


Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.

Signed:	Officer:	SK	Date:	10.07.25	Manager:	LH	Date:	14/7/25
----------------	-----------------	----	--------------	----------	-----------------	----	--------------	---------

Application Ref:	2025/0414			 Ribble Valley Borough Council www.ribblevalley.gov.uk
Date Inspected:	25.6.25	Site Notice:	25.6.25	
Officer:	Stephen Kilmartin			
DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:				PERMISSION IN PRINCIPLE REFUSAL

Development Description:	Permission in Principle for one dwelling within garden area.
Site Address/Location:	1 Bramley View Clitheroe Road, Whalley, BB7 9AL

CONSULTATIONS:	Parish/Town Council
No representations received in respect of the proposal.	

CONSULTATIONS:	Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies
LCC Highways:	
The Local Highways Authority have raised no objection to the proposal	
United Utilities:	
United Utilities have noted the application stating that should consent be granted, matters in respect of drainage will be considered at the 'technical matters' stage.	
CONSULTATIONS:	Additional Representations.
6 letters of representation from individual addresses have been received objecting to the proposal on the following grounds:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Concerns in respect of the standard of the existing road• Impact upon character of the area• Overdevelopment• Inadequate parking provision• Impacts upon ecology and wildlife• Impacts upon privacy• Loss of views• Land is not 'garden area' as stated• Loss of light	

RELEVANT POLICIES AND SITE PLANNING HISTORY:

Ribble Valley Core Strategy:

Key Statement DS1: Development Strategy
Key Statement DS2: Sustainable Development
Key Statement DMI2: Transport Considerations

Policy DMG1: General Considerations
Policy DMG2: Strategic Considerations
Policy DMG3: Transport & Mobility
Policy DMH3: Dwellings in the Open Countryside and AONB

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Relevant Planning History:

2022/0898:

Discharge of condition 6 (scheme for storage of manure) from planning permission 3/2022/0287. (Refused)

2022/0287:

Partial demolition of existing stable buildings and erection of a new stable building. (Approved)

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:

Site Description and Surrounding Area:

The application relates to an area of land located outside of and to the west of the defined settlement limits of Barrow, with the land to which the application relates benefitting from an open countryside designation. The site is bounded to the north and west by existing greenfield agricultural land with the site being bounded to the east by existing residential development that front Clitheroe Road. The site is predominantly greenfield in nature with some existing structures being located to the south and southwest of the application site.

Proposed Development for which consent is sought:

The application seeks 'Permission in Principle' (PiP) consent for the erection of one residential dwelling within the application site. Given the application seeks consent solely for matters pertaining to the principle of the development, no details in respect of the proposed layout, configuration nor external appearance of the dwelling are required to be submitted for consideration at this stage.

Principle of Development:

The application seeks permission in principle for the erection of one residential dwelling at land to rear of 1 Bramley View, Clitheroe (Barrow). The application site lies to the west of and outside of the defined settlement limits of Barrow, being within land that benefits from an open countryside designation. As such, both policies DMH3 and DMG2 are primarily, but not solely, engaged for the purposes of assessing the compatibility of the principle of the development with the adopted development plan.

Policies DMH3 and DMG2 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy seeks to restrict residential development within the open countryside and AONB to that which meets a number of explicit criterion, with Key Statement DS1 setting out the overall spatial and locational aspirations for general (including residential) development within the Borough.

Policy DMG2:

Policy DMG2 is two-fold in its approach to guiding development. The primary part of the policy DMG2(1) is engaged where development proposals are located 'in' principal and tier 1 settlements with the second part of the policy DMG2(2) being engaged in circumstances when proposed development is located 'outside' defined settlement areas or within tier 2 villages, with each part of the policy therefore being engaged in isolation and independent of the other dependant on the locational aspects of a proposal.

The mechanics and engagement of the policy are clear in this respect insofar that it contains explicit triggers as to when the former or latter criterion are applied and the triggers are purely locational and clearly based on a proposals relationship to defined settlement boundaries and whether, in this case, such a proposal is 'in' or 'outside' a defined settlement.

Given the majority of the application site is located outside of any defined settlement boundary, it is the secondary element of Policy DMG2 that is engaged (Policy DMG2(2)) which states that:

Within the tier 2 villages and outside the defined settlement areas development must meet at least one of the following considerations:

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

It is clear from the submitted details that the proposal could not be argued as being 'essential to the local economy or social wellbeing of the area' nor could it be considered that the proposal 'is needed for the purposes of forestry or agriculture'.

In respect of the matter of 'local need', no evidence has been provided to suggest that the proposal would align with the definition of 'local needs housing' as defined within the Adopted Core Strategy which states that 'Local needs housing is the housing developed to meet the needs of existing and concealed households living within the parish and surrounding parishes which is evidenced by the Housing Needs Survey for the parish, the Housing Waiting List and the Strategic Housing Market Assessment'.

In light of the above matters, it cannot be considered that the proposal meets any of the exception criterion contained within Policy DMG2 in relation to the creation of new dwellings outside of defined settlement limits.

Policy DMH3:

Given the majority of the application site is located outside of any defined settlement limits, Policy DMH3 is also engaged in parallel and in concert with Policy DMG2. In this respect Policy DMH3 states that:

Within areas defined as open countryside or AONB on the proposals map, residential development will be limited to:

- 1. 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.*
- 2. 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.*
- 3. The rebuilding or replacement of existing dwellings [subject to a number of criteria].*

As with the inherent criterion within Policy DMG2, the proposal would fail also to meet criterion 1 of Policy DMH3 insofar in that it would not represent 'development essential for the purposes of agriculture or residential development which meets an identified local need', with the proposal also failing to meet exception criterion 2 or 3.

In light of the above it cannot be argued that the proposal meets any of the exception criterion contained within either Policies DMG2 nor DMH3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy in relation to the creation of new dwellings outside of defined settlement limits.

Having regard to the site's location, the development of one dwelling in this location would result in a discordant pattern of development and encroachment into the countryside.

As such the proposal is considered to be in direct conflict with Policies DMG2 and DMH3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy insofar that approval would lead to the creation of a new residential dwelling, located outside of a defined settlement boundary within the defined open countryside, without sufficient justification, in that it has not been adequately demonstrated that the proposal is for that of local needs housing that meets a current identified and evidenced outstanding need or that the proposed dwelling would meet any of the exception criterion inherently contained within either policy.

Impact Upon Residential Amenity:

The remit of assessment of the application is limited to solely that of the principle of the development and as to whether the proposed development would align with the spatial and locational aspirations for residential development within the borough.

As such, matters relating to the potential for adverse impact(s) upon nearby residential amenities resultant from the development, cannot be fully determined nor assessed at this stage and will be reserved for consideration/assessment at any subsequent pursuant 'Technical Matters' submission(s).

Visual Amenity/External Appearance:

The remit of assessment of the application is limited to solely that of the principle of the development and as to whether the proposed development would align with the spatial and locational aspirations for residential development within the borough.

As such, matters relating to the potential for adverse impact(s) upon the character or visual amenities of the area resultant from the development, cannot be fully determined nor assessed at this stage and will be reserved for consideration/assessment at any subsequent pursuant 'Technical Matters' submission(s).

Highways and Parking:

The Local Highways Authority have raised no objection to the proposal stating the following:

Proposal:

The application seeks to build a new dwelling on land to the rear of Bramley View accessed via an unnamed privately maintained access on Clitheroe Road. The Highway Authority would request that the red edge is extended to include the unnamed privately maintained access up to where it joins Clitheroe Road.

Access:

The proposed dwelling would be accessed from the unnamed privately maintained road which currently serves the rear of 1 – 3 Exton Terrace and 1 – 10 Bramley View. The access road is unmade and will likely deteriorate during the construction phase of the dwelling. Measures to mitigate this would be requested at stage 2, should the application be approved, to include pre-commencement and post completion surveys with any damage repaired within and agreed timetable following completion. The refuse collection arrangements should be provided at stage 2 to ensure that the maximum distances for residents and operatives to move waste is not exceeded.

The on-street parking around the site is not restricted and both the access road and Clitheroe Road have 7.5 – 8.5m wide carriageways which allows on-street parking without causing an obstruction to traffic flow.

Sustainability:

Bus services M2 (Burnley – Clitheroe), 280 (Preston – Skipton) and 22 (Clitheroe – Shadsworth) (services 280 and 22 are subsidised by LCC) runs along Clitheroe Road with bus stops within approximately 150m from the centre of the site. The Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Policy (LCWIP) for Ribble Valley, Clitheroe Road is identified as a strategic route between Whalley and Barrow. The nearest primary school and food convenience shop are located 1km to the north of Barrow. This exceeds the recommended walking distance. The local and employment facilities are located in Clitheroe which is approximately 5km to the north which can be accessed by bus and cycle. The dwelling will require a secure, covered cycle store and an electric vehicle charging point to support sustainable travel.

Parking:

The dwelling will require off-street car parking with 1 space for 1 bedrooms, 2 spaces for 2-3 bedrooms and 3 spaces for 4+ bedrooms and a secure, covered cycle store. Garages should be 3m by 6m internally to count as a parking space and cycle parking.

Conclusion:

Lancashire County Council acting as the Highway Authority does not raise an objection regarding the proposed development and are of the opinion that the proposed development will not have a significant impact on highway safety, capacity or amenity in the immediate vicinity of the site.

Landscape/Ecology:

No implication evident at this stage given the remit of the application relates solely to that of matters of principle. As such, should consent be granted, there will be the requirement for appropriate surveys to be undertaken (bats/nesting birds) and submitted in support of any subsequent 'Technical Matters' submission(s), to ascertain as to whether the proposal is likely to result in adverse impacts upon protected species or species of conservation concern.

Other Material Matters:

The applicant, within their submitted information, states that the application seeks Permission in Principle, for the erection of a 'self-build dwelling' with the applicant stating that given the application is 'self-build' in nature – comparisons should be made in respect of recently granted appeal (APP/T2350/W23/3335737) and Land Adjacent 110 Ribchester Road Clayton Le Dale (3/2023/0321).

Importantly, the applicant has not submitted a signed unilateral undertaking to secure the dwelling as such. Were an appropriate legal mechanism be submitted, with a shortfall of self-build housing within the Borough, whilst the proposal only relates to the provision of one dwelling, some weight could be given to the fact that this would be a self-build dwelling on the edge of a Tier 1 settlement that would be sustainably located. However, unlike the Inspector's findings in the appeal decision which the applicant refers to, a development in this location would unacceptably harm the character of the area by virtue of it being a discordant pattern of development and encroachment into the countryside.

Therefore, the matter of whether the dwelling will be 'self-build' in nature for the purposes of the Self-build and Custom housebuilding Act 2015 is not afforded weight in favour of the proposal which outweighs the harm identified.

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 for permission in Principle is recommended for refusal.

RECOMMENDATION:	
------------------------	--

That permission in principle consent be refused for the following reason:

- | | |
|------------|---|
| 01: | The proposal is considered to be in direct conflict with Policies DMG2 and DMH3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy insofar that approval would lead to the creation of a new residential dwelling, located outside of defined settlement limits, within the defined open countryside without sufficient justification. Particularly insofar that it has not been adequately demonstrated that the proposal is for that of local needs housing that meets a current identified and evidenced outstanding need or that the proposed dwelling would meet any of the exception criterion inherently contained within either policy. The development would result in a discordant pattern of development and encroachment into the countryside, and the harm identified would not be outweighed by the benefits to development in this case. |
|------------|---|