


**Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.**

<b>Signed:</b>	<b>Officer:</b>	<b>MC</b>	<b>Date:</b>	<b>04/02/2026</b>	<b>Manager:</b>	<b>LH</b>	<b>Date:</b>	<b>5/2/26</b>
----------------	-----------------	-----------	--------------	-------------------	-----------------	-----------	--------------	---------------

<b>Application Ref:</b>	3/2025/0965			 Ribble Valley Borough Council <a href="http://www.ribblevalley.gov.uk">www.ribblevalley.gov.uk</a>				
<b>Date Inspected:</b>	07/01/2026	<b>Site Notice:</b>	07/01/2026					
<b>Officer:</b>	MC							
<b>DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:</b>					<b>REFUSAL</b>			

<b>Development Description:</b>	Proposed extension of agricultural building to form machinery storage and regularisation of existing hard standing (part retrospective).
<b>Site Address/Location:</b>	Land off Longridge Road Hurst Green BB7 9QP

<b>CONSULTATIONS:</b>	<b>Parish/Town Council</b>
<p>Aighton, Baily and Chaigley Parish Council object to the proposal raising concerns with regards to the necessity of a further extension given the Officer's report on a similar proposal under 3/2025/0134. They do not consider the proposed building reasonably necessary for the purpose of agriculture.</p> <p>They consider that whilst the applicant states that the machinery is currently stored outside and would be better stored in a covered building, this does not justify the erection of a building of such size and scale.</p> <p>The Parish Council would support any valid planning objections raised by residents.</p>	

<b>CONSULTATIONS:</b>	<b>Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies</b>
<b>LCC Highways:</b>	The LHA do not raise any objection to the proposal on highway grounds. An informative regarding obstructing the PROW is suggested.

<b>CONSULTATIONS:</b>	<b>Additional Representations.</b>
No additional representations have been received.	

<b>RELEVANT POLICIES AND SITE PLANNING HISTORY:</b>
<p><b>Ribble Valley Core Strategy:</b></p> <p>Key Statement DS1: Development Strategy Key Statement DS2: Sustainable Development Key Statement EN2: Landscape</p> <p>Policy DMG1: General Considerations Policy DMG2: Strategic Considerations Policy DMG3: Transport &amp; Mobility Policy DME2: Landscape And Townscape Protection</p> <p><b>National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)</b></p>
<b>Relevant Planning History:</b>

**3/2025/0811**

Prior notification for proposed roof over existing silage clamp 13.72m long, 10m wide, 6.6m high to ridge and 5.2m high to eaves under Part 6 Class A of the GDPO.

Refused

**3/2025/0425**

Prior approval of an extension to existing agricultural building for hay and straw.

Permission not required

**3/2025/0134**

Proposed general purpose agricultural storage building for feed and machinery and extension to hardcore track 13.72m long, 10m wide, 4.6m high to eaves and 6m high to ridge.

Refused

**3/2025/0135**

Approval of details reserved by condition 3 (materials) of planning permission 3/2024/0853.

Approved with Conditions

**3/2024/0853**

Proposed agricultural building. Regularisation of works to existing access and access track.

Approved with Conditions

**3/2023/0030 (At Grindlestone House Farm)**

Proposed open fronted silage clamp.

Approved with Conditions

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

The application site comprises an area of agricultural land located just less than 1.3 kilometres to the west of the settlement of Hurst Green. The area is predominantly rural in character and the site is located within the Forest of Bowland National Landscape (formerly Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty). The site is accessed off a Public Bridleway from Longridge Road and a track has been created with hardcore, leading to an existing agricultural livestock barn granted under planning ref: 3/2024/0853. The building has also been extended under planning ref: 3/2025/0425 for the storage of hay and straw.

**Proposed Development for which consent is sought:**

The proposed development is for an extension to the existing agricultural building for the storage of agricultural machinery and retrospective planning permission for existing hardstanding located to the north-west of the existing building. The proposed extension would be approximately 6m in width, approximately 10m in depth and would match the height of the existing building at approximately 6m in height. The total width of the building would be approximately 24.29m. The materials of construction of the extension would match the existing agricultural building.

**Principle of Development:**

The site is not located within a defined settlement boundary and as such Policy DMG2 is of relevance.

Policy DMG2 states that within the Tier 2 villages and outside the defined settlement areas development must meet a number of criteria. This includes development that is needed for the purposes of forestry or agriculture.

As such, an assessment must be made as to whether the proposed building is reasonably necessary for the purposes of agriculture. Through the submission of a number of previous planning applications at the site, the Council are aware that the farmstead forms part of Grindlestone House Farm which includes a number of fields and buildings located to the south of the B6243.

The submitted supporting statement indicates that the extension to the existing building is required to form a machinery store. In addition, the proposal is for the regularisation of the existing hardstanding that has been laid in front of and adjacent to the building. The proposed extension would store grassland machinery which includes a tedder, fertiliser spreader and mower which were previously being stored in an unauthorised building which has since been removed from the site.

It should be noted that the applicant has previously applied under a prior approval application for an additional agricultural building immediately adjacent to the approved building to store machinery and equipment. This application was refused and the delegated report stated the following:

*“Whilst there may be a benefit of having a small feed store at the site, the main site at Grindlestone House Farm is located 570m away and is not considered to be of such a distance that machinery could not be transported to and from the site when required. The applicant has failed to justify the size of the proposed barn for the storage of machinery. Whilst the applicant states that the machinery is currently stored outside and would be better stored in a covered building, this does not justify the erection of a building of such size and scale. As such, both the proposed barn and access track are not considered reasonably necessary for the purposes of agriculture.”*

The justification for the scheme is that there is no storage space for equipment at Grindlestone House Farm for the machinery and equipment to be stored. They also argue that keeping the machinery on site would save time and journeys during harvest and keeping the machinery and equipment in a secure store would reduce the risk of it getting damaged when open to the elements. The applicant also states that the land which would be stored at the site is solely used to farm the 32 acres block of land known as Hud lee.

Having regard to the above, it is still not considered that the application has been supported by sufficient evidence and justification that the building is reasonably necessary for the purposes of agriculture. Whilst there may be some benefits to storing the equipment in a building rather than outside the applicant has failed to justify the size of the extension to the barn for the amount of equipment required to be stored. The extension to the building would not be for the storage of large tractors and as such, it is not considered that the building would be required to be of such a height. In addition, whilst the equipment may be used for this land and the applicant states that there is not sufficient storage at the main farm, the applicant has not provided any information to support this statement in terms of photographs or information in relation to the type and number of buildings at the main farmstead.

With regards to the access track, the applicant considers this to be essential for accessing the existing livestock building for daily feeding, bedding up and mucking out as well as for livestock feeders. They consider that without the hardstanding, over the winter months, the ground would easily become poached which would make vehicle access unsafe. They consider that vehicle access is necessary to transport feed and bales from the building to feeders. They also consider that the size of the hardstanding provides a wide area for tractors to enter the field. When the Planning Officer visited the site recently, it was noted that the area located immediately to the southeast of the existing building has been laid with rubble and sand, as well as an area to the west of the building and up to the northwest of the building, approximately 11m beyond the proposed extension.

The Council do not consider that the level of hardstanding is justified. No information has been submitted in relation to the number and size of the proposed feeders that are required to be kept on hardstanding and it is unclear as to why two large areas of hardstanding is required, immediately in front of the building. There is an existing access into the field to the south-west of the existing agricultural building and there appears to be fencing in part along the north-western site boundary to provide a separation between the field and the

paddock. As such, even if the Council were to consider part of the hardstanding acceptable, closest to the existing field access gate, the remainder of the hardstanding is not considered reasonable necessary for the purposes of agriculture and in accordance with Policy DMG2 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and can be secured by way of planning condition to be used for the purposes of agriculture.

In addition, the site lies within both the Forest of Bowland National Landscape and therefore in making a decision the Local Planning Authority should give weight to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Landscapes which have the highest status of protection in relation to these issues in accordance with Paragraph 188 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

#### **Impact Upon Residential Amenity:**

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

The existing building is already sited approximately 68 metres from the closest residential receptor (Shireburn Barn Farm Annexe). The extension to the existing building and hardstanding would be sited further away from the residential properties than the current building. Granting this consent would result in agricultural machinery being stored at the site more frequently or permanently, however this is not considered to adversely affect the occupiers of neighbouring properties by way of excessive noise or odour pollution beyond the existing agricultural activities.

As such, the proposal accords with Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.

#### **Visual Amenity/External Appearance:**

Key Statement EN2 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy states that:

*'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.'*

*'The landscape and character of those areas that contribute to the setting and character of the Forest of Bowland Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty will be protected and conserved and wherever possible enhanced.'*

*'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.'*

In addition, Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy states that development must *'not adversely affect the amenities of the surrounding area'* and *'consider the density, layout and relationship between buildings, which is of major importance'*.

Policy DMG2 also states that in the AONB *'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'*.

Policy DMG2 also states that the AONB Management Plan should be considered and will be used by the Council in determining planning applications.

Paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that planning decisions should ensure that development:

- a) will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development;
- b) are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping;
- c) are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities)

It is considered that the proposed extension and existing hardstanding would result in a change to the character of the rural landscape. It should be noted that the Council have already approved an existing extension to the building under planning ref: 3/2025/0425, resulting in the total length of the building being approximately 18.29m. The proposed extension would extend this by a further 6 metres to 24.29m. The Council have refused a second agricultural building immediately adjacent to the existing barn, resulting in a total length of approximately 27.44m. The delegated report stated:

*“The proposed building is to be located on a parcel of land that is currently void of any structures as the extant permission granted under planning ref: 3/2024/0853 has not yet been constructed. The proposed building would be within close proximity to a Bridleway and would be in a visually prominent position from the Bridleway. Whilst an agricultural building of this size in isolation may be acceptable, cumulatively, the extent of built form which would result from the proposed and approved agricultural buildings is considered to result in harm to the landscape character within the Forest of Bowland National Landscape by way of loss of openness and additional bulk and massing with a total length of approximately 27.44m if both buildings were to be implemented.”*

The long-term vision for the National Landscape within the AONB Management Plan is *“The Forest of Bowland landscape retains its sense of local distinctiveness, notably the wide open moorland character of the Bowland Fells, undulating lowland farmland, clough woodlands, traditional buildings and the settlement patterns of its villages, hamlets and farmsteads.”*

The management plan also notes that some of the challenges within the Forest of Bowland National Landscape include traditional agricultural buildings becoming redundant and replaced with large, modern buildings as well as the construction of new tracks in open countryside for farming, forestry and moorland management purposes. Whilst it is considered that the erection of new agricultural buildings and tracks are inevitable to allow the modern farming to function adequately, development within the Forest of Bowland National Landscape is required to be sensitively designed and to contribute to the conservation of the natural beauty of the area.

It is considered that a further extension to the building would add bulk and mass to an existing moderately sized agricultural building within the Forest of Bowland National Landscape. The siting of the extension would result in a building of such a size that is considered to result in harm to the special qualities of the Forest of Bowland National Landscape by way of loss of openness and additional bulk and massing. As previously stated, the Council have only recently approved an additional extension to the building and any further extensions would visually detract from the rural landscape which is visible from the Public Bridleway and long-distance views from the Public Footpath which runs to the south of Adamson House.

In addition, the additional hardstanding is considered to result in a harmful urbanising impact and erosion of the rural landscape, without clear justification, failing to protect or conserve the special qualities of the Forest of Bowland National Landscape.

As such, the development is contrary to Key Statement EN2 and Policies DMG1 and DMG2 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.

**Highways and Parking:**

Paragraph 116 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that *'Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network, following mitigation, would be severe, taking into account all reasonable future scenarios'*.

With regards to parking, Policy DMG3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy states that:

*All development proposals will be required to provide adequate car parking and servicing space in line with currently approved standards.*

Policy DMG1 also states that 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.*

Some concerns by a neighbour have been raised regarding the location of the barn as the private track which serves the bridleway is used by walkers and cyclists.

The Local Highway Authority (LHA) have been consulted on the application and raise no objection to the scheme on highway safety grounds. They consider the extension to unlikely increase traffic movement within the site and along the private access track and are of the opinion that the proposal would have a negligible impact on the surrounding network.

They suggest an informative is added to any decision notice to advise the applicant that the Bridleway, (BW0303005) must not be obstructed.

As such, the proposal accords with Policies DMG1 and DMG3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.

**Landscape/Ecology:**

Turning to whether the proposal is required to achieve a 10% Net-Gain in Biodiversity (BNG), the application has been accompanied by a Biodiversity Net-Gain Statement whereby the applicant considers that the proposed building would cover an area of existing stone hardcore and no land within the red line boundary is habitat as classified in the UK Habitat Classification. As such, the applicant believes BNG does not apply. In addition, they believe BNG does not apply as the scheme is retrospective.

Firstly, only part of the scheme is considered to be retrospective (hardstanding) as the building has not been extended yet. Notwithstanding this, when the Planning Officer has recently visited the site, it was noted that the area where the extension to the building is proposed is covered by crushed stone and sand. The laying of sand to create the access track/hardstanding is retrospective and therefore exempt from mandatory BNG.

**Observations/Consideration of Matters Raised/Conclusion:**

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

<b>RECOMMENDATION:</b>	That planning consent be refused for the following reason(s):
<b>01:</b>	The applicant has failed to demonstrate a justifiable need for the hardstanding and proposed extension to the existing agricultural building. As such, it is not considered that the development is reasonably necessary for the purposes of agriculture in this instance as per the requirements of Policy DMG2 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.

**02:**

The proposed extension by reason of its size, scale and siting would result in the loss of openness and additional bulk and mass within the site. In addition, the hardstanding would result in a harmful urbanising impact and erosion of rural landscape, both of which would fail to protect, conserve or enhance the landscape and character of the Forest of Bowland National Landscape, contrary to Key Statement EN2 and Policies DMG1 and DMG2 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.