



DEPOL

CHARTERED TOWN PLANNERS
established 1986

PLANNING STATEMENT

Dilworth Cottage, Longridge, PR3 2ZL



PLANNING STATEMENT

Dilworth Cottage

Longridge, PR3 2ZL

Description:

Demolition of an existing dwelling and the erection of a new dwelling, with the installation of flush solar panels.

Applicant:

Mr J Barton

Date:

December 2025



Planning Statement

Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction	3
Chapter 2: Site Description & Planning History	4
Chapter 3: Application Proposals	7
Chapter 4: Planning Policy Context	8
Chapter 5: Planning Assessment	10
Chapter 6: Conclusion.....	155



Chapter 1

Introduction

- 1.1. De Pol Associates Ltd are retained by Mr John Barton to progress, an application for the demolition of an existing dwelling and replacement with a new dwelling, together with associated development.
- 1.2. Approval is sought for the full planning permission for the works proposed.
- 1.3. This Planning Statement should be read in conjunction with the accompanying application documents as detailed on the submitted application form.



Chapter 2

Site Description & Planning History

Site Description

- 2.1. The site for the existing cottage is situated in its own garden, at the junction of Lower Road (B6243) and Ward Green Lane, approximately 2.6km east of the town centre of Longridge, Ribble Valley.
- 2.2. The existing cottage is situated at the west point of the plot (see Figure 1) but faces south into the plot with the principal elevation fronting the site. The rear elevation backs onto the northern boundary of the site and is separated from the carriageway of Lower Road by a small verge, the remainder of the northern boundary is formed by a dwarf stone wall separating the site from the road. To the east of the house is a two-storey garage and outbuilding with an external staircase providing access to the first floor.
- 2.3. The existing cottage is finished in stone with tightly fitted grey roof slates. The roof also incorporates two chimney stacks, one at each end of the property. The window frames are composed of UPVC and are fitted on stone windowsills. Timber fascia boards are fastened to the eaves, with end tiles fastened to the verges.
- 2.4. Internally the property was originally two cottages and as such has two staircases whilst a thick stone wall splits the internal space into two meaning that there is no connectivity between the first floor areas. It is also costly to heat with areas of the building unconnected.
- 2.5. The eastern and southern boundaries of the site are set behind a row of six trees which curve around the plot. Beyond the trees a hedge separates the site from the wider countryside. The western boundary is demarcated by a further stone wall which extends the full length of the boundary, save gated access from the house itself to the north to the site's southern point.
- 2.6. Access to the property is provided by a split gate which is set across the properties vehicular access from Ward Green Lane. The gate gives way to a driveway which extends up to the garage close to the site's northern boundary.

Figure 1: Existing Site – Aerial View & Plan



- 2.7. In addition to the vehicular access there is also a gated pedestrian access off of Ward Green Lane close to the front elevation of the property. This pedestrian gate leads to a path which provides direct access to the front door of the property.
- 2.8. To the north, south, and west of the site, there are enclosed fields, separated from the site by Lower Road, Ward Green Road, and the junction between the two, respectively.

Planning History

- 2.9. A previous application was refused for a replacement dwelling on 25 March 2025 referenced 3/2025/0039.
- 2.10. The council refused the application, providing two reasons for refusal. These are:
- The demolition of the existing dwelling and erection of the proposed replacement dwelling, by reason of its inappropriate size, scale, siting and design is considered to constitute a prominent addition to the site and would be harmful to the character and appearance of the rural, open countryside when compared to the size, scale and



appearance of the existing dwelling, contrary to policies DMG1 and DMG2 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and Policy LNDP3 of the adopted Longridge Neighbourhood Development Plan.

- There is insufficient information submitted within the application to determine the presence of bats within the site. In the absence of this information, the proposal fails to fully assess the impact on protected wildlife species, contrary to Policy DME3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017.



Chapter 3

Application Proposals

- 3.1. The application proposes the demolition of the existing cottage and its replacement with a new dwelling. Part of the rear wall of the cottage to Lower Road will be retained and used as a retaining wall whilst the detached two-storey garage will also be retained.
- 3.2. The replacement dwelling is proposed to be located in a similar position to the existing cottage but repositioned further into the site away from the north and west boundaries. The vehicular access will remain in its current position, as will the pedestrian access.
- 3.3. A tarmac driveway with spaces for in excess of two cars will be retained as part of the development with double gates. This will continue to provide direct vehicular access to the retained garage and provides sufficient space for a vehicle to enter turn and exit in forward gear.
- 3.4. The proposed cottage is two-storeys and finished in stone with roof slates. A chimney stack is proposed at the western end of the property adjacent to Ward Green Lane. Immediately to the rear of the house is buff-set patio with a permeable sandstone path surrounding the property.
- 3.5. Internally the new dwelling comprises: three bedrooms, two of which are ensuite, together with a family bathroom at first floor. At ground floor level is a dining room; lounge; utility room; craft room; hallway; and internal porch.
- 3.6. The proposal provides a modern home up to modern standards.
- 3.7. The proposed house will retain a reasonable sized garden to the south and east of the dwelling.



Chapter 4

Planning Policy Context

- 4.1. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004) requires planning applications to be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
- 4.2. In this instance, the Development Plan for Ribble Valley consists of:
- The Ribble Valley Core Strategy (CS)
 - Housing and Economic Development Development Plan Document (DPD)
 - The Longridge Neighbourhood Development Plan (NP)
- 4.3. The Core Strategy forms the strategic part of the development plan and was adopted on 16th of December 2014. The Housing and Economic Development DPD whilst part of the development plan does not include policies relevant to this application. The Neighbourhood Plan, approved on the 30th of April 2019, provides local policies specific to the Longridge area.
- 4.4. The key policies within the CS considered as part of this planning application are as follows.
- CS Policy DME1: Protecting Trees & Woodlands
 - CS Policy DME3: Site and Species Protection and Conservation
 - CS Policy DME4: Protecting Heritage Assets
 - CS Policy DMG6: Water Management
 - CS Policy DMG1: General Considerations
 - CS Policy DMG2: Strategic Considerations
 - CS Policy DMG3: Transport and Mobility
 - CS Policy DMH3: Dwellings in the Open Countryside & The AONB
 - NP Policy LNDP3: Infrastructure for New Development
- 4.5. Of the Neighbourhood Plan policy LNDP3 is of relevance.



- 4.6. Whilst not part of the development plan National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out the Government's planning policies for England and paragraph 2 of the document confirms that the NPPF is a material consideration in planning decisions.

- 4.7. Whilst the above are material matters in the assessment of this application this Statement seeks to respond directly to the reason for refusal associated with the previous application.



Chapter 5

Planning Assessment

- 5.1. The Council has acknowledged as part of the determination of the previous application that the principle of a replacement house on the application site is acceptable and accords with policy DMH3 of the Local Plan. As such it is the detail of the proposed house and in particular the previous reasons for refusal which are critical in the assessment of the application
- 5.2. As identified in Chapter 4 of this Statement the previous application was subject to two reasons for refusal. One in respect of planning matters and the second essentially identifying a lack of information in respect of ecological matters. The following seeks to respond to those issues directly and address the issues raised within the decision notice and associated officer report.

Reason for Refusal 1

- 5.3. The first reason for refusal states:
- The demolition of the existing dwelling and erection of the proposed replacement dwelling, by reason of its inappropriate size, scale, siting and design is considered to constitute a prominent addition to the site and would be harmful to the character and appearance of the rural, open countryside when compared to the size, scale and appearance of the existing dwelling, contrary to policies DMG1 and DMG2 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and Policy LNDP3 of the adopted Longridge Neighbourhood Development Plan.*
- 5.4. The reason for refusal clearly outlines the policies and the reasons why the previously proposed development is not considered to comply referencing size, scale, siting, and design. Each of these points are considered below in terms of how the revised proposal addresses those specific matters.

Size and Scale

- 5.5. The application proposal has reduced the size of the house from that which was previously refused. The previous dwelling was for a three-storey house with a ridge height of extending to nine metres. This application proposes a two-storey house with a ridge height of 7.46 metres.



The existing house is two-storey and has a ridge height of 6.933 metres. As such the proposal would increase the height of the house by 53 centimetres or eight percent.

- 5.6. In terms of footprint, the existing dwelling extends to 113sqm, whilst the proposed development has an identical footprint of 113sqm. Overall the proposed development has a total floor area across two floors of 217sqm. The existing dwelling has a total floor area, again across two floors, of 188sqm. therefore has the same footprint as the existing house whilst the total increase in floorspace equates to 29sqm or a 15 percent increase.
- 5.7. As demonstrated above the application proposal has responded to the matter of scale and size. It is considered that the proposed development is not materially larger than the house it replaces nor is it of a scale and size which should be considered unacceptable.

Siting

- 5.8. The application proposal seeks the siting of the proposed house in a slightly different location of the existing house and is the same as that of the previous application. The Officer's report identifies that the underlying reason for refusal is the perceived prominence of the proposed dwelling from Ward Green Lane. However, it is considered, now that the proposed scale of the house has been reduced, that there is no material impact regarding scale or prominence.
- 5.9. The existing house is visible from Ward Green Lane and furthermore it directly abuts the highway via the attached store building. The application proposal relocates the dwelling to the east, away from the carriageway reducing its visibility and prominence from the road. As such any approach from the south along Ward Green Lane is unlikely to notice any material change in perceptions of built form on the site and ultimately the re-siting of a house in the location proposed will result in reduced impact on approach.
- 5.10. The siting of the house has potential highways visibility benefits for the Lower Road / Ward Green Lane junction. In assessing the previous application the Highways Authority acknowledge that the existing arrangement at the junction is sub-standard, as such any improvement is a clear and demonstrable benefit of the scheme. The proposed 1.1 metre high retaining wall identified on the submitted plans does not achieve the standard but still results in a significant improvement, particularly when the ride position of modern cars is accounted for. Notwithstanding the proposed 1.1 metre high wall Highways Officers consider that the matter



could be conditioned to ensure visibility is delivered. As such, and notwithstanding previous comments from highway, any improvement in highways safety can only be considered to be positive.

- 5.11. The relocation of the proposed house from the boundary with Lower Road also has the benefit of reducing the prominence of built form along this stretch of road, enhancing the character and appearance of the countryside from the site onto the road.
- 5.12. In respect of siting, it is considered that the proposal is wholly acceptable and provides a development which improves the character and appearance of surrounding roads as a result.

Design

- 5.13. In design terms the proposed dwelling utilises a palette of materials which are common to the local area and has sought to replicate the materials used on the exiting property. These are stone walls with a slate roof.
- 5.14. In the assessment of the refused application officers raised concern about the height of the gable roof projection together with the two-storey bay window. Officers considered that this bay was not a common feature of the local area. In response to this, the height of the gable roof projection has dropped in line with the overall reduction in height of the building. The previously proposed two-storey bay window has been eliminated entirely and replaced with a traditional window at first floor and patio doors at ground floor.
- 5.15. The officer report also raised concerns about second floor windows on the gable wall adding to the dominance over Ward Green Lane. The reduction in height of the building and removal of this half-storey addresses this concern and remove the perceived impact of these windows.
- 5.16. Overall, it is considered that this proposal addresses the concerns raised by the council previous first reason for refusal. The reduction in height and scale of the building, coupled with the changes to design elements, provides a house which is in keeping with the local area whilst also providing enhanced visibility at the adjacent junction.

Reason for Refusal 2



- 5.17. The second reason for refusal related to a lack of information in relation to the presence of bats on the site. In response to this matter, the applicant has prepared a bat assessment following necessary surveys to support the application which confirms that the site can be safely developed without unacceptable impact on bats.
- 5.18. The application proposal addresses this reason for refusal and there is no conflict with policy DME3 of the Local Plan.

Other Relevant Matters

Access & Car Parking

- 5.19. Policy DMG1 and DMG3 require adequate car parking to be delivered as part of any development. The proposed plans would provide a permeable driveway and at least two car parking spaces.
- 5.20. The number of car parking spaces provided, together with access and egress arrangements (the driveway layout), are unchanged from those proposed as part of the previous application. The Highways Authority raised no concerns with the previous proposal on these matters and, given that there is no material change there is no reason the proposal should be unacceptable in this regard.

Flood Risk

- 5.21. Policy DME6 prohibits development where there is an unacceptable risk of flooding.
- 5.22. The site is located in Flood Zone 1 and as such has the lowest risk of flooding. The site is not identified as being at the risk of surface water flooding now or in the future and as such the proposed development complies with the requirements of CS Policy DME6.

Sustainability

- 5.23. Policy DMG1 requires developments to incorporate sustainable design elements.
- 5.24. The proposed development integrates sustainable energy generation as part of the development, incorporating solar panels flush into the roof as identified on the submitted plans. Furthermore, the proposal incorporates air source heat pumps to provide for the heating of the property.



- 5.25. The existing house is inefficient and as identified earlier is formed by two former cottages which meets that the way the property has been constructed with a thick stone wall through the middle makes it difficult to improve its efficiency requiring two staircases and the inefficiency of such as not having heat transference between rooms. The proposal will provide a modern house which will provide a more efficient and more sustainable home than that which currently exists on the site.
- 5.26. This is evidence that the proposed plan has integrated sustainability into its design, in accordance with Policy DMG1.

Environment

- 5.27. Policy DME1 restricts the felling of broad-leaved woodlands and trees with a “*visual, botanical and historical value*”.
- 5.28. The site contains eight Category B and six Category C trees, according to the tree survey performed in November 2024 by Treestyle Consultancy Ltd. Of the trees marked for removal in this plan, all are Category C trees except for one Category B tree.
- 5.29. The trees proposed to be removed are the same as those proposed as part of the previous application. There were no objections previously to their removal following assessment by the Council’s Tree Officer. As such it is accepted that the proposal will not result in the loss of trees of significant value as per Policy DME1.



Chapter 6

Conclusion

- 6.1. Full permission is sought for the demolition and replacement of the existing Dilworth Cottage.
- 6.2. The principle of development is valid under Policy DMH3, which permits the replacement of rural dwellings, according to criteria. The application meets this criteria proposing a property not significantly larger than that existing, utilising materials which are common to the locality. The siting of the dwelling improves visibility at the adjacent highway junction and reduces its prominence from public view points.
- 6.3. The application is supported by a full bat assessment which confirms that the development can proceed without unacceptable risk to bats.
- 6.4. As demonstrated by this statement the proposed development has been prepared in the setting of the Council's previous reasons for refusal and has responded directly to them. The proposal is considered to comply with the Development Plan and permission should be granted without delay.