


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

<b>Signed:</b>	<b>Officer:</b>	<b>LW</b>	<b>Date:</b>	<b>22/04/26</b>	<b>Manager:</b>	<b>LH</b>	<b>Date:</b>	<b>23/4/26</b>
----------------	-----------------	-----------	--------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------	--------------	----------------

<b>Application Ref:</b>	3/2026/0190				<b>Ribble Valley Borough Council</b> <small>www.ribblevalley.gov.uk</small>
<b>Date Inspected:</b>	02/04/26	<b>Site Notice:</b>	02/04/26		
<b>Officer:</b>	LW				
<b>DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:</b>					<b>REFUSAL</b>

<b>Development Description:</b>	Permission in principle application for 1 self-build dwelling.
<b>Site Address/Location:</b>	Land to the South of Park Farm, Whalley Clitheroe Bypass, Wiswell, BB7 9LB.

<b>CONSULTATIONS:</b>	<b>Parish/Town Council</b>
No comments received with respect to the proposed development.	

<b>CONSULTATIONS:</b>	<b>Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies</b>
<b>LCC Highways:</b>	Considers the existing access can accommodate the increase in vehicular movements. Note that there is a reliance on the private car.

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

<b>RELEVANT POLICIES AND SITE PLANNING HISTORY:</b>
<b>Ribble Valley Core Strategy:</b>  Key Statement DS1: Development Strategy Key Statement DS2: Sustainable Development Key Statement DMI2: Transport Considerations  Policy DMG1: General Considerations Policy DMG2: Strategic Considerations Policy DMG3: Transport & Mobility Policy DMH3: Dwellings in the Open Countryside and AONB  National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
<b>Relevant Planning History:</b>  No relevant planning history.

<b>ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:</b>
<b>Site Description and Surrounding Area:</b>

The application relates to an area of land located to the south of Park Farm and east of Whalley Clitheroe Bypass (A59). The site currently comprises an existing shed structure and is bounded by open agricultural fields.

The site is situated outside of any defined settlement area and on land which benefits from an Open Countryside designation.

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

Consent is sought for 'Permission in Principle' (PiP) for the demolition of the existing structure and construction of one self-build dwellinghouse. Given the application seeks consent solely for matters pertaining to the principal of development, no details in respect of the proposed layout, configuration, nor external appearance of the dwelling are required to be submitted for consideration at this stage.

**Principle of Development:**

Permission in Principle applications may only deal with the principle of development and are not applications for planning permission. Any other details relating to any other material planning considerations are to be dealt with as part of any future Technical Details application. Planning practice guidance confirms the scope of Permission in Principle as being limited to matters of location, land use and amount of development. As such, these matters have been assessed as follows: -

Location

The application seeks Permission in Principle for the construction of one self-build dwelling on land located outside of any defined settlement limits. As such, it is necessary to consider whether the location of the proposed new dwellings would be compatible with the overall spatial strategy for housing growth within the Borough as identified within the currently adopted development strategy.

When considering the principle of new residential development, Key Statement DS1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy outlines a spatial strategy for new housing developments which are to be directed to the strategic sites and Principal and Tier 1 settlements. Policies DMH3 and DMG2 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy seeks to restrict residential development within the Open Countryside and AONB to that which meets a number of explicit criteria.

Policy DMG2 is two-fold in its approach to guiding development. The primary part of the Policy DMG2(1) is engaged where development proposals are located 'in' Principal and Tier 1 settlements with the second part of the Policy DMG2(2) being engaged in circumstances when proposed development is located 'outside' defined settlement areas or within Tier 2 villages, with each part of the Policy therefore being engaged in isolation and independent of the other dependent on the locational aspects of a proposal.

The mechanics and engagement of the Policy are clear in this respect, insofar that it contains explicit triggers as to when the former or latter criterion are applied and the triggers are purely locational and based on a proposals relationship to defined settlement boundaries and whether, in this case, such a proposal is 'in' or 'outside' a defined settlement.

The proposal is located outside of any defined settlement boundary. In this respect, when assessing the location aspects of the development, it is the secondary element of Policy DMG2 that is engaged, which states that:

*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 wellbeing 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.*

Given the site is located out of any defined settlement limits, Policy DMH3 is also applicable, with the Policy being engaged in parallel with Policy DMG2. In this respect, 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 proposals 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 provided they are suitably located and their form and general design are in keeping with their surroundings. Buildings must be structurally capable of conversion without the need for complete or substantial reconstruction.*
3. *The rebuilding or replacement of existing dwellings [subject to a number of criteria].*

In respect of the above first criterion, it is clear from the submitted details that the proposal could not be argued as being 'essential to the local economy or social wellbeing of the area' nor could it be considered that the proposal 'is needed for the purposes of forestry or agriculture'.

In respect of the matter of 'local need', no robust evidence has been provided to suggest that the proposal would align with the definition of 'local needs housing'. The Ribble Valley Core Strategy states that local needs housing is '*the housing developed to meet the needs of existing and concealed households living within the Parish and surrounding Parishes which is evidenced by the Housing Needs Survey for the Parish, the Housing Waiting List and the Strategic Housing Market Assessment*' and that '*the most recent SHMA and Housing Needs Survey and waiting list evidence would always be used in determining if the proposed development meets the identified need*'.

As such, the proposed development would conflict with the spatial strategy set out in the development plan as the site lies outside the settlement boundary and would not meet any of the identified considerations or exceptions which are required for residential development to be acceptable in the Open Countryside.

In addition to the above, Policies DM12 and DMG3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy require new development to be located to minimise the need to travel, with good access by foot and cycle and convenient links to public transport. Considerable weight is to be attached to the availability and adequacy of public transport to serve those moving to and from a proposed development. This aligns with the sustainability objectives of the NPPF.

The site is located within the Open Countryside, approximately 250m to the north-east of the defined settlement limits of Barrow which is a Tier 1 settlement.

Whilst Barrow does benefit from some facilities required to meet the daily needs of future occupants such as a convenience store, pub and primary school which are within a reasonable walking distance from the proposal site (approximately 20 minutes), these services alone do not automatically equate to sustainability. Pedestrian access from Barrow to the proposal site is via Whalley Clitheroe Bypass, which is a dual carriageway, classified as the A59, with a maximum speed limit of 70mph and no footway network.

Furthermore, the nearest bus stops to the proposal site are at Clitheroe Golf Club and Barrow Business Village. Whilst these are serviced by routes that provide connections to key service centres which have a broader range of services, or onward connection points for other public transport services, they are an approximate 1km (14-minutes) walk away and on the opposite side of Whalley Clitheroe Bypass and are therefore not easily accessible from the proposal site.

With the above in mind, it is not considered that the existing connectivity of the area would make travelling by foot or public transport a safe or attractive method of transport, with future occupiers instead being heavily reliant upon private motor vehicles to access services and facilities necessary to meet their day-to-day needs.

As such, the proposed development would be in direct conflict with Policies DMI2 and DMG3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and the NPPF.

#### Land Use

Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy 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 have provided comments on the scheme and note that the existing access off Whalley Clitheroe Bypass, which currently serves Park Farm, is an acceptable width to allow 2-way vehicle movement and is suitable to accommodate the increase in vehicular movement resulting from the proposed residential development. With this in mind, the proposed development is considered to comply with the provisions of Policy DMG1 and is therefore considered acceptable with regards to land use.

#### Amount of development

Policy DMG1 of the Core Strategy states:

*'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...'*

Policy DMG2 also states:

*'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.'*

In this instance, Permission in Principle is sought for the development of one dwelling within the application site. Whilst an indicative site layout plan has not been provided, it is considered likely that the site would comprise sufficient space to accommodate the scale of development proposed with associated gardens and parking areas. As such, no concerns are raised at this Permission in Principle stage with respect to the amount of development being proposed.

However, it is also relevant to consider at this stage whether or not the amount of residential development could be successfully integrated within the landscape. In this respect, it is not considered that the introduction of a new residential development at the proposal site would be acceptable, as the site currently maintains open, countryside views. Whilst it is noted that the proposal site currently comprises a shed structure which is proposed for demolition and only one new residential property is proposed, the location of the dwelling would require the construction of a substantial new access track (approximately 165m in length) leading from the existing access off Whalley Clitheroe Bypass. This,

together with the dwelling itself, the associated hardstanding for parking and introduction of gates/walls/fences to separate the residential curtilage from the adjacent agricultural land that would form part of such residential scheme would result in a harmful urbanising impact, diminishing the rural countryside landscape.

As such, the proposed development is considered to be in conflict with Policies DMG1 and DMG2 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.

#### Other Material Considerations

The most recently published five-year housing land supply figure (base date 31<sup>st</sup> March 2025) indicated that Ribble Valley Borough Council has a housing land supply of 6.2 years. However, a recent appeal decision (dated 7<sup>th</sup> January 2026) at Land to the South of Chatburn Old Road, Chatburn (APP/T2350/W/25/3372635) determined that the Council has a housing land supply of 3.45 years.

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

Specifically for decision making, this means if the most relevant Local Plan policies for determining a planning application are out-of-date (such as when a 5 YHLS cannot be demonstrated), granting permission unless:

- i. The application of policies in the 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 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.

In terms of areas or assets of particular importance referred to at subsection i) above, these are identified as habitat 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. The application site is not affected by any such areas or assets as such this subsection does not apply.

In which case, the tilted balance should be applied and subsection ii) of paragraph 11d) requires the LPA to consider whether the adverse impacts of the development would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. This will be considered in the concluding section of the report.

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

The remit of assessment of the application is limited to solely that of the principle of the development and as to whether the proposed development would align with the spatial and location aspirations for residential development within the Borough.

As such, matters relating to the potential adverse impact(s) upon nearby residential amenities resultant from the development cannot be fully determined nor assessed at this stage and will be reserved for consideration/ assessment at any subsequent pursuant 'Technical Matters' submission.

Notwithstanding this, the proposal site is located a considerable distance away from nearby residential receptors and as such, there is not considered to be any reason why the development of the site for a one dwelling could not be achieved in a way that would maintain the existing amenities of nearby residents.

**Visual Amenity/External Appearance:**

The remit of assessment of the application is limited to solely that of the principle of the development and as to whether the proposed development would align with the spatial and locational aspirations for residential development within the Borough.

The impact on the surrounding open countryside has been assessed above in the 'amount of development' section. As this relates to principle only, a full assessment of the scheme cannot be made with regards to the specific size and scale of the dwelling and associated development. The potential for adverse impact(s) upon the character or visual amenities of the area resultant from the detailed design of the development do not fall to be assessed within the scope of this application and would be reserved for consideration/ assessment following the submission of any subsequent 'Technical Matters' submission.

**Highways and Parking:**

Lancashire County Council Highways have been consulted on the application and comments have been provided. As mentioned under the 'land use' section, the Local Highway Authority (LHA) have confirmed that the existing access off Whalley Clitheroe Bypass can accommodate the increase in vehicular movements likely to be associated with the proposed development. The LHA also note that the dwelling will require suitable car and cycle parking provision and all vehicles must be able to enter and leave in a forward gear. However, detailed assessment of the appropriateness/ adequacy of any internal highway arrangements and matters relating to on-site parking provision are reserved for consideration/ assessment as part of any subsequent 'Technical Matters' submission.

**Landscape/Ecology:**

Appropriate surveys would be required to be undertaken and submitted in support of any subsequent 'Technical Matters' submission to ascertain as to whether the proposal is likely to result in adverse harm upon protected species/ species of conservation concern and trees.

In addition, at the 'Technical Matters' stage, the applicant would be required to demonstrate how the proposal would achieve the mandatory 10% Biodiversity Net Gain requirements or provide an appropriate exemption in accordance with Section 4 of the Biodiversity Gain Requirements (Exemptions) regulations 2024.

**Conclusion and Planning Balance:**

As identified earlier in this report, the Council are unable to demonstrate a Five-Year Housing Land Supply (5YHLS) and so Paragraph 11 d) of the NPPF is engaged. In this case the tilted balance applies, and the proposal must be assessed against 11 d) ii and a balancing exercise must be undertaken.

The benefits of the development have been considered, namely the delivery of housing especially in the context of a lack of 5YHLS, albeit the development would contribute one dwelling to the Council's housing supply. As such, this is considered to carry low weight. There would also be the benefit of consumer expenditure in the area, construction jobs and supporting the building industry supply chain. However, these short-term temporary benefits are considered to carry limited weight.

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

In addition to this, the proposal fails to accord with Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy, insofar that the principle of allowing a new dwelling in this location would result in a harmful urbanising impact, diminishing the existing rural, open countryside character of the area.

The harm resulting from the granting of residential development in this location is therefore considered to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits as there would be a reliance of private motor vehicles for future occupiers to access key services and facilities as well as harm to the surrounding landscape. This harm is considered to be significant and even on the application of the tilted balance, there would not be justification to grant planning permission.

As such, the application is recommended for refusal.

<b>RECOMMENDATION:</b>	That Permission in Principle be refused for the following reason:
<b>01:</b>	The proposal is considered to be in direct conflict with Key Statement DMI2 and Policy DMG3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and the overarching objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) insofar that approval would lead to the creation of a new dwelling in an unsustainable location whereby there would be a reliance on private motor vehicles by occupiers of the dwelling to access key service and facilities.
<b>02:</b>	The amount and type of development proposed conflicts with Policies DMG1 and DMG2 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy, by virtue of the introduction of a new residential dwelling and associated development in a location which would result in a harmful urbanising impact, diminishing the surrounding countryside landscape.