

Late Items – Planning & Development Committee					Ribble Valley Borough Council	www.ribblevalley.gov.uk
Meeting Date: 27 August 2026						
Briefing version		Issue Date:				
Committee Version		•	Issue Date:	27/08/2026		
Application Ref:	3/2025/0801	Proposed Erection of new residential development comprising 80 new homes, including 30% affordable housing, open space and associated infrastructure at Land to the east of Salesbury View, Wilpshire			REC:	DEFER AND DELEGATE

Since the publication of the Committee Agenda the Committee are asked to note the following updates on this application:

Additional Representations / Information Received

One further third party comment has been received relating to reason for refusal 2, informing committee of a recent accident at the bottom of Salesbury View, referencing the Equalities Act and querying the education contributions.

Officer response: un updated refusal reason 2 is set out at the end of this report. As Committee were advised at the last meeting, the relevant consideration is the Public Sector Equalities Duty which was set out in the Late Items Sheet for that meeting and is now set out in the main report. In respect of education contributions, the position at paragraph 5.11 of the main report reflects the original LEA position whereas the position at 10.2 reflects the updated position - which is unchanged from the request for £265,850 reported at the last committee meeting and reported in the Late Items on 23rd July. The current report is therefore correct.

The planning agent acting for the applicant has submitted a Committee Note: Highways and Transport by SCP MD/190760/TAA01 dated 24th August, 2026 (link to the full submission below).

https://webportal.ribblevalley.gov.uk/planx_downloads/25_0801_UPDATED_250826_Committee_Note_-_Highways_&Transport.pdf

This statement has been prepared in response to matters raised during the consideration of the application, including the Highways and Transport Review prepared on behalf of objectors by CTS.

The purpose of this response is to:

- Summarise the relevant planning and highway history of the site;
- Set out the position of Lancashire County Council (LCC) as Local Highway Authority;
- Summarise the findings of the independent highway and drainage review commissioned following the Committee's deferral of the application;
- Consider the matters raised in the CTS Highway and Transport Review;
- Demonstrate the highway matters raised by CTS have already been considered through the planning process and, where appropriate, addressed through the submitted scheme and recommended planning conditions; and
- Confirm that there is no substantive highway basis on which the current application should be refused.

The conclusions of that report state:-

It is therefore clear that the matters raised in the CTS report on behalf of objectors immediately before the previous committee do not identify any new highway issues which would warrant a refusal of the application, or that have not already been examined through the planning process.

The issues of access gradient and visibility have each been considered by the Transport Assessment, Lancashire County Council in its role as statutory highway authority, and the independent review commissioned by the Council following the Committee's deferral. None of those assessments identified a substantive highway reason for refusal.

The latter was commissioned for the express purpose of providing the Committee with an impartial assessment following its decision to defer the application and provides an additional layer of scrutiny beyond the Transport Assessment and local highway authority consultation response.

Each of the Transport Assessment, the local highway authority and the independent review have found that the application proposals are acceptable with regard to transport and there is nothing in the subsequent late representations which affects this conclusion.

Additionally, in response to the concerns raised in the third party consultant's highway review that the speed survey data was not considered to be up-to-date, the agent has submitted updated speed surveys which indicate lower vehicle speeds than the 2019 survey and therefore they consider that the visibility splays shown at the Whalley Road/Salesbury View junction in the TA to be robust.

The above comments do not result in any changes to the officer's views from those stated within the report or the drafted refusal reasons should committee be minded to refuse the application.

2026 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

An updated NPPF was published on 17th August 2026. The policies in this Framework are material considerations which must be taken into account in decision-making from the day of its publication. There is a new presumption in favour of sustainable development which the Government say is designed to give more direction about the suitability of development in different types of location. The Framework states that development plan policies (or parts of those policies) which are materially inconsistent with national decision-making policies in this Framework should be given very limited weight.

The following new policies are of particular consideration for this application:

Policy S3: Presumption in favour of sustainable development - central to the NPPF remains the presumption in favour of sustainable development and the planning system having economic, social and environmental objectives. This paragraph confirms that, for decision-taking, the presumption in favour of sustainable development means approving development proposals that accord with the Development Plan without delay.

Policy S4: Principle of development within settlements- development proposals within settlements should be approved unless the benefits of doing so would be substantially outweighed by any adverse effects, when assessed against the national decision-making policies in this Framework. The tilted balance in the previous NPPF was where the harm '*significantly and demonstrably*' outweighed the benefits – updating this to '*substantially*' outweighs is considered to be a higher bar which tilts development more in favour of the grant of permission within settlements.

In applying S4 the circumstances in which the benefits are likely to be substantially outweighed by adverse effects can include (but are not restricted to):

- a. Have an adverse impact in relation to:
 - i. The allocation or safeguarding of land or buildings for particular uses in the development plan, unless there is no reasonable prospect of an application coming forward for the allocated use, or there is evidence that the safeguarding is no longer appropriate; or
 - ii. The application of the policies in this Framework for existing recreational land and facilities (HC7), Local Green Space (HC8), areas of particular importance for biodiversity and

geodiversity (N6), Protected Landscapes (N4) and development within residential curtilages (L2(1)(d)).

- b. Involve the whole or partial loss of undeveloped land which is used for cemetery or burial ground; or for water storage and/or flood risk management (unless suitable compensatory provision is made that does not increase the risk of flooding either on or off-site); or
- c. Fail to comply with one of the national decision-making policies which state that development proposals should be refused in specific circumstances.

Policy HO7: Meeting the need for homes - notes that substantial weight should be given to the benefits of providing homes which will contribute towards meeting the evidenced accommodation needs of the community (for example affordable housing), as identified through needs assessments prepared for the area.

Policy HO8: Providing affordable homes - development proposals should meet or exceed up-to-date development plan requirements for the proportion and mix of affordable housing tenures relevant to the location, including the minimum proportion of Social Rent. The affordable housing provision that would be secured from the scheme aligns with this policy.

Policy HO9: Specialist forms of accommodation - development proposals to address specialist housing needs should provide living conditions and access to services which are appropriate to the needs of their residents and users. This includes:

- a. Specialist housing for older or disabled people:
 - i. Being located where residents will be able to access frequently-used services easily and safely by walking, wheeling (including mobility scooters) and by public or on-site public transport services; including through facilities provided as part of the scheme; and
 - ii. Being delivered to M4(2) or M4(3) accessibility standards.

Policy L3: Achieving appropriate densities - development proposals should make efficient use of land, taking into account the identified need for different types of housing and other development, local market conditions, the availability of infrastructure and its scope for improvement, a site's connectivity and the importance of securing well-designed, attractive and healthy places.

To contribute to making efficient use of land within settlements, development proposals for residential and mixed-use development should contribute to an increase in the density of the area in which they are situated. The only exception is where there is a clear justification that this is either inappropriate or not possible. In considering the potential to increase densities, the existing character of an area should be taken into account, in accordance with policy DP3, but should not preclude development which makes the most of an area's potential.

Policy DP3: Key principles for well-designed places - development proposals should respond to their context (the history, character and features of their site and its setting), so that they integrate with and enhance their surroundings. To create well-designed places, development proposals should also reflect relevant aspects of the following principles, as appropriate to the nature of the development and its location:

- a. Liveability: support healthy, mixed, vibrant and integrated communities, which will function well over the lifetime of the development, by incorporating a range of uses and tenures, employing features which promote social interaction, and which are robust, durable and easy to look after;
- b. Climate: contribute to climate change mitigation and adaptation and the transition to net zero by using building layouts, building orientation, massing, landscaping and materials which conserve energy and other resources, and which minimise risks from the impacts of climate change including overheating;

c. Nature: incorporate and/or connect to a network of high quality, accessible, multi functional green infrastructure to provide opportunities for recreation and healthy living, strengthen habitats, improve climate change resilience and improve air and water quality. This should include maintaining and enhancing tree cover and incorporating sustainable drainage systems in accordance with policies N3 and F8;

d. Movement: provide transport infrastructure and choices which support the design vision for the site, provide good connections to the wider settlement (or those nearby), and prioritise walking, wheeling, cycling and public transport;

e. Built Form: use the pattern of buildings to define the arrangement of streets, squares and other spaces, promote compact forms of development to optimise the site's potential, distinguish between public and private areas, create focal points and, where appropriate, enhance views into and out of the scheme;

f. Public Space: include spaces that are safe, secure, inclusive, and accessible for all ages and abilities, including for groups such as women and girls; and which facilitate and encourage social interaction, play and healthy lifestyles (for example by providing high quality, clear and legible pedestrian and cycle routes, a variety of recreational spaces and places to meet, integrated lighting and making building entrances and windows face onto streets and other public places to provide natural surveillance);
and

g. Identity: create visually attractive, distinctive and characterful development to establish or maintain a strong sense of place and pride, including through the use of a coherent palette of materials, design features and planting.

Development proposals should be refused if, without clear justification, they conflict the above, or with any explicit design standards set out in the development plan (including those in locally specific policies, guides, codes or masterplans). Substantial weight should be given to compliance with relevant development plan policies when assessing the design quality of proposals.

TR3: Locating development in sustainable locations - so that development is located where it can support sustainable patterns of movement, enable good accessibility for different users and make the most of existing and proposed transport infrastructure, development proposals should reflect the following principles, taking into account the vision for the site, the type of development and its location:

a. Development proposals which could generate a significant amount of movement, in the context of the area within which they would be situated, should be in locations that are sustainable (or which can be made so, taking into account planned improvements, including any provided for as part of the development itself). This means the location should limit the need to travel, particularly by private car, and offer a genuine choice of transport modes for residents and users, unless the nature of the development would make this impractical;

b. Opportunities should be taken to utilise existing or proposed transport infrastructure in optimising the amount or density of development which can be accommodated in different locations, especially where this can support more walking, wheeling, cycling and public transport use;

c. Any significant adverse impacts from the development on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion), or on highway safety, should be mitigated to an acceptable degree using a vision-led approach;

d. The environmental impacts of traffic and transport infrastructure should be identified, assessed and taken into account – including taking opportunities to avoid or mitigate any adverse environmental effects, and to secure net environmental gains such as reductions in air pollution; and e. In rural areas, opportunities to improve walking, wheeling, cycling and public transport and enhance the connectivity of an area should be taken where they exist and can be supported by the development proposed.

TR4: Street design, access and parking - to contribute to creating well-designed places, transport considerations should be integral to the design of development, proposals for which should:

- a. Give priority first to walking, wheeling and cycle movements, both within the scheme and with neighbouring areas; and second – so far as possible – to facilitating easy access to high quality public transport, with layouts and densities which maximise the catchments for bus or other public transport services;
- b. Incorporate or contribute towards appropriate features to support this prioritisation, such as permeable street networks, continuous footways and segregated cycle facilities which are adequately lit, sufficient secure and accessible cycle parking, regularly spaced public seating and good quality waiting facilities for public transport;
- c. Ensure that the arrangement of streets and other routes help to create places that are safe, inclusive and attractive for all users (particularly for women and girls, for other groups who may be vulnerable to crime or the fear of crime, and for those with limited mobility). This includes reflecting relevant aspects of policy DP3(2), as well as employing measures to:
 - i. Minimise the scope for conflict between pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles;
 - ii. Meet the needs of disabled people, older people and children in relation to all modes of transport, and
 - iii. Avoid unnecessary street clutter.
- d. Allow for the efficient delivery of goods, and ease of access by service and emergency vehicles, in ways which do not compromise key place-making principles (set out in policy DP3(2)); and
- e. Provide a suitable number of parking spaces for a range of transport modes where appropriate, reflecting the location and nature of the development (including its connectivity), any locally-set standards in the development plan, and including adequate provision of spaces and infrastructure that allow for the charging of electric vehicles in safe, accessible and convenient locations. A flexible approach to applying parking standards should be taken where the reconfiguration of retail or other sites which attract large numbers of customers would make better use of previously developed land, and there is evidence that a certain number of spaces needs to be retained to meet specific operational and commercial requirements.

With no conflicts identified with relevant 2026 NPPF policies, and with a greater tilt towards allowing development within settlements, the view of officers is that the development remains to be supported by the new NPPF. Should Committee be minded to refuse the application then the drafted refusal reasons have been updated to update the NPPF policy references.

Updated Refusal Reasons

1. The proposed development would be on a prominent hillside location at the edge of a settlement and adjacent to Green Belt. The proposed development fails to be visually attractive and sympathetic to the area's character by virtue of the layout, density, house types and scales, inadequate green buffers and significant level changes to the landform, appearing overly dominant and incongruous in the street scene and from wider public viewpoints to the detriment of visual amenity. This would be contrary to Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy 2008 - 2028 and Policy L3 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. The proposed development would fail to provide suitable access routes, to and from the site as well as within it, for all users, in particular those people with disabilities and reduced mobility, by virtue of the topography of the site and steep incline up Salesbury View. This would be contrary to Policies DMG1 and DMG3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy 2008 – 2028 and Policies HO9, TR3 and TR4 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

