

Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.								
Signed:	Officer:	MC	Date:	28/05/2026	Manager:	LH	Date:	01/6/26

Application Ref:	3/2026/0227			 Ribble Valley Borough Council www.ribblevalley.gov.uk
Date Inspected:	28/04/2026	Site Notice:	28/04/2026	
Officer:	MC			
DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:				REFUSAL

Development Description:	Retrospective application for the raising of eastern wing roof and 'covering' of the former yard/pens and alterations to fenestration. Proposed change of use from agricultural to holiday let.
Site Address/Location:	Lodge at Winkley Hall, Whalley Road, Hurst Green, BB7 9PN

CONSULTATIONS:	Parish/Town Council
Aighton Bailey and Chaigley Parish Council:	No response received.

CONSULTATIONS:	Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies
LCC Highways:	No objections subject to conditions for the provision of car parking/turning areas and cycle storage prior to first occupation/use.
RVBC Environmental Health:	No comment.

CONSULTATIONS:	Additional Representations.
No additional representations received.	

RELEVANT POLICIES AND SITE PLANNING HISTORY:
Ribble Valley Core Strategy: Key Statement DS1: Development Strategy Key Statement DS2: Sustainable Development Key Statement EC3: Visitor Economy Key Statement DMI2: Transport Considerations Policy DMG1: General Considerations Policy DMG2: Strategic Considerations Policy DMG3: Transport & Mobility Policy DME3: Site And Species Protection And Conservation Policy DMB1: Supporting Business Growth And The Local Economy Policy DMB3: Recreation and Tourism Development National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
Relevant Planning History: No relevant planning history.

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:

Site Description and Surrounding Area:

The application relates to a former stone built agricultural building located on the Eastern outskirts of Hurst Green (approximately 2km from the village boundary). The site is located within the Open Countryside and the site is accessed off a private drive from Whalley Road with Public Footpath FP0303047 running behind the building.

The building comprises a single storey, stone built barn and former agricultural pens which has been extended and altered prior to the submission of this application.

Proposed Development for which consent is sought:

This application seeks retrospective planning permission for changes already undertaken to the building, in addition to the insertion of new windows/doors and the change of use of the building from agricultural to a holiday let.

The retrospective works include the removal of the chimney, replacement of the roof structure with slates, the enclosure of the existing pens to add an additional gable roof and the addition of 10 rooflights.

The two gable outriggers have a height of approximately 3.65m compared to the previous 3.05m and would see the insertion of timber boarding to the south elevation along with new patio door openings and a window and smaller single door opening. Window openings have also been created in the eastern elevation which would see aluminium windows inserted.

Principle of Development:

Key Statement EC3 states:

'Proposals that contribute to and strengthen the visitor economy of Ribble Valley will be encouraged, including the creation of new accommodation and tourism facilities through the conversion of existing buildings or associated with existing attractions.'

In addition, Policy DMB1 seeks to support proposals that are intended to support business growth and the local economy.

In this instance, the proposal relates to the creation of new tourist accommodation that could potentially offer small scale benefits to the economy of the Borough. The covering letter submitted with the application suggests that the change of use to a holiday let would provide a viable and sustainable long-term use whilst contributing to the rural economy through rural diversification.

On this basis, the proposed development would therefore accord with the general intentions of Key Statement EC3 and Policy DMB1.

Policy DMG2 of the Core Strategy requires development outside of defined settlement areas to meet at least one of six exceptions, one of which allows for developments for small scale tourism or recreational developments appropriate to a rural area. In terms of assessing the principle of development under Policy DMG2, it is considered that the extensions/alterations to the building to facilitate a change of use of the building to a single storey, 3 no. bedroom holiday let could fall within the scope of a small-scale tourism use appropriate to a rural area.

Policy DMB3 requires additional criteria to be met with regards to the provision of tourism and visitor facilities:

Planning permission will be granted for development proposals that extend the range of tourism and visitor facilities in the borough. This is subject to the following criteria being met:

- 1. The proposal must not conflict with other policies of this plan;*
- 2. The proposal must be physically well related to an existing main settlement or village or to an existing group of buildings,*
- 3. The development should not undermine the character, quality or visual amenities of the plan area by virtue of its scale, siting, materials or design;*
- 4. The proposals should be well related to the existing highway network. It should not generate additional traffic movements of a scale and type likely to cause undue problems or disturbance. Where possible the proposals should be well related to the public transport network;*
- 5. The site should be large enough to accommodate the necessary car parking, service areas and appropriate landscaped areas; and*
- 6. The proposal must take into account any nature conservation impacts using suitable survey information and where possible seek to incorporate any important existing associations within the development. Failing this then adequate mitigation will be sought.*

An assessment against criterion 1 shall be made later in this report once all aspects of the scheme have been considered.

Turning to criteria point 2, the application building lies approximately 66 metres to the north-west of 'Winkley Hall' which is the closest nearby building to the site. Whilst on plan form, a distance of 66m is not considered a significant distance, it is important to consider the context of the buildings within its immediate surroundings and the relation to nearby buildings. The site is not located within a main settlement or village boundary and 'Winkley Hall' is physically separated by a road and mature trees. As such, the application building is physically separated from and not viewed within the context of the nearby group of buildings and appears isolated within the landscape.

It is noted that a change of use of a building to a holiday let located approximately 500m to the south-west of the application site (Shooting Lodge) was granted under planning ref: 3/2024/0527, this proposal was required to support an existing tourism facility, being the wedding venue at Hobbit Hill and was considered to be physically well related to the Hobbit Hill wedding complex. As such, it is not considered that this scheme is directly comparable.

Having regard to the above, the proposal fails to comply with criteria point 2 of Policy DMB3.

An assessment of criterion 3 shall be made later in this report.

Turning to criteria point 4, the application site lies approximately 0.5 kilometres away from the nearest classified road (Whalley Road) and the site is not located within walking distance to any key services or facilities. Notwithstanding this, given the small-scale nature of the proposed use, it is not anticipated that the proposal would generate additional traffic movements of a scale and type likely to cause undue problems or disturbance. Furthermore, no concerns with respect to highway safety have been raised in the response from Lancashire County Council Highways. The absence of nearby public transport links is acknowledged however this shall be balanced against the sustainable benefits of re-using an existing building. The proposal is therefore considered to be broadly compliant with criteria point 4 of Policy DMB3.

With respect to criteria point 5, analysis shows that adequate vehicle parking space for the proposed holiday let could be accommodated within the application site and this has been confirmed by the LHA. In addition,

the existing site could accommodate an area for appropriate servicing and hard/soft landscaping. The proposal would therefore satisfy criteria point 5.

Turning to criteria point 6, as the works to the roof are retrospective, the application has not been supported by any ecology surveys and are therefore not deemed to be necessary (this will be discussed in more detail below in the Landscape / Ecology section of this report). As such, the proposal would satisfy criteria point 6 of Policy DMB3.

Having regard to the above, it is not considered that the building would be physically well related to an existing main settlement or village or to an existing group of buildings, contrary to criterion 2 of Policy DMB3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.

Policy DMG3 of the Core Strategy 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.

In addition, Key Statement DMI2 also states that *“New development should be located to minimise the need to travel. Also it should incorporate good access by foot and cycle and have convenient links to public transport to reduce the need for travel by private car.”*

In this instance, analysis shows an absence of bus stops within the nearby vicinity of the application site with the nearest public transport links being sited approximately 12 minute walk from the application site. In addition, there is an absence of pavements and street lighting along PROW FP0303047 or Whalley Road. Therefore due to the rural location of the application site future occupants of the holiday let accommodation would be reliant on the use of private motor vehicles, in conflict with DMG3, and this weighs against the proposal. This is balanced against the sustainable benefits of re-using an existing building as such this policy conflict is afforded moderate weight.

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.

The closest nearby residential property is Winckley Hall which is sited approximately 66m from the application site and separated by a road and mature trees. As such, it is not likely that the proposed development would be harmful to the amenity of any neighbouring residents or future users of the site. 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 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.'

In addition, 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. Where possible new development should be accommodated through the re-use of existing buildings, which in most cases is more appropriate than new build."

The application form describes the last use of the site as welfare facilities for farm shoots but has been vacant since September 2024. The submitted cover letter also suggests that the applicant undertook the works with the understanding that they constituted 'repair', 'maintenance' and/or 'improvements' to preserve the building back into a usable condition.

Having regard to the above policies, including Policy DMB3 as noted earlier in this report, concerns are raised with regards to the extent of changes made to the building and the visual impact arising on the character of the open countryside as a result of such changes.

Firstly, it is noted that the chimney has been removed and the roof of the taller part of the building replaced with slates. These changes alone are not considered detrimental to the character and appearance of the area. The pre-existing survey plans and the Council's photographic records indicate that the front part of the building comprised three concrete yard 'pens' with a stone wall surrounding each 'pen'. This has been replaced with a new outrigger with a gable roof, similar in size and scale to the rear outrigger (which has been raised in height). When viewed from the east of the property, these outriggers have a dual pitched roof but are of differing widths and appear slightly at odds and detract from the character of the former agricultural building.

The retrospective works have also removed the existing timber, stable door to the south elevation and the proposal seeks to replace this with a powder coated aluminium door. Also, to the south elevation, two sections of timber boarding are proposed which are already in situ and the existing central opening would see the insertion of aluminium patio doors. Whilst timber boarding is not an uncommon material used on the flank walls of agricultural building, it appears at odds with the stone walls, given that the timber boarding would only extend from mid-way to the eaves of the wall and that it is single storey. In addition to this, the insertion of 10 new rooflights and the proposed new windows/doors would appear overly modern/domestic in appearance and do not reflect the randomised sequence of openings typically seen on agricultural buildings.

In addition to this, the site plan shows (and it has been confirmed on site) that a post and wire fence has been erected around the site boundary. As such, this would result in the introduction of domestic curtilage for use by the occupiers of the holiday let and inevitably lead to domestic paraphernalia such as tables, chairs and barbeques which would collectively result in a harmful, urbanising impact on the site, with this impact being discernible in the public realm from Public Right Of Way FP0303047. The site is considered to be widely visible from within the public realm as Public Right of Way FP0303047 forms part of the 'Tolkein Trail' which is a popular walking route in the Borough.

As such, it is considered that the development fails to accord with Paragraph 135 of the NPPF and Policies DMG1, DMG2 and DMB3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.

Highways and Parking:

Policy DMG1 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.”

Policy DMG3 also states that:

“All development proposals will be required to provide adequate car parking and servicing space in line with currently approved standards.”

The proposed development has been subject to review from LCC Highways who have raised no issues with the proposal with respect to access, vehicle parking provision or general highway safety. The LHA have recommended for the provision of secure cycle storage to serve the proposed holiday let, as well as the provision of the parking and turning areas prior to the first occupation of the development.

Having regard to the above, it is considered that the proposal accords with the above policies subject to conditions.

Landscape/Ecology:

Protected species

Policy DME3 states that:

‘Development proposals that are likely to adversely affect the following.... ‘Wildlife species protected by law’ will not be granted planning permission. exceptions will only be made where it can clearly be demonstrated that the benefits of a development at a site outweigh both the local and the wider impacts. Planning conditions or agreements will be used to secure protection or, in the case of any exceptional development as defined above, to mitigate any harm, unless arrangements can be made through planning conditions or agreements to secure their protection’.

The application is not supported by any ecology surveys as the development is retrospective. No further works are proposed to the roof of the building and as such, it is not considered that any further ecology surveys would be required. Had the application been recommended for approval, it would be appropriate to add an informative to advise the applicant on what to do in the event of bats being found.

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 relates to retrospective development.

Observations/Consideration of Matters Raised/Conclusion:

The resultant holiday let would be in an isolated location that does not relate well to existing buildings and would be dependent on private motor vehicle. The extent of alterations and extensions to the existing building, in particular the increase in height of an existing outrigger and introduction of a second outrigger, together with the new additional window/door openings and introduction of domestic curtilage and paraphernalia, would detract from the former agricultural building and result in an urbanising impact on the rural character of the site and its immediate surrounds. This is contrary to Paragraph 135 of the NPPF and Policies DMG1, DMG2, DMG3 and DMB3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.

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 reason(s):
------------------------	---

01:	The resultant holiday let would be in an isolated location that does not relate well to existing buildings and future visitors would be dependent on private motor vehicle. As such the development would fail to satisfy the requirements of policies DMG3 and DMB3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy in terms of siting and visual impact.
02:	The extent of alterations and extensions to the existing building, in particular the increase in height of an existing outrigger and introduction of a second outrigger, together with the new additional window/door openings and introduction of domestic curtilage and paraphernalia, would detract from the former agricultural building and result in an urbanising impact on the rural character of the site and its immediate surrounds. As such the development would be contrary to Paragraph 135 of the NPPF and Policies DMG1, DMG2 and DMB3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.