


Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.

Signed:	Officer:	LW	Date:	08/05/26	Manager:	LH	Date:	8/5/26
----------------	-----------------	-----------	--------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------	--------------	---------------

Application Ref:	3/2026/0202				Ribble Valley Borough Council www.ribblevalley.gov.uk	
Date Inspected:	14/04/26	Site Notice:	N/A			
Officer:	LW					
DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:					REFUSAL	

Development Description:	Proposed erection of an agricultural storage building.
Site Address/Location:	Land off Whalley Road (adj to Greenfield Caravan Site), Langho, BB6 8AB.

CONSULTATIONS:	Parish/Town Council
No comments received.	

CONSULTATIONS:	Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies
LCC Highways:	No objection subject to conditions.

CONSULTATIONS:	Additional Representations.
One letter of objection has been received. The concerns raised can be summarised as below:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Loss of sunlight to nearby houses and gardens.• Loss of views.• Potential for more buildings to be built on the site in the future/ creation of an industrial site.	

RELEVANT POLICIES AND SITE PLANNING HISTORY:
Ribble Valley Core Strategy: Key Statement DS1: Development Strategy Key Statement DS2: Sustainable Development Policy DMG1: General Considerations Policy DMG2: Strategic Considerations Policy DMG3: Transport & Mobility National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
Relevant Planning History: 3/2017/0191: Stable building for private recreational use (Approved). 3/1995/0377: Retain existing road for access to field use for agriculture (Approved).

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:

Site Description and Surrounding Area:

The application relates to parcel of land accessed off Whalley Road, Langho. To the south-east of the proposal site is Billington and Langho Community Centre, while to the south-west is Greenfield Caravan Site which is owned by the applicant. Residential properties are also located to the north and south. To the east of the proposal site, under the same ownership, is an existing area of hardstanding which was granted consent in 2017 for the construction of a stable building under application reference 3/2017/0191.

The access road to the caravan site passes through the land parcel and off this there is an access road into a parcel of agricultural land to the east of the application site. The land parcel which forms the subject of this application is understood to have been previously used for caravan rallies.

The site to which the proposal relates is located 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 the construction of an agricultural storage building measuring 18.3m by 9.1m with an eaves and ridge height of 3.7m and 4.9m respectively. The building would be accessed via an existing track leading from Whalley Road and would be constructed from dark green box profile cladding, natural grey fibre cement roof sheets and timber doors.

A concrete yard is also proposed to the front of the southern elevation of the buildings to join the existing access track.

Principle of Development:

The site is not located within a defined settlement boundary and as such, Policy DMG2 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy is of relevance.

Policy DMG2 states that within Tier 2 villages and outside the defined settlement areas, development must meet a number of criteria. This includes development that is needed for the purposes of forestry or agriculture.

As such, an assessment must be made as to whether the proposed development is reasonably necessary for the purposes of agriculture.

The proposed development relates to the construction of an 18.3m by 9.1m agricultural building to be used for storing agricultural plant, machinery and equipment.

In this respect, it is important to highlight refused planning application 3/2007/0989 which sought consent for the construction of a new agricultural building for the storage of machinery and equipment on land, which is now utilised as a caravan park, owned by the applicant. The caravan park was granted planning permission under appeal reference App/T2350/W/16/3148370 in 2016.

At the time of application 3/2007/0989, the land in question comprised an area of approximately 3.6 hectares with the building proposed measuring 13.7m by 7.3m with an eaves and ridge height of 3m and 3.9m respectively. During the course of the application, a consultation response from the Lancashire County Council Land Agent was received which read as follows:

It is clear that the proposed building does not relate to any current agricultural activity, and that is any agricultural activity did take place at the site it would only be of a very modest scale and described as a hobby activity. The proposed use of the building has been submitted in relation to

maintenance and management of the land, and the applicant considered that some type of storage facility is necessary for this purpose.

However, given the minimum amount of operations required in respect of the use, I do not consider a building for storage purposes to be reasonably necessary but consider that the land can be managed sufficiently without such a facility. This is demonstrated by the fact that the land parcel has been managed without a building in previous years.

In refusing application 3/2007/0989, the Case Officer also stated the following with respect to the agricultural need for the building:

It is stated in the application that the building is to be used to house the applicant's machinery and equipment for the maintenance of the land. With regards to this proposed use, and as to whether the building is essentially required for agricultural purposes, I concur with the comments of the County Council Land Agent as referred to above.

With regards to the current application, the submitted Planning Statement states that the proposed building would be used in connection with the farming of an adjoining four-acre parcel of agricultural land located to the east of the proposal site. It goes on to state that the applicant currently has equipment stored in a number of shipping containers on this land, including tractors and a JCB. In addition to this, it is stated that farm implements, such as a grass topper and a Cambridge roller, are also stored outside on the adjoining caravan site and that these need to be stored inside a building to avoid them being stolen, vandalised and deteriorating in the weather. Additional smaller sundry items such as fencing materials and hand tools are also proposed to be stored in the building.

However, the adjacent land parcel is just four-acres in area (approximately 1.6 hectares) and based on the submitted Cover Letter and Planning Statement, it is understood that there is no existing agricultural use of the land the subject of this application. It is stated that the principal use of the proposal site for many years has been for caravan rallies and the applicant does not own any livestock. As such, it is unclear whether the proposed building would in fact relate to an agricultural activity.

Notwithstanding the above, even if an agricultural activity did take place at the site, it would be of a very modest scale. The size of the land parcel in which the building would be associated with has decreased by approximately 2 hectares since refused application 3/2007/0989, whilst the size of the proposed building itself has increased by 66.5 square metres. Given the modest number of operations required to manage and maintain the land in question, it is not considered that a 166.5 square metre building for storage purposes is reasonably necessary at the site, and the concerns raised during application 3/2007/0989 with respect to the need for an agricultural storage building therefore remain.

The submitted Planning Statement makes reference to refused application 3/2007/0989 and states that since that time there has been other development in the immediate locality of the application site which has altered the character and appearance of the area such that the proposed building will not have any detrimental effect on the appearance of the locality. It goes on to note that the ability to house the farm machinery and equipment within a today modern farm building will be preferable to these items being stored outside on the application site.

However, the applicant has failed to demonstrate a justifiable need for the proposed building in association with the size of the land parcel in question and the agricultural activities in operation. As such, the principal of development is not secured and it is not considered that the proposal is reasonably necessary for the purposes of agriculture in this instance, as per the requirements of Policy DMG2 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.

Impact Upon Residential Amenity:

The proposed development would be sited close to a number of residential receptors located to the north of the proposal site along Petre Wood Crescent and concerns have been raised by third-party representations with respect to the loss of sunlight as a result of the proposal. As such, consideration must be given towards the implications of constructing a new agricultural storage building with respect to impact upon neighbouring amenity.

The proposed building would be located approximately 7m from the rear boundary of the nearest residential property along Petre Wood Crescent and would comprise a maximum height of 4.9m. The parcel of land where the building is to be sited is also enclosed to the north by a mature evergreen hedge which would provide adequate visual screening, mitigating any resultant visual impact upon the occupiers of the aforementioned residential properties. As such, it is not considered that the proposed development would result in any significant detrimental harm upon the existing amenities of any nearby residents, by way of overshadowing, loss of outlook or daylight, that would warrant the refusal to grant planning permission for this reason alone.

It is recognised that concerns have also been raised about the loss of views. However, loss of private views is not a material planning consideration and therefore is not relevant to the determination of this application.

Visual Amenity/External Appearance:

Whilst the proposed building would not be sited within close proximity to any existing agricultural buildings, it would be viewed in context with existing built form, with the proposal site bounded to the north by the residential properties along Petre Wood Crescent, to the south by Billington and Langho Community Centre and Greenfield House, and to the west by Greenfield caravan park. The development would also be set approximately 130m from the public highway and therefore would not appear an overly incongruous addition to the surrounding landscape.

The proposed building would be constructed from dark green box profile cladding and natural grey fibre cement roof sheets with timber doors, all of which are typical of agricultural buildings. The materiality of the development is therefore considered acceptable.

Highways and Parking:

The application has been subject to review by Lancashire County Council Highway and comments have been received. The Local Highway Authority (LHA) note that the site will be accessed via an existing access onto a private access road from Whalley Road. The private access road is a shared access utilised by Billington and Langho Community Centre, Greenfield Caravan Park and Greenfield House. Given the existing use of the access, the LHA is of the opinion the proposal will result in a negligible impact on the surrounding highway network and therefore no objection is raised.

The LHA have requested the imposition of a condition requiring wheel washing facilities to be in place on site during the construction period. However, given the proposal relates to a relatively small-scale development, the Local Planning Authority do not consider this condition to be reasonably necessary in this particular instance.

Landscape/Ecology:

The application has been accompanied by a Biodiversity Net Gain Baseline and Feasibility Report which indicates that a post-development biodiversity net gain of 43.2% could be achieved on site. The proposal therefore satisfies the statutory requirements with respect to Biodiversity Net Gain subject to the statutory condition being satisfied.

Other Matters:

Potential for alternative/ additional development

The submitted Planning Statement notes that the applicant could make a strong argument for the development of the field for housing given that the Council is currently unable to demonstrate a five-year housing land supply. It goes on to state that the applicant does not want to do this and instead wishes to keep the land in its existing use, with the provision of the proposed building assisting in this. However, the applicant does consider the Council's housing situation to be relevant in how this application should be determined. Concerns have also been raised by third-party representations with respect to the construction of further buildings in the future and the creation of an industrial site.

However, the above do not form material planning considerations. Any additional development of the land would be subject to a separate assessment as part of a separate planning application and therefore the potential for the land to be developed for housing or an industrial site is not considered relevant to the determination of this current application which relates solely to the construction of an agricultural storage building.

Observations/Consideration of Matters Raised/Conclusion:

As such, it is 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 reason:

01:

The applicant has failed to demonstrate a justifiable need for the proposed agricultural storage building in association with the size of the land parcel in question and the agricultural activities in operation. As such, it is not considered that the development is reasonably necessary for the purposes of agriculture in this instance, and as such would be inappropriate development in a countryside location contrary to Policy DMG2 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.