

Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.

Signed:	Officer:	EP	Date:	28/08/2026	Manager:	LH	Date:	1/9/26
----------------	-----------------	-----------	--------------	-------------------	-----------------	-----------	--------------	---------------

Application Ref:	2026/0308			 Ribble Valley Borough Council www.ribblevalley.gov.uk
Date Inspected:	02/06/2026	Site Notice:	02/06/2026	
Officer:	EP			
DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:				REFUSAL

Development Description:	Proposed change of use from Class E to Class B8 (storage and distribution).
Site Address/Location:	Harrisons Engineering and Welding Supplies Kendal Street Clitheroe BB7 1PA.

CONSULTATIONS:	Parish/Town Council
Clitheroe Town Council raised no objections.	

CONSULTATIONS:	Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies
LCC Highways:	Have objected to the proposal on highway safety grounds.

CONSULTATIONS:	Additional Representations.
Over 10 objections have been received raising the following concerns - Unsuitable location for this use - Impact on parking - Weight limit on residential street and unsuitable for large delivery vehicles - Noise at unsociable hours - Fire hazard - Unsafe for pedestrians, cyclists and road users due to deliveries causing obstruction - Impact on local character	

RELEVANT POLICIES AND SITE PLANNING HISTORY:**Ribble Valley Core Strategy:**

Key Statement DS1: Development Strategy
Key Statement DS2: Sustainable Development
Key Statement EC1: Business and Employment Development
Key Statement DMI2: Transport Considerations

Policy DMG1: General Considerations
Policy DMG2: Strategic Considerations
Policy DMG3: Transport & Mobility
Policy DMB1: Supporting Business Growth and the Local Economy

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Relevant Planning History:

No recent planning history.

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

The application relates to a commercial property within the defined settlement limits of Clitheroe. The surrounding area is a mix of residential and commercial development. The application site falls within flood zone 2.

Proposed Development for which consent is sought:

Retrospective consent is sought for the change of use of an existing commercial unit from Class E to Class B8 for the storage and distribution of goods.

Principle of Development:

Key Statement EC1 states that employment development will be directed towards the main settlement of Clitheroe, Whalley and Longridge as the preferred locations to accommodate employment growth.

Whilst DMB1 stipulates that proposals that are intended to support business growth and the local economy will be supported in principle. Development proposals will be determined in accord with the core strategy and detailed policies.

The site is located within the main settlement of Clitheroe and generates 5 employment opportunities. KS EC1 and Policy DMB1 broadly accepts proposal that support business growth and therefore the development is policy compliant in this respect.

Taking these factors into account, the proposal represents a sustainable form of development through the effective reuse of a previously developed site in close proximity to existing infrastructure and within the settlement of Clitheroe. The proposal is therefore considered to be acceptable in principle subject to an assessment of the other material planning considerations.

Impact Upon Residential Amenity:

The change of use results in an increase in traffic and activity by virtue of deliveries and the associated comings and goings. As such, consideration must be given to the impact on surrounding residential amenity, namely noise implications, particularly given the residential nature of the area.

The applicants have submitted an accompanying acoustic survey and assessment to address these noise implications. The assessment concludes that, taking accounts of the existing background noise levels there would be little impact. Internal operations are unlikely to produce unacceptable noise levels. External loading operations pose a greater risk, but these noise levels have been assessed within the submitted assessment, and reviewed by the Councils Environmental Health department, and do not exceed 46dB when measured at the nearest receptors. The proposed hours of operation are 9am-6pm Monday – Saturday. Given the hours of operation proposed, which are not unsociable hours, this is considered acceptable.

It is recognised that a number of neighbour objections have been received with respect to adverse impact. These objections also highlight the timing of deliveries as an issue, suggesting deliveries would take place outside of the proposed hours of operations. However, hours of operation are something that could be managed via planning condition if the application were to be approved. This therefore does not justify refusal. If the application were to be approved and the allowed hours of operation were breached, this would be a separate matter for planning enforcement.

Visual Amenity/External Appearance:

The application doesn't seek consent for any external alterations to the building. As such, no adverse impact to the visual amenities of the area is caused resultant.

Highways and Parking:

The change of use subject of this application results in an increase in traffic movement to and from the site, including unloading and loading of deliveries. As such, careful consideration must be given into the impact on the surrounding highway network both from an amenity and safety perspective.

At a National Level Policy DP3 (2) of the NPPF states that development should *include spaces that are safe, secure, inclusive, and accessible for all ages and abilities, including for groups such as women and girls; and which facilitate and encourage social interaction, play and healthy lifestyles (for example by providing high quality, clear and legible pedestrian and cycle routes.*

Policy TR4 states that *to contribute to creating well-designed places, transport considerations should be integral to the design of development, proposals for which should give priority first to walking, wheeling and cycle movements, both within the scheme and with neighbouring area.* Development should also *incorporate or contribute towards appropriate features to support this prioritisation, such as permeable street networks and continuous footways.* TR4 also states that development must *allow for the efficient delivery of goods.*

Policy TR6 stipulates that *in assessing movement patterns and potential impacts, including whether they are considered to be severe, reasonable future scenarios should be considered, taking into account impacts at relevant times of the day and potential cumulative impacts.*

At a local level Policy DMG1 states 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.*
- 3. Consider the protection and enhancement of public rights of way and access.*

LCC Highways have been consulted in relation to the proposal and raised objection on highway safety and amenity grounds. The highway authority has seen photographic evidence of the size and type of vehicles servicing the site and goods being loaded/unloaded within the carriageway. The applicant has also provided some details of the types and frequency of vehicles delivering to the site in the Planning Supporting Statement produced by Trevor Hobday Associates. Although the highway authority acknowledges that this is an existing employment site it notes that the surrounding highway network has not been improved to support modern, larger vehicles associated with this change of use. The size and type of delivery vehicles servicing the site is not suitable for the surrounding highway network layout, particularly the junction widths and layout, which are not designed to accommodate container lorries.

There are no parking restrictions on Chatburn Road on either side of the junction with Kendal Street so vehicles could be parked up close to the junction. This would restrict available carriageway width for a lorry to carry out the turning manoeuvre. There are also concerns that such vehicles may reverse to or from Kendal Street at either junction, which is a highway safety concern given the general residential nature of the area.

The highway authority does not accept any unloading or loading taking place within the public highway network or on the carriageway. Items left here can cause an obstruction. Loading and unloading activities from the container lorries, or other vehicles, can also cause an obstruction of the footway so forcing vulnerable users into the carriageway, which is an additional highway safety concern. There is no suitable loading and unloading space within the property boundary that doesn't encroach on the public highway. The

highway authority also notes the proximity of the site to Pendle Primary School on Longsight Avenue and that Kendal Street provides one of the pedestrian links to the school.

Based on the above, the development would be detrimental to highway safety due to the size and type of vehicles servicing the site being inappropriate for the residential nature of Kendal Street, the loading/unloading taking place within the carriageway and the detrimental impact on highway safety for vulnerable highway users. The development would therefore be contrary to Policies TR4, TR6 and DP3 of the NPPF as outlined in this response.

Whilst the highway authority would normally be willing to work with an applicant to try and overcome its objection it does not consider that acceptable alternatives can be provided in this instance.

Landscape/Ecology:

Flood Risk.

Constraint analysis shows that the property lies within Flood Zone 2 and is at risk of surface water flooding. As such, if the application were to be approved, the applicant would be advised to adhere to the design and risk management measures recommended within the submitted flood risk assessment in addition to the Environment Agency's 'Householder and other minor extensions in Flood Zones 2 and 3' guidance found online.

BNG.

The development is exempt from having to achieve the mandatory Biodiversity Net Gain requirement as it is subject to the de minimus exception.

Observations/Consideration of Matters Raised/Conclusion:

Policy S4 of the NPPF states that development proposals within settlements should be approved unless the benefits of doing so would be substantially outweighed by any adverse effects when assessed against the policies in the Framework. Such circumstances would include the failure to comply with one or more of the policies which state that development proposals should be refused in specific circumstances. The conflict with Policies TR4, TR6 and DP3 of the NPPF would amount to a substantial adverse effect that would justify refusal. As such, for the above reasons and having regard to all material considerations and matters raised the application is recommended for refusal.

RECOMMENDATION:

That planning consent be refused for the following reason(s).

- | | |
|------------|---|
| 01: | The change of use would be detrimental to highway safety due to the size and type of vehicles servicing the site being inappropriate for the residential nature of Kendal Street, the loading/unloading taking place within the carriageway and the subsequent detrimental impact on highway safety for all highway users. The development would therefore be contrary to Policies TR4, TR6 and DP3 of the NPPF and Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy. |
|------------|---|