


Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.

Signed:	Officer:	MC	Date:	24/10/2025	Manager:	LH	Date:	24/10/25
----------------	-----------------	-----------	--------------	-------------------	-----------------	-----------	--------------	-----------------

Application Ref:	3/2025/0507			 <p>Ribble Valley Borough Council www.ribblevalley.gov.uk</p>
Date Inspected:	22/07/2025	Site Notice:	22/07/2025	
Officer:	MC			
DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:				APPROVAL

Development Description:	Application for Planning Permission for conversion of barn to create new dwelling. Demolition of existing farm block.
Site Address/Location:	Lower Reaps Farm, Whinney Lane, Mellor BB2 7EL

CONSULTATIONS:	Parish/Town Council
No objection	

CONSULTATIONS:	Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies
LCC Highways:	No objection subject to conditions relating to a Construction Traffic Management Plan, implementation of the passing places, implementation and retention of parking areas, and cycle storage.
Council for British Archaeology:	<p>The CBA support the conversion of the barn into a single dwelling with a reduced level of internal subdivision than the currently consented scheme. They raise concerns regarding the three sets of bifold doors proposed in the southern and advise openings are kept to a minimum.</p> <p>The CBA note the proposal to line the internal walls of the barn, although no details of a methodology or materials are given. The CBA object to strategies like tanking and internal dry lining of buildings of this construction type as all moisture present is forced into the historic stone walls which sacrificially decay without the ability to 'breathe'. Such interventions are contrary to the requirements of sections 16 and 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and the NPPF.</p>
LCC Archaeology:	Recommends the inclusion of an archaeology condition be added to any grant of permission.
Growth Lancashire:	Whilst there is some residual harm arising from the scheme, this has been reduced to very low to negligible, and this should be weighed against the significant benefits of repair and reuse.
Historic England:	Does not wish to provide comments
RVBC Countryside Officer:	Bat survey reports of no physical evidence to suggest use by bats at the time of the survey and no evidence to suggest the use of the building by nesting birds or use by nesting Barn Owls.
RVBC Environmental Health Officer:	No objection subject to conditions relating to control of noise/dust/fumes/vibration and restriction of construction hours/delivery hour, construction deliveries and agricultural worker ties.
LCC Footpath Officer:	Concerns raised that the proposed parking would obstruct the Public Right of Way.

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 – Sustainable Development
Key Statement EN1 – Green Belt
Key Statement EN5 – Heritage Assets
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 DME4 – Protecting Heritage Assets
Policy DMH4 – The Conversion of Barns and Other Buildings to Dwellings

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Relevant Planning History:**3/2025/0508**

Listed Building Consent for conversion of an existing barn to create a dwelling. Internal and external alterations to include creation of first floor, insertion of rooflights, doors and windows.
Pending

3/2025/0271

Approval of details reserved by conditions 3 (materials), 4 (window and door specifications), 5 (details of roof lights), 6 (sections), 7 (building recording and analysis), 8 (external meter boxes) of listed building consent 3/2022/1166.

Split decision – conditions discharged in part

3/2025/0270

Approval of details reserved by conditions 3 (materials), 4 (window and door specifications), 5 (details of roof lights), 7 (building recording and analysis), 11 (electric vehicle charging point), 13 (landscaping) and 17 (drainage) of planning permission 3/2022/1165.

Split decision – conditions discharged in part

3/2025/0088

Variation of condition 2 (approved plans) of planning permission 3/2022/1165 for proposed refurbishment of existing farm house, conversion of existing attached and detached barns to create three new dwellings, conversion of outbuildings for associated residential use and external works.

Approved with Conditions

3/2025/0089

Variation of condition 2 (approved plans) of listed building consent 3/2022/1166 for proposed refurbishment of existing farmhouse, conversion of existing attached and detached barns to create three new dwellings, conversion of outbuildings for associated residential use and external works.

Approved with Conditions

3/2022/1166

LBC for the proposed refurbishment of existing farm house, conversion of existing attached and detached barns to create three new dwellings, conversion of outbuildings for associated residential use and external works. Resubmission of 3/2022/0729.

Approved with Conditions

3/2022/1165

Application for Planning Permission for proposed refurbishment of existing farm house, conversion of existing attached and detached barns to create three new dwellings, conversion of outbuildings for associated residential use and external works. Resubmission of 3/2022/0727.

Approved with Conditions

3/2022/0729

Listed Building Consent for the proposed refurbishment of existing farm house, conversion of existing attached and detached barns to create three new dwellings, conversion of outbuildings for associated residential use and external works.

Withdrawn

3/2022/0727

Proposed refurbishment of existing farm house, conversion of existing attached and detached barns to create three new dwellings, conversion of outbuildings for associated residential use and external works.

Withdrawn

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:

Site Description and Surrounding Area:

Lower Reaps Farmhouse is a Grade II listed building dating to the 17th century with the barn opposite considered to be a curtilage listed structure with nearby outbuildings sited within land.

The site is located within the Green Belt, in an isolated location outside the settlement boundary of Mellor. Public footpaths FP41, FP43, FP44 and FP48 all pass through the site and as such, the site is considered to be located in a prominent position from the public realm.

Part of the site is also at high risk of surface water flooding.

Proposed Development for which consent is sought:

Planning permission has been granted already for the conversion of the farmhouse and barns to three residential dwellings and subsequently varied by way of a Section 73 application.

This application relates to the barn to the south of the listed building only and seeks planning permission for its conversion to 1 no. 4 no. bedroom dwelling. There is an existing single storey outbuilding located to the west of the barn which is proposed to be retained for a garden/bin store.

The proposal originally included the erection of a detached garage to the east of the application. However, following concerns raised by the Planning Officer, a number of amendments to the scheme have been made.

These include:

- Remove detached garage from the scheme
- Reduce the width of openings to the south elevation
- Removed the parking areas associated with the listed farmhouse from the site plan as these do not relate to this application
- Removal of larger parking area to the west of the barn following comments received from LCC Footpath Officer.
- Alterations to rooflights

The site also has a detached outbuilding which would be used for domestic storage. No works are proposed to this building.

Principle of Development:

The development is located within the Green Belt. Key Statement EN1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy states that:

“The overall extent of the green belt will be maintained to safeguard the surrounding countryside from inappropriate encroachment. The development of new buildings will be limited to the purposes of agriculture, forestry, essential outdoor sport and recreation, cemeteries and for other uses of land which preserve the openness of the green belt and which do not conflict with the purposes of the designation.”

Paragraph 153 of the NPPF states that:

“When considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt, including harm to its openness. Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. ‘Very special circumstances’ will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.”

Paragraph 154 of the NPPF states that development should be regarded as inappropriate other than in exceptions circumstances, a number of which are listed. Criterion (h) allows for:

“Other forms of development provided they preserve its openness and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it. These are:

- i. mineral extraction;*
- ii. engineering operations;*
- iii. local transport infrastructure which can demonstrate a requirement for a Green Belt location;*
- iv. the re-use of buildings provided that the buildings are of permanent and substantial construction;*
- v. material changes in the use of land (such as changes of use for outdoor sport or recreation, or for cemeteries and burial grounds); and*
- vi. development, including buildings, brought forward under a Community Right to Build Order or Neighbourhood Development Order.”*

The submitted structural report confirms these buildings are of substantially construction with no major rebuilding required to facilitate the conversion (other than the upper part of a gable wall and the front corners of both flank walls).

The proposed garage has now been removed from the scheme. In addition, the dilapidated barn to the rear of the barn for conversion is proposed to be removed. The parking area has also been amended so that it is now the same extent as the extant scheme following comments received from LCC Footpath Officer. As such,

it is not considered that the proposed scheme would result in any harm to the openness of the Green Belt and would result in a similar level of additional hardstanding as the extant permission.

Subject to the above, the proposal is considered to represent an appropriate form of development in the Green Belt.

Policy DMH4 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy allows for the conversion of rural buildings where:

“• The building is not isolated in the landscape i.e. it is within a defined settlement or forms part of an already group of buildings; and

• There is no unnecessary expenditure by public authorities and utilities on the provision of infrastructure; and

• There would be no materially damaging effect on the landscape qualities of the area or harm to nature conservations interests; and

• There would be no detrimental effect on rural economy; and

• The proposals are consistent with the conservation of the natural beauty of the area;

• 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 alteration which would adversely affect the character or appearance of the building. The council will require a structural survey to be submitted and plans of any rebuilding proposed;

• Be of sufficient size to provide necessary living accommodation without the need for further extensions which would harm the character and appearance of the building; and

• 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. The conversion should be of a high standard and should not harm the appearance or function of the area. Access should be safe and capable of improvement without harming the appearance of the area.”

As per the previous assessment, the building is not considered to be isolated as it already forms a group of buildings and given the presence of the existence farmhouse on site there is not expected to be any unnecessary expenditure by public authorities. The buildings would be largely unsuitable for modern farming practices and so there would be no detrimental effect on the local economy. No extensive rebuilding or major alteration would be required, or any extensions to facilitate the conversion other than the part re-build of the left gable wall and the re-build of the corners of the front walls. The character of the buildings and its materials are worthy of retention, and the buildings have a genuine history of agricultural use.

As such, the proposal is considered to accord with Policy DMH4 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.

With regards to sustainability, Key Statement DMI2 and Policy DMG3 require new development to reduce the need to travel by car. This is supported by the NPPF. The location of the development at the end of a private road means that the new dwellings will be largely car dependent, and so this weighs against the proposal, however this is balanced with the sustainable benefits of re-using existing buildings.

On balance, taking into consideration the extant permission for a similar scheme and the above assessment, the principle of the proposed development involving re-use of existing buildings is accepted subject to consideration of the appropriate policies listed above.

Impact upon Listed Building(s) and Setting:

In assessing the proposal, regard must be given to the statutory duties imposed on the authority in respect

of the preservation and enhancement of such assets. In this respect, at a local level, Key Statement EN5 and Policy DME4 are primarily, but not solely, engaged for the purposes of assessing likely impacts upon designated heritage assets resultant from the proposed development.

Key Statement EN5 states that:

“There will be a presumption in favour of the conservation and enhancement of the significance of heritage assets and their settings. The Historic Environment and its Heritage Assets and their settings will be conserved and enhanced in a manner appropriate to their significance for their heritage value; their important contribution to local character, distinctiveness and sense of place; and to wider social, cultural and environmental benefits.

This will be achieved through:

- *Recognising that the best way of ensuring the long term protection of heritage assets is to ensure a viable use that optimises opportunities for sustaining and enhancing its significance.*
- *Keeping Conservation Area Appraisals under review to ensure that any development proposals respect and safeguard the character, appearance and significance of the area.*
- *Considering any development proposals which may impact on a heritage asset or their setting through seeking benefits that conserve and enhance their significance and avoids any substantial harm to the heritage asset.*
- *Requiring all development proposals to make a positive contribution to local distinctiveness/sense of place.*
- *The consideration of Article 4 Directions to restrict permitted development rights where the exercise of such rights would harm the historic environment.”*

With Policy DME4 stating, in respect of development within conservation areas or those affecting the listed buildings or their setting, that development will be assessed on the following basis:

“Alterations or extensions to listed buildings or buildings of local heritage interest, or development proposals on sites within their setting which cause harm to the significance of the heritage asset will not be supported. Any proposals involving the demolition or loss of important historic fabric from listed buildings will be refused unless it can be demonstrated that exceptional circumstances exist.”

Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990:

Given the proposal relates to a Grade II Designated Heritage Asset, special regard must also be given to the statutory duties imposed on the authority, pursuant to national legislation, particularly in respect of the preservation and enhancement of such assets.

The principle statutory duty under the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended by s.58B (1) of Levelling-up and Regeneration Act 2023) is to preserve or enhance the special character of heritage assets, including their setting. As such, in determining applications that affect designated heritage assets, the authority must consider the duties contained within the principle Act which states the following;

Listed buildings - Section 16 (2) (as amended by s.58B of Levelling-up and Regeneration Act 2023):

In considering whether to grant listed building consent for any works to a listed building the local planning authority shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the building. Under s.58B (2) this includes preserving or enhancing any feature, quality or characteristic of the asset or setting that contributes to the significance of the asset.

National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024):

The National planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out further duties in respect of determining proposals that affect heritage assets stating that ‘in determining applications, local planning authorities should require

an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation'.

The Framework sets out further duties in respect of considering potential impacts upon designated heritage assets with Paragraphs 212 – 221 reading as follows:

212: When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.

213: Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of:

- a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional;*
- b) assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, registered battlefields, grade I and II* listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional.*

214: Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to (or total loss of significance of) a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or total loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss, or all of the following apply:

- a) the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site; and*
- b) no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation; and*
- c) conservation by grant-funding or some form of not for profit, charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and*
- d) the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use.*

215: Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.

216: The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

217: Local planning authorities should not permit the loss of the whole or part of a heritage asset without taking all reasonable steps to ensure the new development will proceed after the loss has occurred.

218: Local planning authorities should require developers to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage assets to be lost (wholly or in part) in a manner proportionate to their importance and the impact, and to make this evidence (and any archive generated) publicly accessible. However, the ability to record evidence of our past should not be a factor in deciding whether such loss should be permitted.

219: Local planning authorities should look for opportunities for new development within Conservation Areas and World Heritage Sites, and within the setting of heritage assets, to enhance or better reveal their significance. Proposals that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to the asset (or which better reveal its significance) should be treated favourably.

221: Local planning authorities should assess whether the benefits of a proposal for enabling development, which would otherwise conflict with planning policies but which would secure the future conservation of a heritage asset, outweigh the disbenefits of departing from those policies.

The Conservation and Heritage Officer has provided updated comments on the amended scheme. Firstly, they note that the re-use of the barn provides a significant public heritage benefit in its repair and re-use which is more likely to result in its long-term conservation.

The western elevation would re-use existing openings to provide doors and windows. To the south elevation, 3 no. existing openings would be enlarged to form double doors. The level of glazing has been reduced from as originally submitted and the Conservation and Heritage Officer considers that as this has been reduced to align with the current window openings, the harm is reduced.

The northern elevation would re-use existing opening which would include large, glazed openings. However, the Conservation and Heritage Officer notes that the level of glazing proposed to the northern elevation is less than the approved scheme and as such, this would be an improvement. Any harm is considered to be negligible.

It is considered that details of all new windows/doors can be secured by condition which should show a method of opening and should be flush fitting/rebated in the frame.

Following ongoing discussions between the Planning Officer and agent for the application, the ridge lights have now been amended to conservation style rooflights to ensure that the historic character of the barn is retained.

The proposed extent of take-down and rebuild outlined in the structural appraisal appears appropriate given the current condition of the barn. The Conservation and Heritage Officer considers that a condition that controls the areas of rebuild, eg a 1m x 1m sample panel showing the coursing, stone used and pointing should be added to any grant of permission.

Overall, the proposal would result in a low/negligible level of less than substantial harm which should be weighed against the benefits of the proposal.

Turning to the impact of the setting of the designated heritage assets, the detached garage which was originally proposed as part of this scheme has now been removed and the parking area would be retained to a similar level as previously approved which shows 3 no. parking spaces to the front of the site. The Conservation and Heritage Officer considers that this would reduce the harm considerably to the significance of the farmhouse and barn.

The previous application included an archaeology condition. No details have been submitted as part of this application in relation to archaeology and it would therefore seem appropriate to include this condition again. The Heritage and Conservation Officer recommends that following the historic building recording, a method statement should be submitted identifying features of interest and how they will be incorporated into the scheme. It is considered that this could be incorporated into the planning condition.

Impact Upon Residential Amenity:

Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy states that, development must:

1. *Not adversely affect the amenities of the surrounding area.*
2. *Provide adequate day lighting and privacy distances.*
3. *Have regard to public safety and secured by design principles.*
4. *Consider air quality and mitigate adverse impacts where possible.*

This application relates only to the conversion of the barn and not the farmhouse and the farmhouse restoration has not yet been implemented. The nearest residential properties are Middle Reaps Farm and Barn which lie approximately 90m to the east of the site and would not be unduly affected in terms of privacy and amenity. The proposed scheme would result in 1 no. new residential unit rather than 2 no. residential properties within the converted barn and as such, it is likely there would be lesser vehicular movements when compared to the approved scheme.

As such, the proposal is considered to accord with Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.

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 DMG2 also 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.'

The previous delegated report for planning ref: 3/2022/1165 noted that:

In terms of design and materials these will seek to preserve existing features, remove modern additions whilst using more traditional materials to enhance the buildings and their setting.

Overall, the external alterations to the building are similar to the approved scheme and additional hardstanding is considered to be appropriate to the character and appearance of the surrounding open countryside, subject to conditions to ensure there are appropriate materials used that reflect the historic character of the site and surrounding area. The number of rooflights have now been reduced and the design amended to reflect the historic character of the agricultural barn. It was previously considered reasonable to remove permitted development rights and as such, if a planning application were to be granted, permitted development rights should be removed again in the interest of visual amenity.

As such, the proposal is considered to accord with Policy DMG1 and DMG2 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.

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'.*

The proposal would include 3 no. parking spaces as per the approved scheme. The Highway Authority have been consulted on the application and do not object to the scheme, subject to the imposition of a number of conditions. These including the submission of a construction traffic management plan, the implementation of passing places, the provision and retention of parking areas and provision of cycle parking.

An updated plan has been submitted which now shows the passing places to be implanted and the proposed site plan has also been updated to show the proposed cycle storage within the existing outbuilding. As such, these can now be conditioned appropriately.

The removal of the larger parking area to the east of the barn also addresses concerns raised from the Public Rights of Way Team at Lancashire County Council and the parking area would now not obstruct footpath 325FP48 as the routes would pass by the buildings in the same way as existing and the improvements and re-use proposed are considered to enhance the users experience. It may well be that some of the public footpaths would pass close to or within residential curtilage but this is not unusual in a rural setting such as this and no proposals to enclose or affect these have been made.

Subject to the conditions outlined earlier in this report, the proposal is considered to accord with Policy DMG1 and DMG3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.

Landscape/Ecology:

With regards to the impact on protected species, an updated Bat Survey Report and Method Statement has been submitted (dated 3 June 2025). The building, when assessed in combination with location and surrounding habitat was observed to have a low level of bat roost potential. No evidence to suggest use by bats was recorded within the building at a time of year when such physical evidence would be expected. An emergence survey was carried out on 8th May 2025. A low level of Common Pipistrelle bat activity was recorded, with bats observed foraging along a treeline to the north of the building. No bats were observed emerging from the building.

The Countryside Officer has been consulted on the application and they consider that no physical evidence to suggest use by bats was recorded at the time of the survey and no evidence to suggest the use of the building by nesting birds or use by nesting Barn Owls. The development can be implemented in accordance with the Method Statement and Reasonable Avoidance Measures and the proposal therefore accords with Policy DME3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.

Turning to Biodiversity Net-Gain, the works would the creation of some areas of hardstanding on areas of sparsely vegetated urban land. Following discussions between the Planning officer and the agent for the application, the application has been supported by a letter from Pennine Ecological dated 30th September 2025 which states that development would not impact on any priority habitat and would impact on less than 25sqm of onsite habitat or 5 metres of linear habitat.

As such, the Council are satisfied that the development falls within the Di Minimis exemption.

Other Matters:

Refuse collection would need to be made from the top of the track adjacent to Whinney Lane as per the existing arrangements for Middle Reaps Farm and as per the previously approved scheme.

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'.

The application site is located within flood zone 1 (lowest risk of flooding). Notwithstanding this, the site is at high risk of surface water flooding. Whilst the development is for a change of use, there is additional hardstanding proposed (over 250sqm including access road to the front of the barn and hardstanding) and the sequential test would therefore apply to the development. Nonetheless, there is already an extant permission for the change of use of the barn to residential and for a similar level of hardstanding which is considered to be a material consideration in the determination of this application and as such, given that a similar scheme could already be implemented, it is not considered appropriate to undertake the sequential test for the development.

The submitted Surface Water and Foul Water Drainage Strategy by Reid Jones Partnership Ltd dated March 2025 identifies that surface water runoff from the developed site will be attenuated and discharged into the existing drainage ditch, which flows from the northern to the southern boundary before continuing to Arley Brook, maintaining the natural drainage pattern. The discharge rate will be restricted to greenfield runoff rate of 2.0 l/s and the surface water drainage design accommodates runoff from all rainfall events up to the 1-in-100-year critical storm, with a 45% allowance for climate change. Attenuation is achieved through underground storage crates within the soft landscaped areas to the south of the converted buildings. In addition, foul water from the three proposed buildings will be treated by separate treatment plants before being discharged into the drainage ditch. This is considered to be and in compliance with Policy DME6 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.

Observations/Consideration of Matters Raised/Conclusion:

NPPF requires that less than substantial harm be weighed against any public benefits and any harm be clearly and convincingly justified. Based on the secured amendments and additional information and having regard to the duty at section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, in giving 'great weight' to the conservation of the designated heritage asset and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and positively contributing to local character and distinctiveness, the proposal accords with the relevant Policies Ribble Valley Core Strategy Key Statement and the NPPF.

RECOMMENDATION:	That planning permission be granted subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions.
------------------------	--

