


Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.

Signed:	Officer:	LH	Date:	26/1/26	Manager:	NH	Date:	27/01/26
----------------	-----------------	----	--------------	---------	-----------------	----	--------------	----------

Application Ref:	3/2025/0827			 Ribble Valley Borough Council www.ribblevalley.gov.uk
Date Inspected:	19/1/26	Site Notice:	18/12/25	
Officer:	LH			
DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:				REFUSAL

Development Description:	Erection of an agricultural storage barn, erection of 3 poles associated with the installation of CCTV and hardstanding (part-retrospective)
Site Address/Location:	Moor Game Hall Old Clitheroe Road Hurst Green PR3 2YU.

CONSULTATIONS:	Parish/Town Council
Aighton Bailey and Chaigley Parish Council:	Consulted 05/12/25 – no response received.

CONSULTATIONS:	Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies
<p>LCC Highways – No objection subject to condition</p> <p>United Utilities – No formal comments to make as this application does not include any drainage details and does not impact upon land within UU’s ownership or UU’s catchment land.</p> <p>Natural England – Unauthorised drainage works at this location (but outside of the application red line boundary) were determined to have a likely significant effect on the environment – namely drainage of a semi-natural area containing blanket bog, upland fens and flushes and upland heath priority habitats within a protected landscape. An appeal against a Remediation Notice issued in May 2025 is currently ongoing. Comments provided on the application submission in respect of whether or not the site forms part of an agricultural holding and the accuracy of the existing current site plan.</p>	

CONSULTATIONS:	Additional Representations.
<p>Two representations received from 1 neighbouring property objecting to the proposal. A summary of the concerns raised is as follows:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inaccurate and misleading plans of the CCTV poles (but then one pole was duly relocated during the course of the application and this now corresponds with the position shown on the plans) - Questionable justification for intrusive security measures - Loss of privacy and overlooking - Unsafe and unsuitable access - Lack of genuine agricultural need and concern that the barn will be used to store vehicles or equipment associated with a non-agricultural business - Visually harmful to the national landscape - The application relates to retrospective development - A newly installed CCTV camera has been fixed to a tree adjacent to the site entrance which activates a loud alarm siren <p><i>Officers response – the position of the CCTV poles seen on site correspond with the submitted plans. The planning system makes provision for applicant’s to apply to regularise development as such the fact that this application includes retrospective development is not a material consideration which carries any</i></p>	

weight in this case. The CCTV camera installed on a tree adjacent to the site entrance does not form part of the application – whether or not this requires consent would need to be investigated separately. Other concerns raised will be addressed in the relevant sections of the report below.

RELEVANT POLICIES AND SITE PLANNING HISTORY:

Ribble Valley Core Strategy:

Key Statement DS1: Development Strategy
Key Statement DS2: Sustainable Development
Key Statement EN2: Landscape
Policy DMG1: General Considerations
Policy DMG2: Strategic Considerations
Policy DMG3: Transport & Mobility
Policy DME2: Landscape and Townscape Protection
Policy DME3: Site and Species Protection and Conservation
Policy DME6: Water Management
Policy DMB5: Footpaths and Bridleways

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Relevant Planning History:

Whilst there is some planning history associated with the former dog kennels and dwelling, none are directly relevant to this application.

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:

Site Description and Surrounding Area:

The application site relates to land associated with Moor Game Hall which comprises a residential property situated to the west of the site, and outbuildings formerly used as dog kennels and hardstanding / grassed area to the east of the site. There are also two shipping containers on the land which do not benefit from planning permission. The site is located at the northern-most point of a private access road which leads off Old Clitheroe Road and serves a handful of other properties. This access road also serves Public Right Of Way 3-16-FP 3 which continues up to Longridge Fell.

The site is within the Forest Of Bowland National Landscape. The wider area surrounding the application site comprises Longridge Fell to the north as well as a mixture of agricultural land, woodland and a scattering of residential properties.

Proposed Development for which consent is sought:

Planning consent is sought for:-

- An agricultural storage barn measuring 14.5m L, 11m W, 3m eaves and 6.3m ridge height. Walls to be constructed from metal cladding with a stone base, with metal sheet roof
- Three poles, each 5m high, steel, painted black, associated with the installation of CCTV. One sited to the north of the former kennel buildings, one sited at the site entrance and the third at the south-west corner of the field to the south of the site entrance. These poles are in situ (retrospective). They do not currently have CCTV cameras mounted on them, but the application states that CCTV will be installed.

- Hardstanding – additional hardstanding has been laid to the east of the site extending towards the new agricultural storage barn and including an apron which is currently being used to site one of the shipping containers. The extent of new hardstanding is identified on submitted plan EX.02 Rev C and can be seen on site. This aspect is retrospective.

Principle of Development:

The site lies within the National Landscape and outside of a settlement boundary. Policy DMG2 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy states that proposals for development outside the Borough's defined settlement areas can be considered as justifiable if *'the development is needed for the purposes of forestry or agriculture'*.

In this instance, the supporting statement explains:-

'...the proposed agricultural storage building and associated hardstanding is required to ensure the storage of equipment and machinery required as part of the ongoing and future land management / agricultural activities which take place on the farm. The proposed poles and installation of CCTV will function to provide security for the occupiers of the house associated with the farm and ultimately also provide increased protection of the farm and the materials and machinery stored on-site...

[additionally] there are no existing buildings on site which could perform the secure storage function that the proposed building will provide. Furthermore the allowance of the proposed building will result in the removal of the existing storage containers...'

Firstly, the last statement about removal of storage containers is not a benefit as google images show that these containers were not in situ in June 2023 and are therefore not lawful.

The agricultural information form submitted with the application states the applicant owns 43 hectares of pasture and meadow land, that the enterprise comprises 130 sheep and that farm machinery includes a tractor, tipping trailer, harrow, roller, topper and quad.

Whilst some of this machinery was on site at the time of the officer's site visit, there was no evidence of any other farming activity being undertaken. Furthermore, if the proposed building is being used to house some of the materials / equipment currently in the shipping containers then insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate why the former kennel buildings could not be used for some of these storage requirements.

Even if there was an agricultural justification for a new building, there is no justification for its siting away from the current grouping of buildings including the extent of new hardstanding proposed.

Turning to the issue of the CCTV poles, whilst rural crime is a concern by many landowners, and the NPPF (paragraph 135) acknowledges the need to create places that are safe, no justification has been provided for why there needs to be three 5 metre high poles in the locations shown, instead of a more sympathetic solution such as CCTV cameras fixed to existing buildings.

In light of the above, it is not considered that the proposed development is reasonably necessary for the purposes of agriculture. Furthermore the scale and siting of the poles means that they are not considered to be a necessary security provision for the residential property. Accordingly, it is not considered that the proposed development would satisfy Policy DMG2 and is therefore considered to be unacceptable development in principle in this rural location.

Impact Upon Residential Amenity:

Paragraph 135 (f) of the National Planning Policy Framework states:

'Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users and where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion and resilience.'

Furthermore, Policy DMG1 of the Core Strategy requires all proposals for development to consider the effects of development upon existing amenities.

In this instance, concerns have been raised about overlooking and loss of privacy from CCTV cameras to be installed on the poles given their proximity and elevated position to a nearby residential property. However, the CCTV cameras do not fall within the scope of this application, as such there is no detail submitted - nor required to be considered – in terms of their design, positioning and direction. If the poles were to be granted planning permission then the cameras to be installed would need to be the subject of a separate application (they would not be permitted under Class F (Class F) of Part 2, Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (GPDO) because the poles would not be treated as a building).

The poles would not result in any overlooking or loss of privacy issues nor any overbearing impact. The agricultural building would be a considerable distance away from neighbouring properties. As such, it is not considered that the proposed development would be harmful to the amenity of any neighbouring residents and would therefore be compliant with the aims and objectives of Paragraph 135 (f) of the NPPF and Policy DMG1.

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.'

With respect to development within National Landscapes (previously known as Areas Of Outstanding Natural Beauty) Paragraph 189 of the NPPF states:

'Great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty.'

Key Statement EN2 of the Core Strategy provides similar guidance:

'The landscape and character of the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty will be protected, conserved and enhanced. Any development will need to contribute to the conservation of the natural beauty of the area. As a principle the Council will expect development to be in keeping with the character of the landscape, reflecting local distinctiveness, vernacular style, scale, style, features and building materials.'

Policy DMG2 of the Core Strategy states:

'In protecting the designated area of outstanding natural beauty the council will have regard to the economic and social well-being of the area. However the most important consideration in the assessment of any development proposals will be the protection, conservation and enhancement of the landscape and character of the area avoiding where possible habitat fragmentation. Where possible new development should be accommodated through the re-use of existing buildings, which in most cases is more appropriate than new build. Development will be required to be in keeping with the character of the landscape and acknowledge the special qualities of the AONB by virtue of its size, design, use of material, landscaping and siting.'

Whilst the agricultural building is not excessive in scale, it would still be a sizeable addition to the site and its detached siting away from the existing group of buildings together with the proposed hardstanding means that it would fail to assimilate with the existing built form on site. Instead it would extend and elongate the built form into an undeveloped area of the site which, prior to the hardstanding being constructed, positively contributed to the open and rural character of the wider site and its setting within the national landscape.

Whilst the poles are a slimline design their height and siting (adjacent to the PROW in the case of 2 of the poles and elevated above existing buildings in the case of the third) does make them visually prominent. Whilst the poles along the PROW are sited adjacent to trees which helps to mitigate their visual impact their detachment from the built form on site makes them an incongruous feature in the landscape.

In light of the above, it is considered that the proposed development would be harmful to the visual amenities of the area and would fail to protect and enhance the character of the surrounding National Landscape. The proposal would conflict with Paragraphs 135 (C) and 189 of the NPPF and Key Statement EN2 and Policies DMG1 and DMG2 of the Core Strategy.

Highways and Parking:

No changes are proposed to the existing access arrangements, and the highways authority are satisfied with the hardstanding proposed on site to access the building. The proposal raises no issues with regards to highway safety. Whilst two of the poles are located adjacent to a PROW they do not obstruct or affect the enjoyment of the PROW and the highways authority do not object to their siting in this regard.

Landscape/Ecology:

No trees are affected by the development.

The development is exempt from having to achieve the mandatory Biodiversity Net Gain requirement as it is subject to the retrospective development exception.

Other Matters:

Flood Risk

The application site is located within flood zone 1: lowest risk of flooding.

The LPA are aware of unauthorised drainage works to the north of the site (outside of the application red line boundary) which are the subject of a Remediation Notice and ongoing appeal, but no evidence has been provided by any of the consultees to suggest that these works have a direct impact on the proposed development. The application form states that surface water drainage would be to a nearby watercourse although no details of this have been provided. If the application was to be approved then suitable drainage details would need to be secured by condition. Accordingly, the proposed development raises no significant concerns with respect to flood risk.

Hardstanding

Natural England query the accuracy of the current site plan. This does reasonably accurately show the hardstanding proposed within the red edge of the application site. Whilst additional hardstanding outside of the red edge was evident on site, to the south of the proposed building and to the north, this falls outside the scope of the application.

Observations/Consideration of Matters Raised/Conclusion:

The proposed development is not considered to be reasonably necessary for the purposes of agriculture and would by virtue of scale and siting result in harm to the visual amenities of the area. This would conflict with Policies DMG1, DMG2 and EN2 of the Core Strategy and Paragraphs 135 and 189 of the NPPF.

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

RECOMMENDATION:	That planning permission be refused.
------------------------	--------------------------------------