


Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.

Signed:	Officer:	MC	Date:	31/03/2026	Manager:	LH	Date:	7/4/25
----------------	-----------------	-----------	--------------	-------------------	-----------------	-----------	--------------	---------------

Application Ref:	3/2025/0891			 <p>Ribble Valley Borough Council www.ribblevalley.gov.uk</p>
Date Inspected:	22/01/2026	Site Notice:	22/01/2026	
Officer:	MC			
DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:				APPROVAL

Development Description:	Conversion of a Former Public House to provide 3.no Dwellings to include the creation of new access points, landscaping, demolition of single storey rear extensions and erection of new single storey rear extension and window/door alterations and additions.
Site Address/Location:	Former White Bull Hotel 257 Preston Road Longridge PR3 3BJ

CONSULTATIONS:	Parish/Town Council
No objection	

CONSULTATIONS:	Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies
LCC Highways:	No objection subject to conditions
RVBC Countryside Officer:	The Countryside Officer notes that the bat survey was not undertaken in optimal time of May to September.
RVBC Environmental Health Officer:	Recommends conditions relating to sound insulation, control of dust/fumes/vibration/noise and construction hours/delivery restrictions. No objection to the proposed sound insulation which would be covered by Building Regulations.

CONSULTATIONS:	Additional Representations.
No additional representations received.	

RELEVANT POLICIES AND SITE PLANNING HISTORY:
<p>Ribble Valley Core Strategy:</p> <p>Key Statement DS1: Development Strategy Key Statement DS2: Sustainable development Key Statement DMI2: Transport Considerations Key Statement EN5: Heritage Assets</p> <p>Policy DMG1: General considerations Policy DMG2: Strategic considerations Policy DMG3: Transport and Mobility Policy DME1: Protecting Trees And Woodlands Policy DME2: Landscape And Townscape Protection Policy DME3: Site and Species Protection and Conservation Policy DME4: Protecting Heritage Assets Policy DME6: Water Management Policy DMH3: Dwellings in the Open Countryside and AONB</p>

Policy DMB1: Supporting Business Growth and the Local Economy

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Adopted Longridge Neighbourhood Development Plan:

Policy LNDP3: Longridge Design Principles

Policy LNDP6: Landscape

Policy LNDP10: Protecting Existing Community Assets

Relevant Planning History:

3/2017/0484

Erection of single storey extension to rear of premises
Approved with Conditions

3/2003/0174

SINGLE STOREY SIDE EXTENSION FORMING NEW DINING ROOM. SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSIONS FORMING KITCHEN & TOILET FACILITIES AND CELLAR (RESUBMISSION)
Approved with Conditions

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:

Site Description and Surrounding Area:

The application site comprises a vacant public house located in the area of Alston, Longridge. The site is not located within the defined settlement boundary and is located within the Open Countryside designation and within the adopted Longridge Neighbourhood Plan Area. The immediate vicinity of the site is predominantly rural in character with residential dwellings to the East of the site and fields to the South. Access to the site is from the West off Preston Road.

The building is considered to be a non-designated heritage asset (NDHA).

Proposed Development for which consent is sought:

The proposed development is for the conversion of an existing, vacant public house to 3 no. dwellings. The residential units would comprise 2no. two storey dwellings (three bedrooms) and 1 no. single storey dwelling which would occupy the existing single storey side projection (three bedrooms). Each of the dwellings would have its own access point off Preston Road with a driveway and parking for 2 no. vehicles. Following comments from the Local Highway Authority, the proposal also includes the re-instatement of the pedestrian footpath. A visibility splay plan has also been provided.

With regards to alterations to the building, to the front elevation, a new front door and first floor window would be inserted to the two-storey part of the building. To the single storey element, the existing doors would be replaced with windows. To the north-east (side) elevation, a new ground floor window would be inserted to serve a bathroom. The existing single storey rear extension would be demolished and replaced with a mono-pitched roof single storey extension. The extension would serve the proposed kitchen and dining areas of the two storey dwellings. The height of the proposed extension would be approximately 3.8m with an eaves height of approximately 2.8m. In addition, the extension would extend nearly the full width of the two-storey part of the dwelling and would have a depth of just over 3.6 metres. The roof of the extension was originally proposed to have a concrete tile roof.

With regards to external alterations, the proposed external walls of the building are proposed to be rendered in a silicone render and all new windows are proposed in uPVC heritage grain windows. The agent has confirmed that the existing timber windows would also be replaced with uPVC windows.

Principle of Development:

Spatial Strategy

Key Statement DS1 relates to new housing development and seeks to direct new housing development within an identified strategic site and the principal settlements of Clitheroe, Whalley and Longridge in addition to Tier 1 Villages which are the more sustainable of the Borough's 32 defined settlements. The same policy also requires development within the Borough's remaining 23 Tier 2 Village settlements to meet proven local needs or deliver regeneration benefits.

Notwithstanding the above, also of relevance to the proposed development are Policies DMH3, DMH4 and DMB1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy which relates to the conversion of buildings to dwellinghouses.

Firstly, taking into account the conversion of the existing pub, Policy DMH3 states that:

"Within areas defined as Open Countryside or AONB on the proposals map, residential development will be limited to:

1. development essential for the purposes of agriculture or residential development which meets an identified local need. In assessing any proposal for an agricultural, forestry or other essential workers dwellings a functional and financial test will be applied.

2. the appropriate conversion of buildings to dwellings providing they are suitably located and their form and general design are in keeping with their surroundings. Buildings must be structurally sound and capable of conversion without the need for complete or substantial reconstruction.

3. the rebuilding or replacement of existing dwellings subject to the following criteria:

- the residential use of the property should not have been abandoned.*
- there being no adverse impact on the landscape in relation to the new dwelling.*
- the need to extend an existing curtilage."*

With regards to criterion 2 of DMH3, whether or not the proposal amounts to an 'appropriate' conversion and is 'suitably located' leads to the engagement of policy DMH4 and requires a consideration of the proposal against that policy.

Policy DMH4 states that:

"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 already 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:

- 1. 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. The council will require a structural survey to be submitted with all planning application of this nature. this should include plans of any rebuilding that is proposed;*
- 2. 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, and*
- 3. 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*
- 4. the building has a genuine history of use for agriculture or another rural enterprise.”*

Criterion 1 of Policy DMH4 stipulates that buildings subject to residential conversion must be situated within a defined settlement or form part of an existing group of buildings and not read as isolated within the surrounding landscape. The site is located adjacent to residential dwellings. As such, it is not considered that the site is in an isolated location. The site is accessed off Preston Road which is a main road into the town. As such, the building is suitably located.

Turning to Criterion 2 of Policy DMH4, given that the building is an existing public house. It is not anticipated that there is any unnecessary expenditure with regards to installation of services and infrastructure.

With regards to Criterion 4 of Policy DMH4, it is noted that the building has been marketed for over 12 months (further details are set out below). The applicant considers that the redevelopment and subsequent loss of the employment site would have limited economic and social impacts on the Borough and Longridge, as the premises has not operated as a Public House since its closure in late 2023. Furthermore the marketing evidence shows there has been little interest in prospective buyers purchasing the property as a business. As such, given that the property has been vacant for a number of years, with marketing evidence provided, it is not likely that the conversion would result in a detrimental effect on the rural economy.

The acceptability of the scheme against Criteria 3, 5 and 6 of Policy DMH4 shall be assessed later in this report.

With regards to the Core Strategy policies, lastly, Policy DMB1 is also applicable which states that:

“Proposals for the development, redevelopment or conversion of sites with employment generating potential in the plan area for alternative uses will be assessed with regard to the following criteria:

- 1. The provisions of policy DMG1 and*
- 2. The compatibility of the proposal with other plan policies of the LDF and*
- 3. The environmental benefits to be gained by the community, and*
- 4. The economic and social impact caused by loss of employment opportunities to the Borough, and*
- 5. Any attempts that have been made to secure an alternative employment generating use for the site (must be supported by evidence (such as property agents details including periods of marketing and response) that the property/ business has been marketed for business use for a minimum period of six months or information that demonstrates to the council’s satisfaction that the current use is not viable for employment purposes.)”*

Sites with “Employment” generating potential are taken as sites with potential for employment under classes E(g), B2 and B8.

With regards to compliance with Policy DMB1, criteria 1-3 shall be assessed later in this report. With regards to criteria 4, given that the property has been vacant for a number of years it is not likely that the conversion would result in a detrimental effect on the rural economy. With regards to criterion 5, marketing evidence has been submitted showing attempts to secure an alternative ‘employment’ use have been unsuccessful.

The current owners of the property have undertaken an extensive marketing campaign with the property and associated land have been on the market with Trevor Dawson for over 15 months, with the marketing process beginning on 12th September 2024. The report details that the site was originally listed with an asking price of £575,000. The report highlights that a detailed marketing campaign including marketing sales particulars, the erection of commercial boards on site and inclusion of the site on the Trevor Dawson website, Rightmove and Zoopla, has been carried out, all of which are currently on going. As well as this, the site has been shared on social media and to an extensive number of individuals via the Trevor Dawson email database. Throughout this exercise the site has been viewed online via the Trevor Dawson website 1,542 times, via Zoopla 1,298 times and via Rightmove 987 times. There have been 18 in person viewings of the property throughout this marketing exercise, with potential intended uses from potential buyers including a restaurant, residential development, care use and community uses. However, these viewings have resulted in no reasonable offers for the site. In January 2025, the asking price was reduced to entice interest and a further reduction took place in May 2025 following little interest. No further viewings were arranged following this and the report concludes that there has been very little interest in the site, with feedback provided by the license and leisure sector highlighting the challenges in operating a profitable business from public houses and restaurants within semi-rural locations.

The report states that Trevor Dawson is of the opinion that the sustainability of the site as a public house and/or restaurant is not viable and alternative uses for the site should be considered.

It should be noted that the existing pub is designated within the adopted Longridge Neighbourhood Development Plan as a protected community building (building no. 25 within Policy LNDP10). This Policy states that the community facilities are fundamental to developing and maintaining Longridge as an attractive place for residents and visitors alike and will be protected for community use. This Policy also states the following:

“Development leading to an adverse impact on these facilities will only be permitted as an exception where the proposal would bring defined and demonstrable benefits, including equivalent, or better, provision is made elsewhere for the community”.

This is considered to align with Paragraph 88 of the NPPF which allows for decision to retain accessible community facilities including public houses.

The proposal would not result in the provision of an alternative equivalent or better community facility elsewhere within Longridge or the surrounding areas. As such, there is direct conflict with this policy and a further assessment shall be made in the planning balance section of this report.

Sustainability

Separate from the spatial strategy assessment, an assessment must also be made as to whether the site is sustainable.

Key Statement DMI2 states that:

“New development should be located to minimise the need to travel. Also it should incorporate good access by foot and cycle and have convenient links to public transport to reduce the need for travel by private car.”

Policy DMG3 requires considerable weight to be attached to the availability and adequacy of public transport and associated infrastructure to serve those moving to and from the development. This is consistent with the NPPF which requires development proposals to promote sustainable transport.

The site is located outside of the defined settlement boundary of Longridge. Whilst there is a frequent bus service into the town of Longridge and also to Preston, the sustainable location of a site is not only assessed by suitable access to public transport but also if occupiers are able to access key services on foot. The site is

located approximately 0.8 metres to the South of the settlement boundary of Longridge (approximately 31 minute walk to Berry Lane). There are limited key service and facilities within the vicinity of the site and it is considered that users would likely travel by car to access these key services and facilities. As the site is not considered to be sustainably located, this weighs against the proposal.

Housing Supply

The most recently published five-year housing land supply figure for the Ribble Valley (base date of 31st March 2025) indicated that Ribble Valley Borough Council has a housing land supply of 6.2 years. However, a recent appeal decision (appeal ref: APP/T2350/W/25/3372635) has found that the Council no longer have a Five-Year Housing Land Supply and the housing supply is calculated to be 3.45 years.

The consequence of not having a 5YHLS is that paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF is engaged in the decision-making process. On this basis the restrictive approach toward new housing development outside of settlements must be considered to be out-of-date.

Specifically for decision taking this means if the most relevant Local Plan policies for determining a planning application are out of date (such as when a 5YHLS cannot be demonstrated), 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*

In terms of areas or assets of particular importance referred to at subsection i) above, these are identified as habitats sites and/or designated as Sites of Special Scientific Interest; land designated as Green Belt, Local Green Space, or a National Landscape, irreplaceable habitats; designated heritage assets (and other heritage assets of archaeological interest...); and areas at risk of flooding or coastal change. Whilst the building is considered to be a NDHA, the application site is not affected by any such areas or assets outlined above and as such, this subsection does not apply.

In which case the tilted balance should be applied and sub section ii) of Para 11d) requires the LPA to consider whether the adverse impacts of the development would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. This will be discussed later in this report.

Heritage and Visual Amenity/External Appearance:

In assessing the proposal, regard must be given to the statutory duties imposed on the authority in respect of the preservation and enhancement of such assets. In this respect, at a local level, Key Statement EN5 and Policy DME4 are primarily, but not solely, engaged for the purposes of assessing likely impacts upon designated heritage assets resultant from the proposed development.

Key Statement EN5 states that:

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

This will be achieved through:

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

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

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

National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024):

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

With regards to more general design/visual amenity policies, paragraph 135 (c) of the NPPF states:

‘Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting’.

Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy provides additional general design guidance as follows:

‘All development must be sympathetic to existing and proposed land uses in terms of its size, intensity and nature as well as scale, massing and style...particular emphasis will be placed on visual appearance and the relationship to surroundings, including impact on landscape character.’

Policy DMG2 also states that:

‘Within the open countryside development will be required to be in keeping with the character of the landscape and acknowledge the special qualities of the area by virtue of its size, design, use of materials, landscaping and siting. Where possible new development should be accommodated through the re-use of existing buildings, which in most cases is more appropriate than new build.’

Policy LNDP3 of the adopted Longridge Neighbourhood Development Plan states:

“All new development proposals will only be supported when they are of good design that responds positively to the local character and distinctiveness of the surroundings.”

The building is considered to be a NDHA due to its age and community value. The public house is noted on historic maps from 1882 as ‘White Bull Inn’. The site is not located within a conservation area but nonetheless is considered to have heritage value.

The proposal would involve a number of alterations to the fenestration of the property, including the creation of a new front door adjacent to the existing main pub door. The existing door would be retained

but two new composite doors would be inserted to provide access to units 2 and 3. It is considered that these doors are overly modern in appearance and detract from the traditional features of the historic pub. As such, it would be reasonable to secure alternative doors by way of condition. Turning to window alterations, a new first floor window to the front elevation would be added to match the existing which is considered acceptable. In addition, two new uPVC windows would be added to the front elevation of the existing single storey element, as well as a new uPVC window to the north-east (flank) elevation as well as two new sliding patio doors to the rear elevation of the single storey element.

These are considered to be acceptable and the applicant has confirmed that they intend on using heritage grain uPVC windows which would help preserve the historic building. Given that the pub is not listed, nor is it in a conservation area, heritage wood grain effect uPVC windows would be acceptable and the Council would not object to the loss of existing timber windows provided the heritage wood grain effect uPVC are high quality (which can be secured by planning condition).

The building would be rendered using a silicone render. Whilst this may result in some harm to the designated heritage asset, given the presence of existing render to the property, this would not result in any detrimental harm to the visual appearance of the building or surrounding area and should be balanced against the preservation of the building.

The Council welcome the retention of the existing open front porch which is a prominent feature of the building and would help preserve the significance of the NDHA. In addition, the creation of new parking spaces to the front of the site, with the addition of some new soft landscaping is considered to be a visual improvement to the surrounding landscape and the removal of the wooden pergola is welcomed. It is considered that any new boundary treatments along the boundary with the B6243 and within the site itself can be secured by way of planning condition. In addition, the specification for the proposed bin stores can also be secured by way of planning condition. The location of the bin stores appear to be suitable, with units 1 and 3 being sited to the rear/sides of the building and unit 2 being sited at the front of the site, adjacent to an existing boundary treatment.

The proposal also includes the demolition of an existing single storey rear extension and the replacement with a new mono-pitched roof extension. The extension would have a depth of approximately 3.6m, extending the full width of the two-storey part of the building. The extension would have an eaves height of approximately 2.8m and a total height of 3.8m. Concrete tiles are proposed to the roof rather than slates. It was queried with the agent whether slates could be used to match the main building. However, it was considered that due to the roof pitch, slates would not be viable. Given that due to the roof design and location it would not be highly visible from the public realm, subject to a condition securing a sample of the roof tiles, this would be acceptable. The extension would constitute a subservient addition to the main building and is considered to be of an appropriate size and scale.

Overall, it is considered that the conversion of the public house to 3 no. residential dwellings would result be acceptable. The conversion would retain the majority of the character of the NDHA and an alternative door design can be secured by way of planning condition. Overall, whilst the conversion would result in some harm to the significance of the non-designated heritage asset, through the installation of silicone render and new window additions, the harm is not considered to harm the significance of the non-designated heritage asset. In addition, the benefit of securing a viable use of the NDHA is considered to weigh in favour of the proposal and would result in visual improvements to the site and the overall surrounding area.

As such, the proposal is considered to accord with Key Statement EN5, Policies DMG1, DMG2 and DME4 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy, Policy LNPD3 of the adopted Longridge Neighbourhood Plan and the NPPF.

Impact Upon Residential Amenity:

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

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

The proposal would utilise the existing building with the erection of a replacement single storey rear extension. The main impact on residential amenity would be on the occupiers to the North and East of the site along Alston Lane, in particular views into the rear gardens/primary living accommodation of 'Selwyn', 'The Oaks', 'Ingleton'. Given the separation distances of first floor rear windows by over 25m, this would not result in any adverse overlooking into primary living accommodation. In addition, there would be no first floor side facing windows which would overlook the occupiers of no. 255 Preston Road. In addition, the single storey part of the building that is located to the northern part of the site would not be significantly changed nor would it result in any increase in height so there would not be any increase in overshadowing, overbearing impact or loss of light that would adversely affect the occupiers.

In addition, Policy LNDP3 of the adopted Longridge Neighbourhood Development Plan also states that proposals should:

"Have no significant adverse impact on residential amenity for existing and future residents".

The Environmental Health Officer has requested that the applicant provides the details of sound insulation and materials proposed to ensure that internally generated noise from the dwellings would not impact on any of the adjoining dwellings and would be covered by Building Regulations.

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

Highways and Parking:

Ribble Valley Core Strategy Policy DMG3 states that:

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

In addition, Policy DMG1 states that all development must:

1. *consider the potential traffic and car parking implications.*
2. *ensure safe access can be provided which is suitable to accommodate the scale and type of traffic likely to be generated'.*

The Local Highway Authority has been consulted on the application and re-consulted on amended drawings following initial comments raising concerns with visibility splays and the access points.

They note that the proposal includes 3 new shared vehicle and pedestrian access points onto Preston Road, with each dwelling having its own access to a parking area. Residential access points must measure at least 3.2m wide to support vehicle and pedestrian movement. The LHA previously request that visibility splays be provided at each access point using data taken from a 7 day Automatic Traffic Count which was undertaken in 2024. The applicant has provided splays within drawing number 7074 P05 and nothing shall be erected, retained, planted and / or allowed to grow at or above a height of 0.9 metres above the nearside carriageway level where the visibility splays cross over land which falls within the applicant's ownership. The implementation of a 2m footway fronting the site will also provide additional space to allow vehicle to position themselves in good view of traffic on Preston Road before entering the carriageway in comparison to the current arrangements. They consider that amendments to the highway will be required to reinstate the existing access point and for footway provisions to be placed along the site frontage. As well as for the

creation of 3 new access points in line with the plans provided. This work will be required to be undertaken as part of a Section 278 Agreement with Lancashire County Council.

Due to the intensification of pedestrian movement linked with the proposed residential development of the site, the LHA expects that a 2m footway is provided across the frontage of the entire site, including the area within the blue edge. Currently, there is limited pedestrian facilities fronting the site and they consider that a segregated provisions would create a safer environment for pedestrians. As footway provisions on the right end to the south of the site and cannot be tied into existing provisions to the north due to the positioning of neighbouring properties and limited carriageway widths to accommodate a continuous footway, the LHA require a pedestrian crossing and refuse island to be provided linking the new footway to the existing provisions on the opposite side of the road. The footway and crossing provisions on both sides of the road shall be in line with inclusive mobile guidance and be supported by tactile paving. The footway provisions and crossing point also provides linkage to bus stops situated along Preston Road. This can be secured by way of a Section 278 Agreement with Lancashire Country Council.

The closest northbound and southbound bus stops are located adjacent to and opposite, the site. However, there are localised constraints associated with the location of these bus stops, which prevent any improvements from being made. Therefore, the LHA require these bus stops to be relocated adjacent to and opposite the dwelling named "Rose Villa," were, as a minimum, bus border kerbing should be provided. As such, the LHA request that the relocation of these bus stops and any highway improvements which improve pedestrian connectivity to and from the site are secured under a Section 278 agreement.

No objections are raised with regards to the parking provision for each dwelling, which following amendments is now considered to be acceptable.

As such, the proposal is considered to accord with Policy DMG1 and DMG3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.

Landscape/Ecology:

The Countryside Officer has been consulted on the application and notes that the bat survey was undertaken outside of the optimal time of May to September and recommends another survey be undertaken in the optimal period. However, the report concluded that the lack of evidence and lack of potential access points or crevices in this building indicates that the removal of the rear outshots will not impact adversely on any local bat population by removing any roost potential or by disrupting any potential commute forage routes. As such, the report states that it is highly unlikely that any bats will be uncovered or disturbed during the demolition and emergence surveys would not be required nor a requirement for a mitigation scheme.

It is therefore considered that an informative to advise the applicant of what to do in the presence of bats should be added to any grant of permission rather than undertaking additional surveys due to the likely presence of bats.

The applicant within the submitted application form considers that the proposal would fall within the 'di minimis' as the development would result 18sqm of on-site habitat loss.

With regards to Biodiversity Net-Gain, the applicant considers that the development falls within the 'di minimis' exemption. Drawing ref: 7074-P06 has been provided which identifies that approximately 18.84sqm of on-site habitat would be lost. It should be noted that the proposed development includes additional habitat creation through the planting of new grass and trees. Having regard to the submitted details, it can be reasonably concluded that the proposal would result in the loss of less than 25sqm of on-site habitat.

The site has a number of trees within its boundaries which would be retained. Whilst some of the works would be within the root protection area of the trees to the northern boundary (patio areas), these trees are within the site boundaries and are not protected by Tree Protection Order.

Other Matters:

Policy DME6 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy states that:

'Development will not be permitted where the proposal would be at an unacceptable risk of flooding or exacerbate flooding elsewhere.

Applications for development should include appropriate measures for the conservation, protection and management of water such that development contributes to:

- 1. preventing pollution of surface and / or groundwater*
- 2. reducing water consumption*
- 3. reducing the risk of surface water flooding (for example the use of sustainable drainage systems (suds)) as a part of the consideration of water management issues, and in parallel with flood management objectives, the authority will also seek the protection of the borough's water courses for their biodiversity value.*

All applications for planning permission should include details for surface water drainage and means of disposal based on sustainable drainage principles. the use of the public sewerage system is the least sustainable form of surface water drainage and therefore development proposals will be expected to investigate and identify more sustainable alternatives to help reduce the risk of surface water flooding and environmental impact'.

Having regard to the above policy, whilst the scheme is for a conversion of an existing building, it would include the creation of new access and parking areas which have the potential to increase flood risk. As such a drainage strategy should be secured by a pre-commencement condition, should permission be granted.

Conclusion and Planning Balance:

As identified earlier in this report, the Council are unable to demonstrate a Five Year Housing Land Supply (5YHLS).

The NPPF at paragraph 11d) states that a presumption in favour of sustainable development means 'where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, granting permission unless the proposal conflicts with the policies of the Framework relating to the protection of assets or areas of importance or the adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the 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.

The NPPF at paragraph 11d) footnote 7 identifies a number of protected areas of particular importance. However, it is not considered that the site falls within any of the areas identified in footnote 7.

As such, the tilted balance therefore applies and the proposal must be assessed against paragraph 11d) ii and a balancing exercise must be undertaken.

There are some benefits that would arise from the scheme. The granting of this permission would provide a small contribution to the Council's housing stock, although as the permission is for 3 dwellings only, this would not represent a significant gain in stock or significant contribution towards the Council's 5YHLS. As such, only moderate weight would be given to this benefit. There would also be the benefit of consumer expenditure in the area, construction jobs and supporting the building industry supply chain. Given the

development is only for three dwellings these benefits are considered to carry limited weight. Other benefits include re-using an existing, vacant building and sustaining the future of a NDHA building.

In identifying the harm, paragraph 11d) section ii) requires the LPA to have particular regard to key policies for directing development to sustainable locations, and for the reasons outlined within this report, it is considered that the granting of this permission would result in the creation of residential development in an unsustainable location.

Additionally, the conversion of the building to residential would be in direct conflict with the adopted Longridge Neighbourhood Plan it would result in the loss of a community facility, without the provision of an alternative elsewhere. However, the applicant has provided marketing evidence which demonstrates that there is little interest in continuing to use the property for a use which services the community. Furthermore the pub has been vacant for some time. This conflict therefore carries limited weight in this case.

In this case it is considered that the harm identified would not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of development in this case, as such with all matters considered, this application is recommended for approval.

RECOMMENDATION:

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