


Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.

Signed:	Officer:	BT	Date:	25/3/26	Manager:	LH	Date:	31/3/26
----------------	-----------------	----	--------------	---------	-----------------	----	--------------	---------

Application Ref:	3/2026/0065			 Ribble Valley Borough Council www.ribblevalley.gov.uk
Date Inspected:	N/A	Site Notice:	11/2/26	
Officer:	BT			
DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:				REFUSAL

Development Description:	Change of use of existing holiday let accommodation to a local needs occupancy residential dwelling. Regularisation of construction of a domestic kitchen.
Site Address/Location:	Holiday let adjacent to Clough Farm, Catlow Road, Slaidburn, BB7 3AQ.

CONSULTATIONS:	Parish/Town Council
Slaidburn and Easington Parish Council:	Consulted 10/2/26 – no response received.

CONSULTATIONS:	Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies
LCC Highways:	No objections subject to conditions.
LCC PROW:	Consulted 10/2/26 – no response received.

CONSULTATIONS:	Additional Representations.
One letter of support has been received in relation to the proposal.	

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 EN2: Landscape Key Statement DMI2: Transport Considerations Policy DMG1: General Considerations Policy DMG2: Strategic Considerations Policy DMG3: Transport and Mobility Policy DMH3: Dwellings In The Open Countryside & The AONB Policy DMB5: Footpaths And Bridleways</p> <p>National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)</p>
<p>Relevant Planning History:</p> <p>3/2025/0168: Change of use of existing holiday let accommodation to a residential dwelling. Regularisation of construction of a domestic kitchen (Refused)</p>

3/2023/0453:

Certificate of Lawfulness for existing use of holiday let as permanent dwelling contrary to condition 4 of planning permission 3/1991/0710 (conversion of redundant barn to holiday flats) and S106 Agreement dated 26 March 1993 (Refused)

3/1991/0710:

Conversion of redundant barn to holiday flats (Approved)

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

The application relates to a barn building situated on the Northern outskirts of Slaidburn. The barn forms part of the farmstead at Clough Farm with access to the farmstead being from Catlow Road from the East. The barn building has been previously extended by way of a mono pitch side extension on its South-eastern gable end. The residential property of Clough Farm and numerous agricultural buildings lie immediately to the South-east of the barn. The surrounding area comprises a mixture of woodland, agricultural land and open countryside with the proposal site lying within the Forest Of Bowland National Landscape.

Proposed Development for which consent is sought:

Planning permission was granted for the conversion of the application building for use as a holiday let property under planning application ref: 3/1991/0710. The application's supporting information states that the applicant has utilised the holiday let accommodation as unrestricted residential accommodation since 2016. In addition, a single storey kitchen extension has since been added to the South-eastern side elevation of the application building. The current application seeks consent for a change of use of the existing holiday let accommodation for use as local needs housing and for the retention of the unauthorised single storey kitchen extension.

Principle of Development:

Key statement DS1 of the Ribble Valley Borough Council Core Strategy sets out the spatial vision for the Borough as follows:

The majority of new housing development will be:

- concentrated within an identified strategic site located to the South of Clitheroe towards the A59; and
- the principle settlements of:
 - Clitheroe;
 - Longridge; and
 - Whalley

In the 23 remaining Tier 2 Village settlements, which are the less sustainable of the 32 defined settlements, development will need to meet proven local needs or deliver regeneration benefits.

The site lies outside of any settlement boundary and therefore KS DS1 does not offer any policy support to the development.

Policy DMG2 of the Core Strategy states:

Within the tier 2 villages and outside the defined settlement areas development 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*

Policies DMG2 supports development outside of settlement boundaries for development which is essential to the social well-being of the area, or for local needs housing which meets an identified need and is secured as such. Similarly, criterion 1 of DMH3 supports residential development which meets an identified local need.

In this instance, the holiday let accommodation subject to the proposed change of use lies approximately 3.5 kilometres outside of the defined settlement area of Slaidburn within the open countryside. The application's supporting information states:

'The proposed scheme is essential to the social wellbeing of the area. The development is for local needs housing and which meets an identified need and is secured as such.'

In terms of justification for the above assertion, numerous letters of support have been provided as part of the application submission which make reference to a lack of affordable housing within the immediate area of the application site, falling numbers of children in the area's local primary school due to absence of nearby affordable housing, the reliance of local shops and services upon custom from local residents and details of the applicant's employment which is undertaken locally within the Bowland Fells area.

Whilst it is accepted that the applicant and his family taking up permanent residence within the application property would offer some contribution towards the social wellbeing of the area (i.e. through the ties that would be retained between the applicant and the local community), it is not considered that this arrangement would be *essential* to the social wellbeing of the area given the limited benefits that would be derived from one household. Whilst the application is offering a Section 106 agreement to restrict the dwelling to 'local occupancy', even if such details of what this means in practice were set out, this is not considered to meet the policy test of 'essential'.

In order to satisfy the policy requirement for local need housing then it must be demonstrated to fall into the category of affordable housing. The application states that the applicants will enter into a S106 agreement to restrict the occupancy to individuals who meet the criteria for local occupancy. At a time when the property is either sold or rented a valuation will be carried out to establish a market value and an agreed discount will be applied to be agreed with the Council in line with their acceptable rates. The National Planning Policy Framework Glossary illustrates the various types of affordable housing. Within the Ribble Valley any discount sale properties in rural areas would need to be discounted by 60% of the market rate in order to be considered affordable. In the absence of any details of proposed rates it is not possible to conclude at this stage that the development would fall into the category of affordable housing.

Therefore as the proposal does not fall into the category of 'essential to the social wellbeing of the area' or 'local needs housing' then it cannot benefit from the policy support towards housing offered by policy DMG2 and DMH3.

It is also acknowledged that Policy DMH3 (and in turn Policy DMH4) allows for the 'appropriate conversion of buildings to dwellings' but the proposal represents a change of use, not a conversion of an existing building as the application building has already been converted to residential use by virtue of the development approved and implemented under application 3/1991/0710. Therefore this part of policy

DMH3 and the provisions of Policy DMH4 (The Conversion of Barns and other Buildings to Dwellings) are not applicable in this instance.

Policy DMH3 goes on to state that the creation of a permanent dwelling by the removal of any condition that restricts the occupation of dwellings to tourism / visitor use or for holiday use will be refused on the grounds of unsustainability. Whilst the application does not seek to remove conditions the effect of granting full planning permission for a change of use to a residential dwelling would result in the same outcome / policy conflict.

Taking account of the above, the proposal would fail to satisfy Key Statement DS1 and Policies DMG2 and DMH3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.

Policy DMG3 seeks to support development proposals which are well related to the primary road network and can be accessed by sustainable transport modes. This is in line with one of the overarching objectives of the NPPF to encourage sustainable development and in turn reduce reliance on private motor vehicles. In this instance, the application property lies within the open countryside and is not located within a sustainable location.

The imposition of a restrictive condition placed on planning consent 3/1991/0710 currently limits use of the application property to short-term holiday let accommodation which is considered to be a more sustainable use in the context of the application property's open countryside location. In contrast, the proposed change of use would result in an intensified use of the application property whereby future occupants of the property 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 application's supporting information asserts that a continued use of the application property as holiday let accommodation as previously approved would amount to a less sustainable use by virtue of the potential for multiple families and couples to simultaneously utilise the site (each with their own vehicles), and by virtue of multiple trips that are often undertaken by such groups throughout the course of a single day. Whilst this is acknowledged, it is important to note that such patterns of use associated with the holiday let accommodation are periodic (with this being secured by way of restrictive occupancy conditions) and would therefore still amount to more sustainable use overall relative to an unrestricted residential use of the application property which in contrast would allow for a continuous daily flow of comings and goings without periods of cessation. Consequently, the proposal would amount to an unsustainable development by virtue of introducing an unrestricted residential use within an open countryside location and as such would fail to satisfy the requirements of Policy DMG3 or the NPPF.

For the above reasons the proposal is therefore unacceptable in principle.

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.

In this instance, the application building lies approximately 50 metres away to the North-west of Clough Farm therefore it is not considered that an unrestricted residential use of the barn building and retention of the unauthorised side extension as proposed would compromise the amenity of the adjacent neighbouring residents with respect to any loss of privacy, natural light or outlook. Further analysis shows that all habitable rooms within the application building currently receive an adequate provision of natural light to support the unrestricted residential use proposed by virtue of the existing window openings in place.

Consequently, it is not considered that the proposed development would be harmful to the amenity of any neighbouring residents or future occupants utilising the application building as unrestricted residential accommodation. 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.’*

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

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

The above is reiterated within Key Statement EN2 of the Core Strategy:

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

In this instance, a single storey extension has been added to the South-eastern gable end of the converted barn building. The unauthorised extension comprises a sizeable footprint relative to the footprint of the original barn, with its depth spanning along the large majority of the barn building's South-eastern elevation and roof slope extending up to the second floor window cill of the barn's primary bedroom. In addition, the North-eastern end of the unauthorised extension's roof slope projects above the barn's cat-slide roof which in turn has necessitated the creation of a dividing parapet wall which reads as a somewhat asymmetrical and incongruous feature within the context of the barn's principal elevation. In terms of justification for retaining the unauthorised extension, the application's supporting information makes reference to the extension having been modelled in the style of a 'drag shippon' commonly found in the Lancashire / Yorkshire area. Notwithstanding this, the extension in question reads as an overtly domestic addition (as opposed to being agricultural in character as stated) with its proportions dominating the South-eastern side of the traditional stone building. As such, the unauthorised extension, by virtue of its depth, footprint, height, bulk and massing reads as an unsympathetic, over dominant and incongruous addition to the traditional barn building.

Consequently, it is considered that retention of the unauthorised extension would be harmful to the historic and rural character of the host property and for this reason it is not considered that the retention of this structure would enhance or conserve the visual amenities of the immediate or wider landscape. The proposal would therefore fail to satisfy the requirements of Paragraphs 135 (C) and 189 of the NPPF and Key Statement EN2 and Policies DMG1 and DMG2 of the Core Strategy.

Highways and Parking:

LCC Highways have reviewed the proposal and have raised no issues with the proposed development with respect to access, parking or general highway safety. The LHA have made a request for conditions to be imposed in the event of approval of the proposal with regards to parking and turning facilities and cycle storage provision. Consequently, 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:

BNG

The development is exempt from having to achieve the mandatory Biodiversity Net Gain requirement as it is subject to the de minimis exception and forms the basis of retrospective development.

Other Matters:

Flood Risk

Recently updated flood risk mapping (NaFRA2 - National Flood Risk Assessment 2) identifies sections of the access track to the application site as being at risk of flooding from surface water therefore a Flood Risk Assessment and associated flood risk mapping data have been provided in support of the application. In this instance, the submitted Flood Risk Assessment and accompanying data show that occurrences of surface water flooding would be limited to two areas on the site's access track where small ditches are

culverted, with these areas having a minimal annual flood risk probability (3.3%). Furthermore, an additional section of the site's access track (to the West of the two aforementioned sections) comprises an even lower threshold of annual flood risk probability from surface water flooding (0.1%). 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 change of use would amount to the introduction of unjustified residential accommodation into the defined open countryside contrary to Key Statement DS1 and Policies DMG2 and DMH3 of the Core Strategy. The proposed development does not fall within the remit of a genuine affordable housing scheme as such it cannot be considered local needs housing nor would it be essential to the social well-being of the area. Furthermore, the dwelling would not be in a sustainable location for housing as future occupants would be dependent on private motor vehicle and as such the proposal fails to satisfy the sustainability objectives of the NPPF and Policy DMG3 of the Core Strategy. Therefore the principle of a residential development in this rural location is in conflict with the Core Strategy and NPPF.

Moreover, it is considered that retention of the unauthorised extension would be harmful to the historic character of the host property and for this reason it is not considered that the retention of this structure would enhance or conserve the visual amenities of the immediate or wider landscape. The proposal would therefore fail to satisfy the requirements of Paragraphs 135 (C) and 189 of the NPPF and Key Statement EN2 and Policies DMG1 and DMG2 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), the application site lies within a National Landscape (Forest Of Bowland) which are identified as areas of particular importance subject to protection under the relevant parts of the Framework (see footnote 7 of the NPPF), with Paragraph 189 being relevant to this particular consideration. In this instance, it is not considered that the retention of the building's unauthorised extension would enhance or conserve the visual amenities of the immediate or wider landscape. Retention of the unauthorised development would therefore be in conflict with Paragraph 189 of the NPPF which states that great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (now National Landscapes). This conflict effectively means that the flat balance should be applied and it is not necessary to go on to consider Paragraph 11 (d) (ii). However, for completeness the LPA will go on to consider this.

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 property is not located within a sustainable location and the proposed change of use would result in an intensified use of the application property whereby future occupants of the property 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 not considered that the retention of the building's unauthorised extension would enhance or conserve the visual amenities of the immediate or wider landscape. 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 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 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 reasons:

- | | |
|------------|--|
| 01: | The proposed development, by virtue of the barn building's isolated and unsustainable location, means that future residents would be dependent on private motor vehicle on a daily basis to access key services and facilities, as such the site is unsuitable for housing and the proposal fails to represent sustainable development. This is in conflict with Policy DMG3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and the sustainability objectives contained in the Framework including paragraphs 110 and 115. |
| 02: | Retention of the unauthorised extension would be harmful to the historic and rural character of the host building and for this reason it is not considered that the retention of this structure would enhance or conserve the visual amenities of the immediate or wider landscape. The proposal would therefore fail to satisfy the requirements of Paragraphs 135 (C) and 189 of the National Planning Policy Framework and Key Statement EN2 and Policies DMG1 and DMG2 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy. |