


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

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

<b>Application Ref:</b>	3/2026/0073			 Ribble Valley Borough Council <small>www.ribblevalley.gov.uk</small>
<b>Date Inspected:</b>	11/2/26	<b>Site Notice:</b>	11/2/26	
<b>Officer:</b>	BT			
<b>DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:</b>				<b>APPROVAL</b>

<b>Development Description:</b>	Conversion of a redundant barn to an affordable local needs occupancy residential dwelling. Installation of a package treatment unit.
<b>Site Address/Location:</b>	Poor Parts Barn, Hellifield Road, Bolton-By-Bowland, BB7 4LU.

<b>CONSULTATIONS:</b>	<b>Parish/Town Council</b>
<b>Bolton-by-Bowland, Gisburn Forest &amp; Sawley Parish Council:</b>	Consulted 10/2/26 - no response received.

<b>CONSULTATIONS:</b>	<b>Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies</b>
<b>LCC Highways:</b>	Further information requested with regards to achievable visibility splays.
<b>LCC Archaeology:</b>	No objections.
<b>CONSULTATIONS:</b>	<b>Additional Representations.</b>
Six letters of support have been received in relation to the proposal.	

**RELEVANT POLICIES AND SITE PLANNING HISTORY:**

**Ribble Valley Core Strategy:**

- Key Statement DS1: Development Strategy
- Key Statement DS2: Sustainable development
- Key Statement EN2: Landscape
- Key Statement DMI2: Transport Considerations
- Policy DMG1: General considerations
- Policy DMG2: Strategic considerations
- Policy DMG3: Transport and Mobility
- Policy DME3: Site and Species Protection and Conservation
- Policy DMH3: Dwellings In The Open Countryside And AONB
- Policy DMH4: The Conversion Of Barns And Other Buildings To Dwellings

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

**Relevant Planning History:**

**3/1998/0235:**

Outline application to convert barn to agricultural workers dwelling (Refused)

**BO1861:**

Conversion of barn to dwellinghouse (Refused, dismissed at appeal)

**BO1470:**

Erection of dwellinghouse (Refused)

**BO1350:**

Proposed conversion of barn to house (Refused, dismissed at appeal)

**ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:**

**Site Description and Surrounding Area:**

The application relates to a traditional barn building located on the North-eastern outskirts of Bolton-By-Bowland within the Forest Of Bowland National Landscape. Access to the application site is from Hellifield Road via an existing field access. The barn building proposed for conversion occupies a 'T' shaped footprint with its materiality consisting of stone walls, timber doors and slate roof tiles with its cart entry feature facing to the South-east. The application site occupies a remote location with the nearest residential property of Spring Head Farm lying approximately 350 metres away to the North of the site. The wider area comprises a mixture of woodland, agricultural land and open countryside.

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

Planning consent is sought for the residential conversion of the site's barn building to form a three bedroom dwelling. Additional works proposed include soft and hard landscaping to form an associated domestic curtilage area.

**Principle of Development:**

The proposal site lies outside of a defined settlement within the Forest Of Bowland AONB (now National Landscape). Criterion 2 of Policy DMH3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy allows for the appropriate conversion of buildings to dwellings within the AONB providing they are suitably located and their form and general design are in keeping with their surroundings. The same policy stipulates that buildings must be structurally sound and capable of conversion without the need for complete or substantial reconstruction.

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

Policy DMH4 of the Core Strategy states:

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

- 1. The building is not isolated in the landscape, i.e. it is within a defined settlement or forms part of an existing group of buildings, and*
- 2. There need be no unnecessary expenditure by public authorities and utilities on the provision of infrastructure, and*
- 3. There would be no materially damaging effect on the landscape qualities of the area or harm to nature conservations interests, and*
- 4. There would be no detrimental effect on the rural economy, and*

*5. The proposals are consistent with the conservation of the natural beauty of the area*

*6. That any existing nature conservation aspects of the existing structure are properly surveyed and where judged to be significant preserved or, if this is not possible, then any loss adequately mitigated.*

*The building to be converted must:*

*- Be structurally sound and capable of conversion for the proposed use without the need for extensive building or major alternation, which would adversely affect the character or appearance of the building;*

*- Be of a sufficient size to provide necessary living accommodation without the need for further extensions which would harm the character or appearance of the building –*

*- The character of the building and its materials are appropriate to its surroundings and the building and its materials are worthy of retention because of its intrinsic interest or potential or its contribution to its setting, and*

*The building has a genuine history of use for agriculture or another rural enterprise.*

In this instance, access to the converted barn building would be via the site's existing field access from Hellifield Road, with foul water being dealt with by way of package treatment plant which would be installed at the applicant's own expense. As such, it is not anticipated that the residential conversion of the barn would warrant any unnecessary expenditure by public authorities or utilities on the provision of infrastructure. The proposal would therefore satisfy the requirements of criteria point 2 of Policy DMH4.

The barn building subject to the proposed conversion is not currently in agricultural use and does not form part of a working farmstead therefore it is not anticipated that the proposed conversion of the barn building would have any detrimental impact upon the rural economy. The proposal would therefore satisfy the requirements of criteria point 4 of Policy DMH4.

A preliminary roost assessment and emergence survey work have been provided in support of the application, with the emergence survey work showing that the proposed development could be undertaken without any undue harm to protected species, subject to the acquisition of a European Protected Species License and through adhering to appropriate mitigation strategies. The proposal would therefore satisfy the requirements of criteria point 6 of Policy DMH4.

A structural survey has been provided in support of the application which shows the structural integrity of the barn to be in generally good condition and capable of supporting the proposed residential conversion, subject to some small scale rebuilding work. The proposal would therefore satisfy criteria point 6-1 of Policy DMH4 and the structural requirements of Policy DMH3.

No extensions are proposed to the barn building to be converted and analysis of the proposed plans submitted in support of the application shows that the barn building comprises sufficient space to accommodate the proposed residential conversion. The proposal would therefore satisfy the requirements of criteria point 6-2 of Policy DMH4.

The character of the barn and its materiality reflect the vernacular of rural farm buildings in the locality which contribute to the setting of the surrounding Forest Of Bowland National Landscape therefore the barn building in question is considered to be worthy of retention. The proposal would therefore satisfy the requirements of criteria point 6-3 of Policy DMH4.

A heritage statement has been provided in support of the application which comprehensively documents the agricultural origins of the barn and surrounding site and in light of this it is clear that the barn benefits from a genuine history of use for agriculture. The proposal would therefore satisfy the requirements of criteria point 6-4.

Notwithstanding the above, criteria point 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. In this instance, the barn building in question is sited within an open countryside location well outside of the defined settlement area of Bolton-By-Bowland. In addition, the barn building is not sited in close proximity to any other buildings and remains the sole form of built development within the application site. As such, the barn building reads as a predominantly isolated structure within the surrounding landscape therefore the residential conversion of this building is considered to be in conflict with criteria point 1 of Policy DMH4.

Moreover, Policy DMH3 carries a requirement for all buildings being converted to residential use to be in keeping with their surroundings with respect to their form and general design. Similarly, criteria points 3 and 5 of Policy DMH4 and its additional criteria require proposals to be consistent with the conservation of the natural beauty of the area without causing undue harm to the visual amenities of the surrounding landscape. In this instance, the proposed conversion would involve the introduction of several new window and door openings to the historic barn building, with only one existing opening utilised as part of the proposed works. Several of the barn's historic openings would also be obscured and infilled as part of the proposed conversion with several of the proposed window, door and rooflight openings not serving habitable rooms. Furthermore, the proposed site plan submitted in support of the application denotes a sizeable area of domestic curtilage area to serve the proposed dwelling with this encroaching well into the agricultural fields well beyond the South-western building line of the barn. Moreover, the application property occupies an isolated location in full public view from Hellifield Road therefore the visual impact of the proposed development would be pronounced (the visual impact of the proposed development is assessed in further detail in the report's 'Visual Amenity/External Appearance' section).

Policy DMG3 of the Core Strategy also requires decision taking to consider the availability and adequacy of public transport and associated infrastructure to serve those moving to and from new developments. This is consistent with the NPPF which requires development proposals to promote sustainable transport. Due to the rural location of the application site future occupants of the dwellings would likely be reliant on the use of private motor vehicles and this weighs against the proposal.

Consequently, it is considered that the proposed scheme of residential conversion, by virtue of the barn building's isolated and unsustainable location, fenestration, loss of historic building fabric, closure and obscurement of historic openings and encroachment into the surrounding open countryside would constitute an incongruous and unsympathetic form of development that would detract from the historic character of the barn building and visual amenities of the area. Accordingly, the proposed development fails to satisfy criteria points 1, 3 and 5 of Policy DMH4, the form, design and locational requirements of Policy DMH3 and provisions of Policy DMG3.

For the above reasons the proposed development is considered to be unacceptable in principle.

#### Local Needs Housing

Policies DMG2 supports development outside of settlement boundaries 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. The application's supporting information states that the proposed development relates to local occupancy housing, but 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's supporting information states that there is an intention to rent the converted barn building at an affordable rent (80% of open market value) to a young family. The National Planning Policy Framework requires affordable housing for rent schemes to meet all of the following conditions:

*(a) the rent is set in accordance with the Government's rent policy for Affordable Rent, or is at least 20% below local market rents (including service charges where applicable);*

*(b) the landlord is a registered provider, except where it is included as part of a Build to Rent scheme (in which case the landlord need not be a registered provider); and*

*(c) it includes provisions to remain at an affordable price for future eligible households, or for the subsidy to be recycled for alternative affordable housing provision.*

It is stated that there is an intention to rent the property at an affordable rent (80% of open market value), however the Council's recently published Affordable Housing Needs Assessment (May 2025) states:

*'The affordable rent model effectively increases social rent to the higher level of up to 80% of market rent, and this shift in tenure provision by increasing the rental values is considered to affect working households the most. Challenges with affordability including heightened new-build prices support the fact that a 20% discount from open market value does not make the property affordable to those in affordable housing needs in the borough and therefore, unless a viability case is made, it is not an affordable housing product we would accept as addressing housing needs. As such the strategy is for the Council to always seek to ensure that the rent is within the LHA rates to ensure the properties are affordable.'*

Analysis shows the weekly Local Housing Allowance rate for three bedroom properties within the Ribble Valley as ranging between £116 and £149 however no information has been provided to demonstrate that the converted property would be rented within this threshold. Property search analysis (Zoopla) and the applicant's own research show monthly rental rates of £900 and £1400 PCM respectively for properties in nearby Gisburn which in turn indicates that the intention to rent the converted barn property at 80% of the local market rent rate in the area would be well outside of the aforementioned LHA rates for the Ribble Valley. Consequently, the proposed development is not considered to fall within the remit of a genuine affordable housing scheme.

In this instance, the application's supporting information states that the converted barn building would be managed by a housing association of the Council's choosing or a letting agent, both of whom would be registered providers. However in the absence of any agreement being secured, and given the remoteness of the site and the likely pushback from a register provider in wanting to manage the property, the proposal fails to meet the requirements of condition (b).

The application's supporting information states that the applicant would enter into a Section 106 legal agreement to ensure the property remains as affordable in perpetuity however as set out above the 80% rental of open market value is not considered affordable, as such the proposal fails to meet the requirements of condition (c).

Therefore as the proposal does not fall into the category of affordable housing then it cannot benefit from the policy support towards local needs housing.

#### 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 barn building to be converted for residential use occupies a remote location at considerable distance from the nearest neighbouring property of Spring Head Farm. As such, it is not considered that the residential use proposed for the barn building would be harmful to the amenity of any neighbouring residents. Having regard to the amenity of future occupants of the development, all habitable rooms within the proposed dwelling would be served by a sufficient quantity of windows and roof light openings therefore future users of the dwelling would receive an adequate provision of natural light and outlook to support the proposed residential use.

Consequently, it is not considered that the proposed development would be harmful to the amenity of any neighbouring residents or future occupants of the proposed dwelling. The proposed development would therefore be compliant with the aims and objectives of Paragraph 135 (f) of the NPPF and Policy DMG1.

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

Paragraph 135 (c) of the NPPF states:

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

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

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

Paragraph 189 of the NPPF provides guidance in relation to proposals for development within the setting of Areas Of Outstanding Natural Beauty (now known as National Landscapes) as follows:

*'Great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty...development within their setting should be sensitively located and designed to avoid or minimise adverse impacts on the designated areas.'*

Key Statement EN2 of the Core Strategy provides similar guidance:

*'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, Historic England guidance on converting traditional farm buildings states:

*'There should always be a presumption in favour of maximising the use of existing openings without changing their size and limiting the formation of new ones. Where new openings are added or new windows inserted within existing door openings, great care needs to be given to their placing and design.'*

In this instance, the proposed conversion would involve the introduction of several new window and door openings to the historic barn building, with only one existing opening utilised as part of the proposed works. Several of the barn's historic openings would also be obscured and infilled as part of the proposed conversion, with several of the proposed window, door and rooflight openings not serving habitable rooms. Furthermore, the proposed site plan submitted in support of the application denotes a sizeable area of domestic curtilage area to serve the proposed dwelling with this encroaching well into the agricultural fields well beyond the South-western building line of the barn. Consequently, the proposed development, by virtue of the unjustified insertion of new window openings (which would also occur at the expense of sacrificing historic openings within the barn building) and subsequent loss of historic building fabric is considered to be predominantly at odds with the well-established approach to converting historic farm buildings quoted above in as much that little attempt has been made to conserve the significance of the historic barn building. Moreover, the application property occupies an isolated location in full public view from Hellifield Road therefore the visual impact of the proposed development would be pronounced.

In light of the above, it is considered that the proposed development would amount to an incongruous and unsympathetic form of development which would have a harmful urbanising impact that would neither enhance or conserve the visual amenities of the surrounding National Landscape. The proposed development would therefore fail to satisfy the requirements of Paragraph 135 (c) and 189 of the NPPF and Key Statement EN2 and Policy DMG1 of the Core Strategy.

#### **Heritage:**

Correspondence from Lancashire County Council's Archaeology team identifies the barn building as holding some local heritage interest as conveyed in the application's Heritage Statement. Historic building recording has not been advised in this instance in light of the information already provided within the application's Heritage Statement and structural survey. As such, the proposal raises no concerns with respect to matters of archaeological / historical importance. Whilst the building could be considered a non-designated heritage asset, because the proposal is not considered a sensitive or sympathetic conversion, the fact that the building would be re-used and benefit from investment is not considered to carry any weight in the overall planning balance.

#### **Highways and Parking:**

The application's proposed site plan depicts South-western and North-eastern visibility splays from the site's access point. The proposed development has been subject to review from Lancashire County Council Highways who have identified the depicted visibility splays as being 2m x 28m Southbound and 2m x 32m Northbound however the LHA response acknowledges a requirement to provide visibility splays of 2.4m x 215m at the site's access in light of the 60mph speed limit in place on Hellifield Road. Notwithstanding this, the LHA have stated that the depicted visibility splays could be accepted on the basis of an observed traffic speed study being provided to demonstrate that the 85th percentile traffic speeds are less than detailed above however no such information has been provided to date. As such, it remains unclear as to whether the necessary visibility splays to serve the proposed development would be achievable for the application site. In light of this, it is not considered that the application as submitted fully assesses the highways impact of the proposed development. As such, the proposal fails to satisfy the requirements of Policies DMG1 and DMG3.

## **Landscape/Ecology:**

### Protected Species

A Preliminary Roost Assessment carried out at the application site identifies the barn building as holding moderate suitability for roosting by bats. As such, additional dusk emergence surveys were subsequently carried out on site on 2/6/25, 10/7/25 and 12/9/25 which confirmed use of the application building by fluctuating numbers of common pipistrelle bats as a day roost.

In this instance, the works proposed to the barn building would impact two Common Pipistrelle summer day roosts therefore the proposed development could only be carried out under a relevant Natural England Protected Species Mitigation license.

In order for the Natural England license to be granted, Natural England requires 3 tests for the development to be met: (a) Preserving public health or public safety or other imperative reasons of overriding public interest; (b) there is no satisfactory alternative; and (c) the action will not be detrimental to maintaining the population of the species concerned at a favourable conservation status in its natural range. As competent authority the Habitats Directive places a duty on local planning authorities to consider whether there is a reasonable prospect of a license being granted and apply the three tests.

With regard to the first test, the proposed conversion of the barn building to a dwelling would prevent a non-designated heritage asset from falling into disrepair which forms part of the area's local history by virtue of its age, design and association with historic farming practices in the area. As such, the works proposed are considered to be in the public interest and the proposal would therefore meet the requirements of the first test.

In terms of the second test, a conversion of the building to an alternative use would still interfere with the bat roosts and leaving it in its existing form would fail to safeguard the asset therefore there is not considered to be any satisfactory alternative.

The final test is an ecological one, which the submitted ecology survey work suggests could be met, subject to careful planning and appropriate mitigation measures.

Accordingly, the proposed development would meet the requirements of all three tests therefore there is considered to be a reasonable prospect that Natural England would grant a license for the proposed development. The provision of a Natural England License would need to be secured by way of a planning condition in the event of any future planning consent being granted.

BNG

A biodiversity net gain assessment has been provided in support of the application therefore consultation has been undertaken with the Greater Manchester Ecology Unit (GMEU) however no response has been received to date. Notwithstanding this, the submitted Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment shows that the proposed development would deliver a net gain in biodiversity to the application site in excess of the statutory 10% requirement through on-site enhancements. As such, the proposed development satisfies the statutory requirements with respect to biodiversity net gain.

#### **Other Matters:**

##### Flood risk

Recently updated flood risk mapping (NaFRA2 - National Flood Risk Assessment 2) identifies the application site as being at risk of flooding from surface water therefore a Flood Risk Assessment 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 a small area sited directly adjacent to the North-west of the barn building (outside of the barn building's footprint), with this area having a minimal annual flood risk probability (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 scheme of residential conversion, by virtue of the barn building's isolated and unsustainable location, fenestration, loss of historic building fabric, closure and obscurement of historic openings and encroachment into the surrounding open countryside would constitute an incongruous and unsympathetic form of development that would detract from the historic character of the barn building and visual amenities of the area. The proposed development therefore fails to satisfy criteria points 1, 3 and 5 of Policy DMH4, the form, design and locational requirements of Policy DHM3 and provisions of Policy DMG3. In addition, the proposed development does not fall within the remit of a genuine affordable housing scheme as such it cannot be considered local needs housing. Therefore the principle of a residential development in this rural location is in conflict with the Core Strategy.

Furthermore, the proposed development, by virtue of the unjustified insertion of new window openings into the historic barn building, subsequent loss of historic building fabric, closure and obscurement of historic openings and resultant encroachment into the surrounding open countryside would amount to an incongruous and unsympathetic form of development which would have a harmful urbanising impact that would neither enhance or conserve the visual amenities of the surrounding National Landscape. The proposed development would therefore fail to satisfy the requirements of Paragraph 135 (c) and 189 of the NPPF and Key Statement EN2 and Policy DMG1 of the Core Strategy.

Moreover, the application has failed to demonstrate that the necessary sightlines required to serve the proposed development would be achievable for the application site. In light of this, it is not considered that the application as submitted fully assesses the highways impact of the proposed development nor demonstrates that a safe access could be achieved for the development. As such, the proposal would fail to satisfy the requirements of Policies DMG1 and DMG3.

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 proposed scheme

of residential conversion would enhance or conserve the visual amenities of the immediate or wider landscape. The proposed 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 future occupants of the converted barn building 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 proposed scheme of residential conversion 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 even through applying Paragraph 11 (d) (i) or (ii) of the Framework.

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

**RECOMMENDATION:** That planning consent be refused for the following reasons:

- |            |   |
|------------|---|
| <b>01:</b> | 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 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.   |
| <b>02:</b> | The proposed development, by virtue of the insertion of new window openings into the historic barn building, subsequent loss of historic building fabric, closure and obscurement of historic openings and resultant encroachment into the surrounding open countryside would amount to an incongruous and unsympathetic form of development which would have a harmful urbanising impact that would neither enhance or conserve the visual amenities of the surrounding National Landscape and would detract from the historic character of the barn building. The proposed development would therefore fail to satisfy the requirements of Paragraph 135 (c) and 189 of the NPPF and Key Statement EN2 and Policies DMG1 and DMG2 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy. |
| <b>03:</b> | The application has failed to demonstrate that the necessary sightlines required to serve the proposed development would be achievable for the application site. In light of this, it is not considered that the application as submitted fully assesses the highways impact of the proposed development nor demonstrates that a safe access could be achieved for the development. As such, the proposal would fail to satisfy the requirements of Policies DMG1 and DMG3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.  |