

Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.								
Signed:	Officer:	BT	Date:	11/6/26	Manager:	LH	Date:	12/6/26

Application Ref:	3/2025/0922				Ribble Valley Borough Council www.ribblevalley.gov.uk
Date Inspected:	22/5/26	Site Notice:	1/5/26		
Officer:	BT				
DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:				REFUSAL	

Development Description:	Change of use from agricultural building to single residential self-build dwelling and associated residential curtilage together with hardstanding/parking.
Site Address/Location:	Land at Pendleton Road, Wiswell, BB7 9BZ.

CONSULTATIONS:	Parish/Town Council
Wiswell Parish Council:	Object to the proposal on the following grounds: • A permanent residential use of the proposal site would irreparably damage the character and appearance of the landscape • A permanent residential use of the proposal site would adversely impact on the privacy of neighbouring properties • Concerns raised with regards to an absence of information pertaining to the management of foul and surface water • Refute the claim that the application site is no longer feasible for agricultural use • The principle of development is unacceptable with regards to its location and conversion of the existing building on site

CONSULTATIONS:	Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies
LCC Highways:	No objections subject to conditions.

CONSULTATIONS:	Additional Representations.
Objections have been received from five households which are summarised as follows: • The proposed development would amount to an inappropriate use of agricultural land • Refute the claim that the application site is no longer feasible for agricultural use • Unsustainable location of the application site to support a residential use • Impact of the proposal upon the visual amenities of the area • Impact of the proposal upon highway safety	

- The proposed development would not amount to a genuine conversion of the existing building on site
- The proposed development does not fall within the remit of local needs housing

RELEVANT POLICIES AND SITE PLANNING HISTORY:

Ribble Valley Core Strategy:

Key Statement DS1: Development Strategy
 Key Statement DS2: Sustainable Development
 Key Statement EN2: Landscape
 Key Statement DMI2: Transport Considerations
 Policy DMG1: General Considerations
 Policy DMG2: Strategic Considerations
 Policy DMG3: Transport & Mobility
 Policy DME2: Landscape & Townscape Protection
 Policy DME5: Renewable Energy
 Policy DMH3: Dwellings in the Open Countryside and AONB
 Policy DMH4: The Conversion of barns and other Buildings to Dwellings

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Relevant Planning History:

3/2024/0615:

Proposed change of use from agricultural building to single residential dwelling and associated residential curtilage together with hardstanding/parking area (part retrospective) (Refused)

Planning Enforcement Notice served on 16/02/2024 in respect of breach of conditions 2 and 4 of planning permission 3/2018/0989 by failing to lay out the building as per the approved plans and by using the building for residential purposes. This was not appealed. Photographic evidence supplied by the applicant in June 2024 confirm the necessary works have been carried out and the residential use has ceased. Complied with effect from 14/06/2024.

3/2024/0252:

Regularisation of use of agricultural building as a dwellinghouse. Received 27/03/2024. LPA responded on 26/04/24 to advise that as the application is seeking permission for a dwelling and hardstanding to which pre-existing enforcement notices relate, then under Section 70C of the TCPA the LPA has resolved to decline to determine the application. The application is effectively considered withdrawn.

3/2023/0746:

Certificate of Lawfulness for existing use of agricultural building as a dwellinghouse. Received 20/09/2023 (Refusal)

Planning Enforcement Notice served on 08/02/2023 in respect of without planning permission, the Without planning permission, the carrying out of engineering operations and other installations on the Land including the creation of areas of hardstanding, installation of CCTV on a building, erection of a free standing post for CCTV, installation of infrastructure for a stand-alone solar array, and erection of a stand-alone solar array of dimensions which exceed that permitted by the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) ("the Order"). Appealed (Planning Enforcement Appeal APP/T2350/C/23/3318459) – Appeal dismissed. Complied with effect from 21/08/2024.

3/2022/0345:

Discharge of conditions 3 (Materials) 7 (Replacement Trees) and 8 (Boundary Treatments) from planning permission 3/2018/0989 (Approved)

3/2018/0989:

Proposed extension to existing agricultural building. Regularisation of the existing building (Approved)

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:**Site Description and Surrounding Area:**

The application relates to a parcel of land situated on the North-western edge of Wiswell. The land parcel in question comprises an elongated strip of grassland bound by trees on all perimeters which extends to the North-west from Pendleton Road. Access to the land parcel is from Pendleton Road via a gated field access. A building originally approved for agricultural use lies approximately 50 metres away to the South-west of the site's access which forms the basis of this application. Residential properties border the South-western perimeter of the application site with the wider area comprising a mixture of woodland, agricultural land and open countryside.

Proposed Development for which consent is sought:

Retrospective planning consent was granted for the retention of an unauthorised agricultural building under previous planning application 3/2018/0989 in March 2019. Subsequently, a certificate of lawfulness application (3/2023/0746) was submitted which sought to establish the lawful use of this building as a dwellinghouse however this application was refused on the basis of a Breach of Condition Notice having been served to the applicant during the period of four years beginning with the date of the alleged breach, and also due to the presence of evidence which was considered to make the applicant's version of events less than probable. Photographic evidence submitted by the applicant to the Council in June 2024 subsequently showed the application building as having been configured in accordance with the approved plans (from application 3/2018/0989) including all internal domestic paraphernalia removed and a residential use having ceased. Following this, a full planning application submission for a proposed change of use of the existing building on site to a residential dwelling was refused in January 2025 under planning application 3/2024/0615. The current application seeks planning consent for a change of use of the existing building on site and its surrounding agricultural land to form a single self-build dwelling along with associated residential curtilage and hardstanding and parking areas.

Whilst the application has been assessed on the basis of the applicant's development description, the Council has not seen any evidence to indicate that the existing building on site has ever been used for any agricultural activity (this issue was previously raised as part of the assessment of application 3/2024/0615 and is discussed in further detail below).

Principle of Development:

The proposal site is not situated within any of the Borough's defined settlement areas and as such lies within the open countryside.

Criterion 2 of Policy DMH3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy allows for the appropriate conversion of buildings to dwellings providing they are suitably located and their form and general design are in keeping with their surroundings. The same policy stipulates that buildings must be structurally sound and capable of conversion without the need for complete or substantial reconstruction. With regards to criterion 2 of DMH3, whether or not the proposal amounts to an 'appropriate' conversion leads to the engagement of policy DMH4 and requires a consideration of the proposal against that policy.

Policy DMH4 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy states:

Planning permission will be granted for the conversion of buildings to dwellings where:

- 1. The building is not isolated in the landscape, i.e. it is within a defined settlement or forms part of an existing group of buildings, and*
- 2. There need be no unnecessary expenditure by public authorities and utilities on the provision of infrastructure, and*
- 3. There would be no materially damaging effect on the landscape qualities of the area or harm to nature conservations interests, and*
- 4. There would be no detrimental effect on the rural economy, and*
- 5. The proposals are consistent with the conservation of the natural beauty of the area*
- 6. 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 alternation, which would adversely affect the character or appearance of the building;*
- Be of a sufficient size to provide necessary living accommodation without the need for further extensions which would harm the character or appearance of the building -*
- 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.

Having regard to criteria point 1 of Policy DMH4, the application building is situated in reasonably close proximity to four residential properties (Four Acres, Steps Cottage and No. 1 & 2 Tithe Barn Cottages) and two commercial properties (Tithe Barn stables and cattery) and as such does not read as an isolated feature within the surrounding landscape. The proposed development would therefore satisfy criteria point 1 of Policy DMH4 and locational requirements of Policy DMH3.

Turning to criteria point 2, access to the application site would remain via the site's existing access from Pendleton Road and the application's supporting information indicates that surface water runoff from the development would be discharged into Light Clough (a minor river which solely runs along the North-eastern perimeter of the application site) by way of a simple pipe connection which would be installed at the applicant's own expense. In addition, it is stated that foul water drainage would be dealt with by way of a package treatment plant which would also be installed at the applicant's own expense. As such, it is not anticipated that the proposed development would warrant any unnecessary expenditure by public authorities or utilities on the provision of infrastructure. The proposal would therefore satisfy the requirements of criteria point 2 of Policy DMH4.

Having regard to criteria point 4, there is no evidence to suggest that the application building forms an integral part of any agricultural or rural enterprise (this aspect of the proposal is covered in further detail below) therefore it is not considered that the proposed development would be of detriment to the rural economy of the Borough.

Turning to criteria point 6, the application building holds negligible potential for accommodating protected species by virtue of its corrugated metal roof design therefore the works proposed to the roofspace of the application building would raise no conflict with the requirements of criteria point 6. Having regard to criteria point 6 (2), the proposed plans submitted in support of the application indicate that the application building could accommodate the necessary living space to support the residential use proposed, with no extensions proposed to the application building as part of the proposal. The proposed development would therefore satisfy the requirements of criteria point 6 (2).

Taking account of the above, the proposed development would be partially compliant with Policy DMH3 with respect to its location and would also satisfy the requirements of criteria points 1, 2, 4, 6 and 6 (2) of Policy DMH4.

Notwithstanding the above, Policy DMH3 carries a requirement for all buildings being converted to residential use to be in keeping with their surroundings with respect to their form and general design. Similarly, criteria points 3 and 5 of Policy DMH4 require any conversion of buildings to dwellings to be in keeping with the natural beauty of their surroundings without causing undue harm to the landscape qualities of the area. In this instance, analysis shows that the application building has been constructed largely in accordance with the development as approved under previous application 3/2018/0989 however a timber decking area has been added to the front North-western elevation of the building, along with the addition of an incongruous and largely unsympathetic metal housing unit which accommodates a solar panel battery and inverter, with both additions to the building reading as overtly domestic in appearance and being largely at odds with the unadorned agricultural character of the building approved under application 3/2018/0989. In addition, the current proposal seeks to make further domestic alterations to the existing building which include the addition of stone cladding to all elevations of the building along with the introduction of a replacement tiled roof with solar panels, with the proposed introduction of a driveway, footpath, hardstanding and terraced steps (in place of the existing timber decking) all adding further urbanisation to the site (the visual impact of the proposed development is assessed in further detail in the report's 'Visual Amenity/External Appearance' section).

In addition, criteria point 6 (1) of Policy DMH4 requires buildings being converted to residential use to be structurally sound and capable of conversion without the need for extensive building or major alternation which would adversely affect the character or appearance of the building. In this case, the application's structural survey states that in order to convert the application property into a dwelling there would likely be a requirement to underpin and widen the existing foundations of the building along with a requirement to introduce a ground floor slab, bracing to the existing timber stud walls and additional roof trusses to support the additional loading from the proposed replacement tiled roof and its solar panels. As such, the submitted structural report does not provide a confident indication that the application building would be structurally capable of supporting the proposed development (the submitted structural report states that the work required to convert the property could be more expensive than demolishing the existing property and constructing a new house of equivalent size). In addition, and as conveyed above, the proposal seeks to make significant external alterations to the design of the existing building which in turn would result in the creation of an overtly domestic building which would be at odds with the site's open countryside setting.

Furthermore, criteria point 6 (3) of Policy DMH4 carries a stipulation for buildings being converted to residential use to be worthy of retention by virtue of their intrinsic interest or contribution made to their setting however the existing building in situ is a modern structure which has also only been in situ for approximately seven years and this building has not been constructed in accordance with approved consent 3/2018/0989. Consequently, it is not considered that the application building provides a meaningful or positive contribution to its setting, nor is it considered be worthy of retention.

Moreover, criteria point 6 (4) of Policy DMH4 states that rural buildings being converted to residential use must have a genuine history of use for agriculture or other rural enterprise. With regards to this, the application's supporting information states:

'The term "genuine history" is not defined within the Local Plan, nor is any additional guidance provided in the form of an SPD. It is understood that the site itself has been in agricultural use, with a building in situ, since the 1960s, and planning permission was granted for an agricultural building in 2018. Given a lack of guidance on the matter it is considered that there is a genuine history of agricultural use.'

Notwithstanding the applicant's perceived ambiguity with regards to the parameters of a 'genuine history' of use for agriculture or another rural enterprise, no evidence has been submitted in support of the proposal to indicate that the existing building on site has ever been used for any agricultural or other rural enterprise (this issue was previously raised as part of the assessment of application 3/2024/0615). In light of this, it is not considered that the application building benefits from a genuine history of use for agriculture or other rural enterprise and the proposal therefore fails to satisfy the requirements of criteria point 6 (4) of Policy DMH4.

The nature of the existing building, being a modern structure with a nil-use, means that the development fails to meet two important exception criteria in Policy DMH4, and in turn it cannot be said to satisfy Policy DMH3 in that it cannot be considered an 'appropriate' conversion.

Policy DMG2 of the Core Strategy states that development within the tier 2 villages and outside the defined settlement areas must meet at least one of the following considerations:

- 1. The development should be essential to the local economy or social well-being 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.*
- 6. The development is compatible with the enterprise zone designation*

In this case, the proposal does not fall within the realm of development that would be essential to the local economy or social well-being of the area, nor is the proposal required for the purposes of agriculture. The proposal does not relate to small scale tourism or a recreational development appropriate to a rural area and does not fall within the realm of a small scale use appropriate to a rural area where a local need or benefit has been demonstrated. In addition, the proposal is not compatible with the enterprise zone designation. The application's supporting information states that the application site will fulfil a local need for low cost accommodation on account of the applicant being unable to rent or buy alternative accommodation on the open market however no information has been provided to substantiate this claim or to evidence that the building would satisfy the definition of Affordable Housing as per the Core Strategy or NPPF. Nor has any legal mechanism been submitted to secure it as such (these issues were previously raised as part of the assessment of application 3/2024/0615). The proposal would therefore fail to meet the above criteria of Policy DMG2.

Policy DMG3 of the Core Strategy also requires decision taking to consider the availability and adequacy of public transport and associated infrastructure to serve those moving to and from new developments. This is consistent with the NPPF which requires development proposals to promote sustainable transport. In this instance, analysis shows an absence of bus stops within the nearby vicinity of the application site with the nearest public transport links being sited approximately 350 away from the application site within the defined settlement area of Wiswell. In addition, there is an absence of pavements and street lighting along Pendleton Road. Such issues can potentially be balanced against the sustainable benefits of re-using existing buildings. The 're-use' of a building dictates that the building in question has or has had an established use which would subsequently be superseded in the event of the building in question

being utilised for residential use however given that the application building is not considered to benefit from a genuine history of use for agriculture or other rural enterprise, it is not considered that the proposal would amount to a genuine 're-use' of the building in question and the sustainable benefits of re-using an existing building can therefore not be applied in this case. Furthermore, this is not a building considered worthy of retention as assessed above.

The application's supporting statement makes a comparative reference to application 3/2022/0988 which was allowed on appeal (ref: APP/T2350/W/24/339770) with an assertion that the use proposed for the application site should not be considered as being any less sustainable than the existing situation in place with regards to vehicle movements, as was initially determined by the inspectorate in the aforementioned appeal. Notwithstanding this assertion, the aforementioned appeal decision was quashed by the High Court in September 2025 and therefore carries no legal basis. Furthermore, the development subject to the referenced appeal concerned the proposed construction of a new dwelling within the Green Belt where the current use of the site was for equestrian purposes, as such the Inspector's reasoning for not identifying a policy conflict was primarily because of the current situation which is not applicable here. As such, there is not considered to be a reasonable basis of comparison between the referenced appeal and current proposal, nor is the referenced appeal considered to provide justification for introducing unrestricted residential development into an unsustainable location.

Taking account of all of the above, the proposed development would fail to satisfy the requirements of Policy DMH3, criteria points 3, 5, 6 (1), 6 (3) and 6 (4) of Policy DMH4 and Policies DMG2 and DMG3 of the Core Strategy and is therefore considered to be unacceptable in principle.

Self-build

The proposal has been submitted as a self-build development however no legal mechanism has been submitted to secure this. Subject to a suitable agreement being received, with a shortfall of self-build housing within the Borough, this would carry some weight however being only one dwelling this weighting is considered limited.

Other Material Considerations – Housing Supply

In January 2026 an appeal decision determined that the Council's housing supply position is 3.45 years. Consequently, strategic policies DMG2 and DMH3 referenced above are considered to be out-of-date in so far as their ability to restrict housing from coming forward and there is a requirement for the Council to assess the proposed development against Paragraph 11 (d) (i) & (ii) of the Framework.

Paragraph 11 (d) of the NPPF states:

Plans and decisions should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development...For decision-taking this means:

d) where there are no relevant development plan policies or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date (this includes, for applications involving the provision of housing, situations where the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites – see footnote 8 of the Framework), granting permission unless:

- i. the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for refusing the development proposed; or*
- ii. any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole, having particular regard to key policies for directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land, securing well-designed places and providing affordable homes, individually or in combination.*

This assessment will be done in the concluding section of the report once all matters have been duly considered.

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’.

Furthermore, Policy DMG1 of the Core Strategy requires all proposals for development to consider the effects of development upon existing amenities whilst providing adequate day lighting and privacy distances.

In this instance, analysis shows the application building as lying approximately 13 metres away to the North of the nearest residential receptor of No. 2 Tithe Barn Cottages which in turn would not impede the provision of natural light or outlook to and from the neighbouring property respectively in the event of the application building being retained due to the adequate separation distance in place and solar orientation of the application building. In addition, analysis shows that all window openings serving habitable spaces within the proposed dwelling would solely provide views into the confines of the application site and as such would not compromise the privacy of the nearest neighbouring dwellings to the South-west of the application site. Accordingly, it is not considered that the proposal would be harmful to the amenity of any neighbouring residents. Having regard to the amenity of future occupants of the development, all habitable rooms within the proposed dwelling would be served by a sufficient quantity of window openings therefore future users of the dwelling would receive an adequate provision of natural light and outlook to support the proposed residential use.

Consequently, it is not considered that the proposed development would be harmful to the amenity of any neighbouring residents or future occupants of the proposed dwelling. The proposed development 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.’

In this instance, the application site comprises an elongated parcel of land which is largely void of any built form (save for the application building and a redundant greenhouse building), with the site having a distinct openness and agricultural character which forms part of the wider surrounding open countryside. As previously conveyed, the application building has been constructed largely in accordance with the development as approved under previous application 3/2018/0989 with respect to its proportions, design and external detailing, albeit with the exception of nominal changes to the building’s approved footprint / height proportions and roof materials (a corrugated metal roof has been constructed as opposed to a timber roof). Notwithstanding this, the application building has subsequently been subject to further alterations in the form of a timber decking area which has been

added to the front North-western elevation of the building. An incongruous and largely unsympathetic metal housing unit accommodating a solar panel battery and inverter has also been sited adjacent to the building's North-eastern side elevation, with the flat roof symmetry of this structure being noticeably at odds with the gabled roof profile of the application building. In addition, the proposal seeks to make further domestic alterations to the existing building which include the addition of stone cladding to all elevations of the building along with the introduction of a replacement tiled roof with solar panels, with the proposed introduction of a driveway, footpath, hardstanding and terraced steps (in place of the existing timber decking) all adding further urbanisation to the site. Furthermore, the unsympathetic metal housing unit accommodating the solar panel battery and inverter would be retained as part of the development, with the retention of this structure having a further harmful urbanising impact upon the agricultural character of the site.

Consequently, the proposed development, by virtue of the overtly domestic alterations proposed to the existing building along with the introduction of a driveway, footpath, hardstanding, terraced steps and retention of the existing metal housing unit would amount to an incongruous and unsympathetic form of development which would have a harmful urbanising impact upon the visual amenities of the application site and surrounding area. The proposal would therefore fail to satisfy the requirements of Paragraphs 135 (c) of the NPPF and Policies DMG1 of the Core Strategy.

Highways and Parking:

Concerns with regards to highway safety have been raised through the application's public consultation process however the proposed development has been subject to review by Lancashire County Council Highways who have raised no issues with the proposal with regards to access, parking provision or general highway safety. The LHA response recommends for the imposition of conditions in the event of planning consent being granted with respect to construction management and visibility splays. On this basis, it is not considered that the proposed development would have any undue impacts upon highway safety as such the proposal satisfies Policy DMG1 of the Core Strategy (highways).

Landscape/Ecology:

Trees

The proposed development would be sited within influencing distance of trees within the application site therefore an Arboricultural Impact Assessment has been submitted in support of the application. The submitted AIA confirms that no tree removal would be required to facilitate the proposed development however the report confirms that there would be a requirement to safeguard the root protection area of the trees within the site in the event of works of construction being undertaken to facilitate the proposal. Consequently, the proposed development raises no concerns with regards to its impact upon trees, subject to adherence with the tree protection measures specified within the submitted AIA which would need to be secured through the imposition of a condition in the event of any future planning consent being granted.

BNG

The application cites that the development is exempt from having to achieve the mandatory Biodiversity Net Gain requirement as it is a self-build application, however this would need to be secured with a legal agreement in order for the exemption to apply.

Other Matters:

Flood risk

Recently updated flood risk mapping (NaFRA2 - National Flood Risk Assessment 2) identifies the application site as being at risk of flooding from surface water therefore a Flood Risk Assessment has been provided in support of the application. In this instance, the submitted flood risk assessment identifies the annual probability of surface water flood risk within the site as falling within the 'very low' threshold (0.1% - 3.3% annual flood risk probability) with the accompanying FRA mapping showing the identified extent of surface water flood risk as being limited to the confines of Light Clough (a minor river which solely runs along the North-eastern perimeter of the application site away from the extent of the proposed development). Accordingly, the proposed development raises no significant concerns with respect to flood risk and the development is not required to satisfy the flood risk sequential test given that it forms the basis of a change of use.

Observations/Consideration of Matters Raised/Conclusion:

The proposed development, by virtue of the overtly domestic alterations proposed to the existing building along with the introduction of a driveway, footpath, hardstanding, terraced steps and retention of the existing metal housing unit would amount to an incongruous and unsympathetic form of development which would have a harmful urbanising impact upon the visual amenities of the application site and surrounding area. In addition, the application building is not considered to be structurally sound and capable of conversion for the proposed use without the need for extensive building and it is not considered that the application building provides a meaningful or positive contribution to its setting, nor is it considered to be worthy of retention or benefit from a genuine history of use for agriculture or other rural enterprise. Furthermore, the proposal site lies within the open countryside and fails to meet any of the relevant exceptions for permissible or sustainable development within such areas. The proposal therefore fails to satisfy the requirements of Policies DMH3, DMH4 DMG2 and DMG3 of the Core Strategy and as such is considered to be unacceptable in principle.

Furthermore, the proposed development, by virtue of the overtly domestic alterations proposed to the existing building along with the introduction of a driveway, footpath, hardstanding, terraced steps and retention of the existing metal housing unit would amount to an incongruous and unsympathetic form of development which would have a harmful urbanising impact upon the visual amenities of the application site and surrounding area. The proposal would therefore fail to satisfy the requirements of Paragraphs 135 (c) of the NPPF and Policies DMG1 of the Core Strategy.

As outlined above, in light of the Council's housing supply position, it is necessary to assess the proposal against Paragraphs 11 (d) (i) and (ii) of the Framework.

Having regard to Paragraph 11 (d) (i) of the NPPF (flat balance), Recently updated flood risk mapping (NaFRA2 - National Flood Risk Assessment 2) identifies the application site as being at risk of flooding from surface water, with sites at risk of flooding identified as areas of particular importance subject to protection under the relevant parts of the Framework (see footnote 7 of the NPPF). Notwithstanding this, and as previously conveyed, the proposed development raises no significant concerns with respect to flood risk and as such raises no measurable conflict with the provisions of Paragraph 11 (d) (i) of the NPPF.

Having regard to Paragraph 11 (d) (ii) (tilted balance), the Council considers Paragraphs 115 (a), 129 (c) and (d) and 135 (c) as being relevant to the development proposed under this application (see footnote 9 of the NPPF). As previously conveyed, the application building is not located within a sustainable location and future occupants of the proposed dwelling would be reliant upon the use of private motor vehicles to access services and facilities on a daily basis such as shops, schools and medical facilities. The proposal is therefore considered to be an unsustainable form of development and would therefore be in conflict with Paragraphs 115 (a) and 129 (c) of the NPPF, both of which seek to direct development towards sustainable locations. In addition, and as conveyed above, it is considered that the proposal would amount to an incongruous and unsympathetic form of development which would

have a harmful urbanising impact upon the visual amenities of the application site and surrounding area. The proposal would therefore also be in conflict with Paragraphs 129 (d) and 135 (c) of the NPPF which seek to maintain the prevailing character and setting of areas and ensure that developments are sympathetic to their surrounding built environment and landscape setting.

In light of the above, the limited benefits that would arise from delivering one additional dwelling to the Council's housing supply, and potentially (subject to an appropriate legal mechanism) one additional self-build dwelling, are not considered to outweigh the harm that would arise from the aforementioned Framework policy conflicts with regards to landscape / visual impact and sustainability. Consequently, the proposed development cannot be supported even through applying Paragraph 11 (d) (i) or (ii) of the Framework.

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

RECOMMENDATION:	That planning consent be refused for the following reason(s):
------------------------	---

- | | |
|------------|--|
| 01: | The site lies within the open countryside but the proposal fails to represent a suitable conversion as the building is not considered to be structurally sound and capable of conversion for the proposed use without the need for extensive building, is not considered to provide a meaningful or positive contribution to its setting, nor is it considered to be worthy of retention or benefit from a genuine history of use for agriculture or other rural enterprise. Furthermore, the rural and isolated location of the site means that future occupants of the development would be dependent on private motor vehicle to access nearby services and facilities. The proposal therefore fails to satisfy the requirements of Policies DMH3, DMH4 DMG2 and DMG3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and fails to provide a sustainable form of development in the terms of the National Planning Policy Framework. |
| 02: | The proposed development, by virtue of the overtly domestic alterations proposed to the existing building along with the introduction of a driveway, footpath, hardstanding, terraced steps and retention of the existing metal housing unit would amount to an incongruous and unsympathetic form of development which would have a harmful urbanising impact upon the visual amenities of the application site and surrounding area. The proposal would therefore fail to satisfy the requirements of Paragraphs 135 (c) of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policies DMG1 and DMG2 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy. |