

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 04 July 2025 15:37  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0133 FS-Case-728633379

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

**Planning Application Reference No.:** 3/2025/0133

**Address of Development:** Loft Shay , Knowle Green , Longridge

**Comments:** My Objections are as follows and in [REDACTED] .  
: Consultation response to Planning Application 3/2025/0133: Change of use of land to form extension to residential curtilage. Proposed detached garage to include solar panels and living accommodation above. Insertion of second floor side facing window to main dwelling.  
Applicant address: Loft Shay Farm, Knowle Green, Nr. Longridge, Preston PR3 2YQ  
Objection: Submitted for and on behalf of: [REDACTED] ,  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

1. Precedent of refusal for further building on this site and consistency in terms of planning decisions: There are multiple material planning reasons for refusing this application. These include the Application's lack of compliance with national planning policy guidance and Ribble Valley Borough Council's Core Strategy planning policies, as well as the precedent set by previous refusal, and dismissal of an Appeal by a Planning Inspector. It is first of all worth noting that the previous application for an extension on this site was refused by Ribble Valley Borough Council and an Appeal by the Applicant was dismissed by a Government Planning Inspector, as detailed below:  
Appeal Decision by Paul Singleton BSc MA MRTPI; an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State: Appeal  
Ref: APP/T2350/D/22/3290570; Loft Shay Farm, Clitheroe Road, Ribchester, PR3 2YQ; Decision date: 01/04/2022.  
In refusing the Appeal, the Inspector stated:  
"My conclusions on these matters are supported by the fact that planning permission was applied for and granted in 2016, and again in 2021, for a residential conversion which did not include new extensions or outbuildings nor propose significant external alterations to the barn.

”

The Planning Inspector went on to state that: “The harm to the surrounding landscape also gives rise to a conflict with Key Statement EN2 which seeks to protect the landscape and character of the AONB and requires that any development should contribute to the conservation of the natural beauty of the area.

”

It is important to re-iterate the Inspectors conclusions, which equally apply to the application currently under consideration, and to note that the current proposal is materially worse in terms of the proposed building’s prominence, height, separation from the dwelling and visibility from the road and surrounding area.

## 2. Reasons for refusal:

Paragraph 174 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) highlights the need to protect and enhance valued landscapes through the planning system, including any local landscape designations such as Nationa

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 04 July 2025 15:36  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0133 FS-Case-728610998

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

**Planning Application Reference No.:** 3/2025/0133

**Address of Development:** Loft Shay Farm, Knowle Green, Nr. Longridge Preston PR32YQ

**Comments:** Objection: Submitted for and on behalf of [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

Consultation response to Planning Application 3/2025/0133: Change of use of land to form extension to residential curtilage. Proposed detached garage to include solar panels and living accommodation above. Insertion of second floor side facing window to main dwelling.  
Applicant address: Loft Shay Farm, Knowle Green, Nr. Longridge, Preston PR3 2YQ

This application is for a substantial 2 storey detached building, serviced by mains water and electricity, with accommodation on the first floor reached by an external stairway, which is proposed to be built in a Natural Landscape area (AONB) as an extension to the existing barn conversion.

A previous application for such an extension was refused , and an appeal dismissed by the Government planning inspector . The grounds for refusal of that application also apply to this application.

The barn conversion was granted permission on the basis that it would not require extensions or further living accommodation .

The reasons for the refusal of further permission are related both to the National Planning Policy Framework and to RVBC's own Core Strategy Statement EN2 as well as CS policies DMG1, DMG2 and DMH3.

These all make reference to the AONB status of the area, affording special protection to the landscape, which gives councils a duty to ensure that any development ' conserves and enhances the natural beauty of the area'.

This development, if permitted to go ahead, would directly contravene these same policies and contradict the precedent clearly set out by the inspector .

It should be noted that the applicant has recently created a large area of hardstanding where there was previously grassland, and has placed two large shipping containers on the site, all without the required permissions. The confidence that this shows in the success of the application, however, is not well founded, as there are clear and unequivocal reasons why this application should be

dismissed .

The development cannot be considered an ancillary building. A single storey garage, situated close to the existing barn conversion, for the purpose of parking a vehicle, unobtrusive in design and scale, would constitute an ancillary building.

The proposed building is 5m high, approx 7m by 9m and situated at the outer limits of large car park, with external stairs and living accommodation above, constituting a new stand alone development, as an extension to the existing barn conversion, not an ancillary building. As such it breaches the conditions by which the barn conversion was given planning permission

The external staircase at the back of the building constitute a privacy issue : they overlook the adjacent private residential property, giving a clear view of the garden and inside the kitchen and upstairs bedroom of CS DMG1

The proposed development , a large car park with a detached 2 storey accommodation at its outer edge , increases the footprint of the settlement and changes the nature and character of the existing settlement .

Visually it will be seen from a great distance, situated as it is on the lower slopes of Longridge Fell, and surrounded by open grassland cut across by public footpaths, contravening CS policies, (AONB)National Landscape guidelines and the NPPF framework  
(There has, however, as yet been no Visual and Landscape Impact Assessment )

A previous application has been refused on very clear grounds . The Inspector's conclusions apply equally to the application currently under consideration, and in fact the current proposal is materially worse in terms of the proposed building's prominence, height, separation from the dwelling and visibility from the road and surrounding area.

The inspector wrote

“My conclusions on these matters are supported by the fact that planning permission was applied for and granted in 2016, and again in 2021, for a residential conversion which did not include new extensions or outbuildings nor propose significant external alterations to the barn.”  
and that “The harm to the surrounding landscape also gives rise to a conflict with Key Statement EN2 which seeks to protect the landscape and character of the AONB and requires that any development should contribute to the conservation of the natural beauty of the area.”

A change in the name AONB to National Landscape should not bring with it a watering down of the protections it provides to the landscape.

I do not see how RVBC can possibly progress this application, given the number of policies the application breaches :the council's own Core Strategy policies; the NPPF; and the area's National Landscape status. I do not see how the RVBC can ignore the precedent set by the dismissal of a previous appeal for additional building on the site.

(Appeal Decision by Paul Singleton BSc MA MRTPI; an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State: Appeal Ref: APP/T2350/D/22/3290570; Loft Shay Farm, Clitheroe Road, Ribchester, PR3 2YQ; Decision date: 01/04/2022.)

In short I do not expect the RVBC to approve this application, as to do so would directly contradict their stated aims enshrined in the Core Strategy, and would set a new precedent which could potentially open the door to the further erosion of safeguards for the landscape in this area.



[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 04 July 2025 12:04  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0133 FS-Case-728549118

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

**Planning Application Reference No.:** 3/2025/0133

**Address of Development:** Loft Shay Farm, Knowle Green, Nr. Longridge Preston PR32YQ

**Comments:** Consultation response to Planning Application 3/2025/0133: Change of use of land to form extension to residential curtilage. Proposed detached garage to include solar panels and living accommodation above. Insertion of second floor side facing window to main dwelling.  
Applicant address: Loft Shay Farm, Knowle Green, Nr. Longridge, Preston PR3 2YQ

Objection: Submitted for and on behalf of: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

1. Precedent of refusal for further building on this site and consistency in terms of planning decisions: There are multiple material planning reasons for refusing this application. These include the Application's lack of compliance with national planning policy guidance and Ribble Valley Borough Council's Core Strategy planning policies, as well as the precedent set by previous refusal, and dismissal of an Appeal by a Planning Inspector.

It is first of all worth noting that the previous application for an extension on this site was refused by Ribble Valley Borough Council and an Appeal by the Applicant was dismissed by a Government Planning Inspector, as detailed below:

Appeal Decision by Paul Singleton BSc MA MRTPI; an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State: Appeal Ref: APP/T2350/D/22/3290570; Loft Shay Farm, Clitheroe Road, Ribchester, PR3 2YQ; Decision date: 01/04/2022.

In refusing the Appeal, the Inspector stated:

"My conclusions on these matters are supported by the fact that planning permission was applied for and granted in 2016, and again in 2021, for a residential conversion which did not include new extensions or outbuildings nor propose significant external alterations to the barn."

The Planning Inspector went on to state that: "The harm to the surrounding landscape also gives rise to a conflict with Key Statement EN2 which seeks to protect the landscape and character of the AONB and requires that any development should contribute to the conservation of the natural beauty of the area."

It is important to re-iterate the Inspectors conclusions, which equally apply to the application currently under consideration, and to note that the current proposal is materially worse in terms of the proposed building's prominence, height, separation from the dwelling and visibility from the road and surrounding area.

## 2. Reasons for refusal:

Paragraph 174 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) highlights the need to protect and enhance valued landscapes through the planning system, including any local landscape designations such as National Landscapes.

NPPF paragraph 187 states that: “Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... “protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, sites of biodiversity or geological value and soils.”

Paragraph 189, states that: “Great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and National Landscapes which have the highest status of protection in relation to these issues.”

Ribble Valley Borough Council’s Core Strategy begins by stating that one of the key issues and challenges to be addressed within the Local Development Framework concerns “retaining the high quality environment and protection of the AONB ...”

To protect the Forest of Bowland National Landscape (AONB ), in which this proposed development would take place, Core Strategy Policy DMG1 states that all development must “protect and enhance heritage assets and their settings.” This policy also states that development must be “sympathetic to existing land uses in terms of size, intensity and nature, as well as scale, massing, style, features and building materials” (emphasis added).

Policy DMG2 further states that “the most important consideration in the assessment of any development proposal will be the protection, conservation and enhancement of the landscape and character of the area...”

Policy DMH3 makes it clear that there should be no new building within the AONB, with limited exceptions for agriculture and forestry, and the conversion of existing buildings only. It adds that: “the protection of the open countryside and designated landscape areas from sporadic or visually harmful development is seen as a high priority by the Council and is necessary to deliver both sustainable patterns of development and the overarching Core Strategy vision.”

Policy DMH4 requires that barn conversions must be capable of conversion without the need for extensive building or major alterations which would adversely affect the character and appearance of the building, and be of sufficient size to provide the necessary living accommodation without the need for further extensions that would harm its character and appearance.

The proposals fail to meet these policies in the following way:

Firstly, the application is for a substantial additional building, and not the conversion of an existing building on this site.

Secondly, this is a substantial building - some 9m in length, almost 7m wide and 5m high, with two storeys and living accommodation on top, with stairs at the rear for access to the first floor, set back from the main dwelling towards the rear of the land owned by the applicant.

Thirdly, it is stated in the Design and Access statement that there is a requirement for accommodation which is addressed by the first floor of the building. As made clear by the Planning Inspector in relation to the refusal and dismissed Appeal referenced above, this is completely unacceptable, for the reasons cited in his report.

Fourth, the proposed building would do nothing to add to and would considerably detract from the historic character of the original farmstead and surrounding landscape, which sits within the Forest of Bowland National Landscape (AONB), whose distinctive character and natural beauty has been safeguarded in the national interest, and has a legal purpose “to conserve and enhance the beauty of the area.”

Fifth, the application conflicts with CS Key Statement EN2 and CS Policies DMG1, DMG2 and DMH3 in relation to protecting the character, landscape value, protection, conservation and natural beauty of the AONB by adding a 5m tall building, with a completely inappropriate bolt-on stairway, in a

location that can be seen for miles around. It also conflicts with Policy DMG1 in terms of its scale and massing.

It is also clear that a detached two storey building (9m x c.7m wide and 5m high), with living accommodation and access to the first floor via external stairs at the rear, cannot be considered an ancillary building (if this were to be claimed made it somehow exempt from the policies cited above). Permission was given for the barn conversion in accordance with this policy on the basis that no further extensions or living accommodation (as included in this application) would be needed. The living space above the garage could also be used as an independent dwelling, which conflicts with the previous permission given for the barn conversion and contravenes the CS policies cited above in terms of the restrictions on dwellings within an AONB.

In addition to the above, the fact that the proposed building would be situated apart and set back from the main dwelling, towards the outer corner of the site, exacerbates its adverse visual impact, blocking natural landscape views that were previously and currently available for all.

In addition to the above, the external staircase at the rear of the property and entrance to the upper storey rear door also overlooks the neighbouring property's back garden, and potentially the kitchen and upstairs bedroom, resulting in an unacceptable loss of privacy. The National Planning Policy Framework and RVBC Core Strategy guard against this, CS Policy DMG1 stating that all development must "not adversely affect the amenities of the surrounding area," and "provide adequate day lighting and privacy distances."

It is also worth taking account of the Applicants disregard for the planning system in not obtaining permission for a disproportionately large area of hard standing and placement of two large shipping containers on the boundary of the site, something which is being taken up with Planning Enforcement.

If this application were not to be refused outright, as it should be, in line with RVBC's CS planning policies, and a smaller single storey garage building were to be considered permissible, it would seem reasonable to expect such a building to be:

- a.) a single ground floor design;
- b.) for the purpose of parking a vehicle under cover, and not for other purposes requiring an upper storey;
- c.) of an appropriately scale in terms of mass and height and relative to the main dwelling;
- d.) suitably tucked alongside the dwelling;
- e.) as unobtrusive and well disguised as possible (as oppose to 5m high with external structures on the perimeter of the site).

There is a very large area of hardstanding to the side of the dwelling in which this could be located without adversely impacting the local landscape and without overlooking the neighbouring property. It would also possibly remove the need for a Visual and Landscape Impact Assessment, which also seems to have been completely overlooked as far as this Application is concerned. There is clearly no justification for an upper storey on this building or any need to site it where significant harm would be caused to landscape views and neighbouring privacy.

### 3. Summary:

The application fails to comply with the NPPF's guidance on National Landscapes and Ribble Valley Borough Council's Core Strategy planning policies, as well as being inconsistent with the precedent set by previous refusal for additional building on this site, and the dismissal of an Appeal against such by a Planning Inspector.

Specifically, it conflicts with National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraphs 174, 187 and 189 in terms of adversely affecting a protected National Landscape. It also conflicts with CS Key Statement EN2 and CS Policies DMG1, DMG2 and DMH3 in relation to protecting the character,

landscape value, protection, conservation and natural beauty of the AONB by adding a 5m tall building, with inappropriate bolt-on stairway, in a location that can be seen for miles around. It is also inconsistent with National Planning Policy Framework and RVBC Core Strategy CS Policy DMG1 in adversely affecting the amenities of the surrounding area and providing adequate day lighting and privacy distances.

This proposed building was not part of the application for the barn conversion for which planning permission was originally granted and represents a significant expansion of development on the site, in conflict with all the policies that have been designed to protect the AONB from this sort of harm.

This application should and must be refused.

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 04 July 2025 14:30  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0133 FS-Case-728586576

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

**Planning Application Reference No.:** 3/2025/0133

**Address of Development:** Loft Shay Farm, Knowle Green, Nr. Longridge Preston PR32YQ

**Comments:** Objection: Submitted for and on behalf of: [REDACTED]

Consultation response to Planning Application 3/2025/0133: Change of use of land to form extension to residential curtilage. Proposed detached garage to include solar panels and living accommodation above. Insertion of second floor side facing window to main dwelling.

Applicant address: Loft Shay Farm, Knowle Green, Nr. Longridge, Preston PR3 2YQ

The applicant is proposing a substantial detached 2 storey building ( dimensions 5m high, approx 7m x 9m ) with living accommodation on top , serviced by mains water and electricity, reached by an external stairway .

A previous application for an extension on this site was refused by Ribble Valley Borough Council and an Appeal by the Applicant was dismissed by a Government Planning Inspector with clear and extensive reference to AONB and NPPF and the Core Strategy

The inspector cited Policy DMH4 , which requires that barn conversions must be capable of conversion without the need for extensive building or major alterations which would adversely affect the character and appearance of the building, and be of sufficient size to provide the necessary living accommodation without the need for further extensions that would harm its character and appearance. Permission for the existing extensive barn conversion was granted on this basis ie that no further extensions or living accommodation be needed. This application proposes an extension which would be in breach of that condition.

The applicant has already placed two large shipping containers on the site , and created a large area of hard standing where there was previously grassland , as a car park for a number of vehicles. It should be noted that this has happened without the permission of the council.

The confidence that this demonstrates, that this application will be approved, is not well founded, however, as upon inspection the application is clearly totally inappropriate, being in breach of a number of regulations and in direct contradiction to a previous refusal for similar.

The application should be refused for the following reasons :-

-The large area being transformed into hard standing and 2 storey building with living accommodation above materially changes the character and nature of the settlement, in breach of RVBC's own Core Strategy policies DMG1, DMG2 and DMH3, as well as Key statement EN2, all of which were given as reasons for previous refusal

-It will be visible from a great distance , situated as it is on the lower slopes of Longridge Fell and near to a number of public footpaths, going against the safeguards of the National Landscape ( AONB), put in place 'to conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the area'

-The proposed building cannot be considered ancillary. An ancillary building such as a garage would not need to be a 2 storey building , with living accommodation above.

It would not need to be of these proportions

It could be built next to the barn, and not at the outer limits of the space. This proposed building does not fit the description 'ancillary' but rather the description 'a new extension or outbuilding' , which were precluded in the permission granted for the barn conversion of 2021

-There seems to have been Visual Impact assessment .

It would be appropriate if the applicant were to apply for a single storey, unobtrusive garage, tucked into the farm settlement without extending it further, and in keeping with the character of the farm settlement, adjacent to and in proportion to the existing barn conversion; in this case visual impact in the National Landscape would not be such an issue .

-The need for an external staircase at the rear of the building , overlooking the neighbours property, raises a privacy issue , giving , as it does, a clear view into the kitchen and upstairs bedroom as well as into the garden of the adjacent property.

The reasons for this application to be thrown out are clear, and are stated unequivocally by the inspector, Paul Singleton BSc MA MRTPI appointed by the Secretary of State , in relation to a previous application for a similar extension .

In refusing the Appeal, the Inspector stated:

“My conclusions on these matters are supported by the fact that planning permission was applied for and granted in 2016, and again in 2021, for a residential conversion which did not include new extensions or outbuildings nor propose significant external alterations to the barn.”

The Planning Inspector went on to state that: “The harm to the surrounding landscape also gives rise to a conflict with Key Statement EN2 which seeks to protect the landscape and character of the AONB and requires that any development should contribute to the conservation of the natural beauty of the area.”

(Appeal Ref: APP/T2350/D/22/3290570; Loft Shay Farm, Clitheroe Road, Ribchester, PR3 2YQ; Decision date: 01/04/2022)

These conclusions apply equally to the application currently under consideration.

A change of name from AONB to National Landscape does not merit a watering down of the protections it provides to our landscape. This current proposal is even worse in terms of the proposed building's prominence, height, separation from the dwelling and visibility from the road and surrounding area.

I cannot see how RVBC could possibly allow it to proceed , as to do so would be to directly contradict your own policies and overturn your own precedent .