor notes that Bolton Fold Farm comprises 32 ha of agricultural land and the farming business also occupies a further 6 blocks of land either owned or tenanted and the total area occupied extends to 195. The holding has up to 500 dairy cows which calve all year round. The bull calves from these cows are sold off the holding at several weeks of age. The heifer calves are reared as replacements for the older cows.

The Agricultural Advisor considers that Bolton Fold Farm is a long-established substantial family dairy farm carrying over 1,000 cows and young stock and at the present time there is a clearly established *existing* functional need in relation to the landholdings based on Bolton Fold Farm, Alston Lane, Longridge. This has been calculated to a labour requirement in excess of 3 full time workers and states that the LPA should have confidence that the overall business will remain financially viable for the foreseeable future.

The Agricultural Advisor considers that it is essential that 2 full time workers actively involved in the management of the farming unit at Bolton Fold Farm should be resident on this farm to meet the existing functional need and there is only 1 existing dwelling on these land holdings and whereas it may be suitable to house a full time worker, it is not available. They consider that the provision of 2 no. additional dwellings is essential for the continued viability of the farming business through the farm succession process and the location of the proposed dwellings is reasonable to meet the existing functional need on this farm.

They note that planning permission has been recently granted for a number of agricultural buildings and considers the farm to be financially viable.

Whilst it would normally be appropriate to add a condition to secure the original farmhouse as an agricultural workers dwelling to stop it being sold off, the agricultural advisor does not consider this to be appropriate as the house is not within the ownership of the applicant and given its proximity to the farm, as well as the further enclosure of the farmhouse within the farmstead if the two agricultural dwellings are granted, the risk of the dwelling being separated for the farm is considered low.

Taking into account the above, it is considered that the erection of 2 no. agricultural workers dwellings at Bolton Fold Farm would be reasonably necessary for the purpose of agricultural with a clear functional need

to allow the farm to successfully continue, in accordance with Policies DMG2 and DMH3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.

Impact Upon Residential Amenity:

The proposed dwellings would be sited approximately 25 metres from the properties opposite the site at Rose Villa and Bolton Fold Cottages. As such, whilst there may be some impact to the occupiers' amenity, due to the distance between the two properties, there would not likely be any detrimental loss of light, overlooking, overshadowing or overbearing impact.

To the east of the site is the farm cottage which is not within the applicant's ownership (Bolton Fold Farm). As shown on the submitted proposed site plan, drawing number: PSP 001 REV A, the dwelling identified as 'Dwelling 2', would be sited approximately 3.7 metres from the boundary. There may be some impact to amenity, due to the orientation of the dwellings, it is not considered there would be any adverse loss of light or overshadowing. A condition should be added to any grant of permission to ensure the first-floor side facing windows are obscure glazed to prevent any detrimental overlooking to the occupiers of Bolton Fold Farm and 251 Preston Road.

The Environmental Health Officer has provided comments on the scheme and consider that subject to the dwellings being secured as agricultural dwellings, they would not object on noise grounds and recommend a condition restricting the hours of construction/delivery hours as well as the control of construction noise/vibration/dust/smoke (the latter of which would not meet the tests).

Subject to a condition restricting the occupancy of agricultural workers, future occupiers are not likely to be harmed by way of excessive noise and subject to a condition restricting delivery hours/construction hours, the proposal would not result in any adverse impact to the amenity of nearby residential properties in accordance with Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and Policy LNPD3 of the adopted Longridge Neighbourhood Development Plan.

Visual Amenity/External Appearance:

Paragraph 135 (c) of the NPPF states:

'Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting'.

Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy provides additional general design guidance as follows:

'All development must be sympathetic to existing and proposed land uses in terms of its size, intensity and nature as well as scale, massing and style...particular emphasis will be placed on visual appearance and the relationship to surroundings, including impact on landscape character.'

Policy LNPD3 of the adopted Longridge Neighbourhood Plan also states that:

'All new development proposals will only be supported when they are of good design that responds positively to the local character and distinctiveness of the surroundings'. This Policy states that proposals should:

"a) Conserve and enhance the locally distinctive built, historic and natural environment;

b) Are designed to take account of site characteristics and surroundings, including:

i. Layout – the predominantly green appearance of the area to be maintained with appropriate green space and planting of trees and shrubs;

ii. Siting;

iii. Scale;

iv. Height;

- v. Proportions and massing;
- vi. Fuel efficiency;
- vii. Architectural detailing;
- viii. Landscaping;
- ix. Materials;”.

Policy DMG2 states that:

“Within the open countryside development will be required to be in keeping with the character of the landscape and acknowledge the special qualities of the area by virtue of its size, design, use of materials, landscaping and siting. where possible new development should be accommodated through the re-use of existing buildings, which in most cases is more appropriate than new build”.

There is no objection to the introduction of solar panels to the single storey roof slopes as whilst they would likely be visible from Alston Lane, they would not be highly prominent, given they are on a single storey roof, rather than the main roof.

Notwithstanding this, proposed development would be located in a prominent position with the site running parallel to the boundary with Alston Lane. As such, the dwellings would be highly visible from the public realm, in an area currently void of built form. The dwellings are considered to be large in size and scale with a height of approximately 8.4 metres with a gable ended roof. The dwellings are considered to be substantial in floor area as well, with a floor area of over 270sqm and a depth of over 10 metres. The depth of the dwellings is considered to be excessive and would result in a large, gable ended wall facing Alston Lane. The dwellings have been positioned so that the single storey garage element is sited away from the site boundaries, however this would result in there being a gap of approximately 3.4 metres from the western boundary to the two-storey flank wall. The size and scale of the dwelling in this location, being so close to the site boundary is not considered to be acceptable and would result in harmful bulk and massing, located in a prominent position within the street scene which would fail to respond positively to the local character, where the dwellings at the entrance to Alston Lane are single storey at the closest point to the roadside which helps to reduce their prominence. In addition, the eastern dwelling would be located in close proximity to an existing building within the farmstead. Whilst this is single storey and as such would help to mitigate any visual harm by additional bulk, it does raise concern that the footprint of the building is too large in relation to the plot size/shape.

In addition, the dwellings include the addition of 6 no. rooflights each which would give the appearance that they are 2.5 storeys in height which is not fully justified, given they are for agricultural workers. It is also considered that the driveway to the front of the site would result in a large expanse of hardstanding, with little way of soft landscaping features between the two properties. Had the application been recommended for refusal, an alternative soft landscaping scheme could be secured.

Having regard to the above, it is considered that the proposed development would fail to accord with the local character of the surrounding area, resulting in harm to the character and appearance of the street scene by way of the size, siting and design of the proposed dwellings which would be unduly prominent within the street scene, contrary to Policy DMG1 and DMG2 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and Policy LNDP3 of the adopted Longridge Neighbourhood Development Plan.

Highways and Parking:

Ribble Valley Core Strategy Policy DMG3 states that:

‘All development proposals will be required to provide adequate car parking and servicing space in line with currently approved standards’.

In addition, Policy DMG1 states that all development must:

- '1. consider the potential traffic and car parking implications.*
- 2. ensure safe access can be provided which is suitable to accommodate the scale and type of traffic likely to be generated'.*

Paragraph 116 of the NPPF also states that:

"Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network, following mitigation, would be severe, taking into account all reasonable future scenarios".

The Local Highway Authority have been consulted on the application and note that the site will be accessed via a new shared driveway access from an existing private access road which meets the adopted highway at Alston Lane. The private access track also makes up FP0302069.

They consider that the direct driveway access to the proposed agricultural dwellings is a proposed shared access measuring a minimum of 5.5m wide which is acceptable to the LHA and will allow for two-way vehicle movements. The existing hedgerow which is to be retained on either side of the shared driveway access should be retained at no more than 0.9m to provide visibility along the private access road but they would request that the access with Alston Lane be widened to a minimum of 5.5m, extending for 10m back which will allow for two-way movement to take place within the access following the intensification of the use of the private access road.

They also consider the access road should be appropriately paved for a minimum of 5m behind the carriageway edge to prevent loose surface material from being carried on to the public highway and to ensure adequate intervisibility between highway users at the amended access, a visibility splay set 2.4 metres back from the near edge of the carriageway and extending 214 metres along the nearside carriageway edge should be provided. The visibility splay should be wholly within the land which the applicant controls and/or the adopted highway and nothing shall be erected, retained, planted and / or allowed to grow at or above a height of 0.9 metres above the nearside carriageway level which would obstruct the visibility splay of the proposed access. The LHA consider that the applicant should provide accurate details of the required sight line requirement, before determining the application.

The LHA also raise concern regarding the proposed access to the farm track which runs along the side of the boundary to the rear field, given its proximity to the junction of the private access road with Alston Lane as well as the junction of Alston Lane with Preston Road there is a concern that the accesses will conflict with each other and in turn cause highway safety concerns. The LHA are of the opinion that this field access should be closed to reduce the number of accesses within close proximity and that the existing access on the opposite side of the field be used for field access which is located at a farm access further along Alston Road.

Additionally, the width of the agricultural field access is currently shown as 3m on the Proposed Site Plan, drawing PSP 001 REV A. However, to be in accordance with the LHAs guidance, an agricultural access should be 4m wide for a minimum distance of 6m behind the highway boundary. A further 1m should be added to the width when it is bound on both sides. There is also a proposed gate which again does not comply with the LHAs guidance which requires the gate to be setback a minimum distance of 6m to allow agricultural vehicles to not obstruct the highway whilst the gate is being operated. Therefore, currently, the farm track access is substandard.

Turning to parking/internal layout, the LHA have reviewed the Proposed Site Plan, drawing PSP 001 REV A and are aware that the dwelling complies with the LHAs parking standards as defined in the Joint Lancashire Structure Plan and consider the garages would comply with the minimum size requirements. They consider that cycle storage and EV chargers should be secured by way of planning condition to promote sustainable travel.

The LHA note that Public Rights of Way's FP0302069 through the wider farm. Following changes to the private access road, diversion of the Public Right of way may be required to enable the safe passage of pedestrians alongside vehicle movements and the applicant should be advised to contact Lancashire County Council's Public Rights of Way section by email to discuss their proposal before any development works begin.

As such, the proposed development in its current raises highway safety concerns and would be contrary to Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and Paragraph 116 of the NPPF.

Landscape/Ecology:

The application has been supported by a Tree Survey which indicates the location of trees/hedges within and adjacent to the site. This identifies a 6 Category 'C' trees, outside of the application site boundary, however it is not considered that the footprint of the building would be built within the Root Protection Area (RPA). In addition, the buildings would not be within the RPA of tree 'T1' which is a mature Oak tree but the Countryside Officer recommends a tree protection condition be added to any grant of permission. The proposal would involve the removal of a small section of hedgerow to facilitate the new access, however additional hedgerow planting is provided within the site. This could be secured by way of condition as part of an appropriate landscaping scheme.

Policy DME3 states that development proposals that are likely to adversely affect the wildlife species protected by law will not be granted planning permission. exceptions will only be made where it can clearly be demonstrated that the benefits of a development at a site outweigh both the local and the wider impacts.

The application is supported by a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal dated January 2024. This indicates that the site is a suitable habitat for nesting birds and hedgerows on site are classed as habitats of principle importance. In addition, a pond with a Good Habitat Suitability Index Score is located within 250m of site. As such, a number of mitigation measures are suggested. This includes, Precautionary Working Methods during the construction phase for badgers, Reasonable Avoidance Measures for common amphibians and hedgehogs. Removal of vegetation is to be completed outside of the breeding bird season (March to September, inclusive) and if this is not feasible, a Nesting Bird Check is to be completed by a qualified ecologist within 48 hours before removal is completed.

An eDNA survey for Great Crested Newts has also been submitted which notes that Pond P1 was confirmed to be absent of great crested newt DNA at the time of survey, and as such, GCN are highly unlikely to be present with the site. The report recommends that Reasonable Avoidance Measures are to be followed during site clearance for common amphibians. All site contractors are to be inducted to the potential presence of the species and debris is to be cleared by hand, and any common amphibians located moved carefully, by hand, to outside of the development area.

Notwithstanding the above, the Countryside Officer has provided comments on the scheme and considers that there is inconclusive evidence of Great Crested Newts. It is not considered that this the eDNA survey alone is sufficient to confirm the absence of Great Crested Newts within the site. As such there is uncertainty over whether a Natural England (protected species) license is required and the proposal fails to adequately protect and enhance protected species and habitat contrary to Key Statement EN4 and policy DME3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy 2008 -2028 as well as the National Planning Policy Framework.

The development is proposed as being exempt from having to achieve the mandatory Biodiversity Net Gain requirement as it relates to self-build development, however in order to benefit from this exemption the applicant would be required to enter into a Unilateral Undertaking. Had the application been recommended for approval, this would be required to be signed prior to the determination of the application.

Other matters:

Policy DME6 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy states that:

Development will not be permitted where the proposal would be at an unacceptable risk of flooding or exacerbate flooding elsewhere.

Applications for development should include appropriate measures for the conservation, protection and management of water such that development contributes to:

- 1. Preventing pollution of surface and / or groundwater*
- 2. Reducing water consumption*
- 3. Reducing the risk of surface water flooding (for example the use of sustainable Drainage systems (SuDS))*

As a part of the consideration of water management issues, and in parallel with flood management objectives, the authority will also seek the protection of the borough's water courses for their biodiversity value.

All applications for planning permission should include details for surface water drainage and means of disposal based on sustainable drainage principles. The use of the public sewerage system is the least sustainable form of surface water drainage and therefore development proposals will be expected to investigate and identify more sustainable alternatives to help reduce the risk of surface water flooding and environmental impact.

A drainage report has been submitted as part of the application which states that a stone culvert lies to the south of the main farm buildings and runs across the fields to the southeast to also discharge into the watercourse. This report also confirms that surface water from the main farm buildings runs off into the stone culvert and surface water runoff from the developed site will be controlled to the limiting discharge rate of 2.0 l/s, prior to a controlled discharge made into the stone culvert. Attenuation will be provided utilising underground storage and foul water from the proposed residential dwellings will be treated by a sewage treatment plant and the effluent discharged into the stone culvert.

The drainage strategy should be secured by way of planning condition.

A Phase I Geoenvironmental Site Assessment has been submitted as part of the application. This states that although site-wide contamination is not anticipated, a detailed Phase II intrusive investigation is required to confirm the findings of the initial conceptual site model and determine the characteristics of the underlying geology to support the structural design of the proposed structures. This could also be secured by way of planning condition.

The proposed development is within the Consultation Distance of a major hazard pipeline, however the Health & Safety Executive do not advise against the granting of planning permission.

It should be noted that the submitted agricultural appraisal identifies a plan showing a number of buildings which are not within the ownership of the applicant. This contradicts drawing ref: LP 001 Rev A which shows that these buildings are within the blue edge and therefore within the ownership of the applicant but outside of the application site.

Observations/Consideration of Matters Raised/Conclusion:

As such, for the above reasons and having regard to all material considerations and matters raised that the application is recommended for refusal.

RECOMMENDATION:	That planning consent be refused for the following reasons:
------------------------	---

01:	The proposed development would fail to accord with the local character of the surrounding area, resulting in harm to the character and appearance of the street scene by way of the size, siting and design of the proposed dwellings which would be unduly prominent within the street scene, contrary to Policy DMG1 and DMG2 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and Policy LNDP3 of the adopted Longridge Neighbourhood Development Plan.
02:	The proposed development would by reason of the substandard agricultural access track, number of accesses and lack of visibility splays provided would result in result in harm to highway safety, contrary to Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and Paragraph 116 of the NPPF.
03:	The proposal fails to demonstrate that appropriate assessments have been carried out to fully assess the impacts upon Great Crested Newts. Therefore, the proposal fails to adequately protect and enhance protected species and habitat contrary to Key Statement EN4 and policy DME3 of the Ribble Valley Core and the National Planning Policy Framework.