

Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.							
Signed:	Officer:	BT	Date:	1/9/26	Manager:	LH	Date: 2/9/26

Application Ref:	3/2026/0468			 Ribble Valley Borough Council www.ribblevalley.gov.uk
Date Inspected:	17/7/26	Site Notice:	17/7/26	
Officer:	BT			
DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:				REFUSAL

Development Description:	Proposed erection of a two-storey self-build dwelling and associated annexe following demolition of existing workshop buildings.
Site Address/Location:	Healings Farm, West Bradford Road, Waddington, BB7 3JE.

CONSULTATIONS:	Parish/Town Council
Waddington Parish Council:	Consulted 17/7/26 – no response received.

CONSULTATIONS:	Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies
LCC Highways:	No objections subject to conditions.
United Utilities:	No objections.
LCC PROW:	Consulted 17/7/26 – no response received.
CONSULTATIONS:	Additional Representations.
None.	

RELEVANT POLICIES AND SITE PLANNING HISTORY:
Ribble Valley Core Strategy: 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 DME3: Site and Species Protection and Conservation Policy DMH3: Dwellings in the Open Countryside and AONB National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Relevant Planning History: 3/2026/0469: Proposed temporary siting (3 years) of five shipping containers for B8 storage (Ongoing) 3/2025/0155:

Proposed demolition of existing building and erection of a new dwelling with associated annexe (Refused)

3/2024/0255:

Proposed demolition of four existing buildings and erection of one new single-storey, three-bedroom dwelling with associated parking and landscaping (Approved)

3/2024/0429:

Approval of details reserved by conditions 7 (ground levels and floor levels), 16 (demolition method statement) and 17 (surface water drainage strategy) from prior approval 3/2023/0992. (Approved)

3/2023/0992:

Prior notification for the demolition of existing workshop building and replacement with one new single-storey dwelling with basement, including landscaped gardens, access and parking (Approved)

3/2023/0687:

Prior notification for the demolition of existing workshop building and replacement with one new two-storey dwelling with basement, including landscaped gardens, access and parking (Refused, allowed on appeal)

3/2023/0444:

Prior notification for the demolition of existing workshop building and replacement with one new two-storey dwelling with basement and rooms in the roofspace, including landscaped gardens, access and parking (Refused)

3/1995/0027:

Outline application for residential development (Refused, appeal dismissed)

3/1993/0533:

Use of redundant farm buildings for manufacture of a light aircraft (Approved)

3/1984/0667:

Proposed change of use from agricultural building to the preparation and cooking of meats (Approved)

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:

Site Description and Surrounding Area:

The application relates to a farmstead situated on the North-eastern outskirts of Waddington. The farmstead previously operated as a poultry rearing site (with a temporary use later granted for the construction of light aircraft parts) and comprises a farmhouse, detached garage and numerous former agricultural buildings comprised of a pitched roof building, three Nissen huts and a mono pitched roof building. Access to the proposal site is from West Bradford Road with two Public Rights Of Way flanking the Northern and Western sides of the site. A small cluster of residential properties and a primary school lie just to the North of the farmstead with the wider area comprising a mixture of woodland, agricultural land and open countryside. The Forest Of Bowland National Landscape lies directly to the North of the proposal site on the Northern side of West Bradford Road.

Proposed Development for which consent is sought:

Planning consent is sought for the demolition of the site's mono pitched roof building and two Nissen huts and for the construction of a two storey four-bedroom self-build dwelling, detached annex and associated parking and landscaping.

Principle of Development:

Key statement DS1 of the Ribble Valley Borough Council Core Strategy sets out the spatial vision for the Borough with a stipulation for the majority of new housing development to be sited within the principal settlements of Clitheroe, Whalley and Longridge with an additional focus towards the Borough's Tier 1 settlements. New housing development within and outside of the Borough's Tier 2 settlements is more tightly controlled with such development only being permissible where local needs housing or regeneration benefits can be delivered.

In a similar vein, Policy DMG2 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy states:

'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 well-being 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.*
- 6. the development is compatible with the enterprise zone designation.*

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

Policy DMH3 seeks to restrict residential development within the open countryside to development essential for the purposes of agriculture or residential development which meets an identified local need. The same policy also allows for the conversion of buildings to dwellings (subject to compliance with Policy DMH4) and for the rebuilding and replacement of existing dwellings under certain circumstances.

In this instance, the proposal site lies outside of the defined settlement area of Waddington and as such lies within the open countryside. The proposed development would involve the demolition of three former light industrial buildings which would be replaced with a new detached two storey four bedroom dwelling and annex. No evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the proposed development relates to local needs housing to meet an identified need, nor has any evidence been provided to demonstrate that the proposed development would deliver regeneration benefits. In addition, no case has been put forward to demonstrate that the proposed development would be essential to the local economy or social well-being of the area, nor would the proposed development be utilised in relation to agriculture, small scale tourism, recreation or any other small-scale uses that would be appropriate within a rural area. Furthermore, the proposed dwelling would be a new build property and would not involve the rebuilding or replacement of an existing dwelling or conversion of an existing building. Accordingly, the proposal fails to satisfy the requirements of Key Statement DS1 and Policies DMG2 and DMH3 of the Core Strategy.

In addition to the above, Key Statement DMI2 and Policy 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. With regards to the local bus service, a bus stop lies approximately 70 metres away to the West of the application site (Waddington and West Bradford CEPS) which is served by five school buses (the number 66, 444, 643, 901 and 903) along with the

number 66, 66S and 67 public buses which stop at the principal settlement of Clitheroe. The 66 bus runs from 08:34 to 19:15 hourly / two hourly Monday to Saturday, with the 66S providing a two hourly service on Sundays from 09:33 to 17:44, and with journey times to Clitheroe for both services being approximately 10 minutes. The 67 bus runs from 07:24 to 18:27 hourly / two hourly Monday to Saturday with journey times to Clitheroe being approximately 10 minutes. These bus services, including Sunday services are therefore limited and as such are not considered to be of a duration or frequency that would make travelling by public transport an attractive method of transport for future occupiers. Whilst the site may be considered to have access to a reasonable bus service, there are other considerations to whether a site is sustainable in respect of walking and cycling options.

In this instance, analysis shows the application site as being roughly a 40 minute walk from the nearest substantial services and amenities which in this instance are located within the defined settlement area of Clitheroe, with the shortest walking route from the application site to Clitheroe being via Public Right Of Way FP0343022, Clitheroe Road and Waddington Road, with Clitheroe Road being an unlit carriageway and with both Waddington Road and Clitheroe Road having no designated cycle lanes and sections without pavements. As such, it is not considered likely that future occupants of the proposed dwelling would be able to access services, amenities and additional public transport links within Clitheroe by foot or bicycle as these would not be an attractive or safe mode of travel. Consequently, future occupants of the proposed dwelling would likely be reliant upon the use of private motor vehicles to access key services and facilities and the site is therefore not considered to be a suitable or sustainable location for housing. The proposed development therefore fails to satisfy the requirements of Key Statement DMI2 and Policy DMG3 of the Core Strategy.

Policy SP5 (1) of the National Planning Policy Framework (2026) allows for certain types of development outside of settlement areas including where the development in question would address an evidenced unmet need including the provision of housing where a local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five year housing land supply and in this instance the most recently published five-year housing land supply figure for the Ribble Valley (base date of 31st March 2026) indicates that Ribble Valley Borough Council has a housing land supply of 2.24 years. Notwithstanding this, the above policy carries a requirement for the development in question to be physically well-related to an existing settlement and in this case the proposal site is not considered to be physically well related to the nearest settlements of Waddington or West Bradford and as such fails to satisfy the requirements of Policy S5 (1) (j) (i). Furthermore, the proposed development would fail to meet any of the additional exceptions for development outside of settlement areas specified within Policy SP5 (1).

Policy SP5 (4) of the NPPF states that development proposals outside of settlement areas which do not fall within the categories set out in Policy S5 (1) should only be approved in exceptional circumstances. A similar proposal for a new build dwelling was submitted under previous planning application 3/2024/0255. This proposal was found to have the same policy conflicts with the Ribble Valley Core Strategy as identified above with respect to new residential development however a viable fallback position was identified by virtue of the proposal site benefitting from an extant Class ZA consent allowed through planning appeal ref: APP/T2350/W/23/3334523 which would have allowed (and still does allow) for the construction of a sizeable two storey dwelling exceeding the overall quantum of development being proposed under application 3/2024/0255. As such, the development proposed under application 3/2024/0255 was ultimately deemed to be acceptable in principle as the impact was deemed to be no greater than the fall-back position. In contrast, the development proposed under this application would involve the introduction of a sizeable dwelling and detached annex building to the application site which would collectively exceed the overall quantum of development allowed under planning appeal APP/T2350/W/23/3334523 and the development consented under application 3/2024/0255 by a considerable measure (the visual impact of the proposed development is assessed in further detail in the report's 'Visual Amenity/External Appearance' section). For this reason, it is not considered that a viable fallback position or any other exceptional circumstances exist in this instance to justify the principle of development proposed under this application.

Taking account of all of the above, the proposed development would fail to satisfy the requirements of Key Statements DS1 and DMI2 and Policies DMG2, DMG3 and DMH3 of the Core Strategy and Policy SP5 (1) and (4) of the NPPF (2026) and as such is considered to be unacceptable in principle.

Self-build

The proposal has been submitted as a self-build development, however there is no legal agreement submitted to secure this. Had an acceptable legal agreement been submitted and with a shortfall of self-build housing within the Borough, whilst the proposal only relates to the provision of one dwelling, some weight could nonetheless be given to the fact that this would be a self-build dwelling. The Council has given regard to the provision of a self-build unit as a material consideration, however this is considered to carry only limited weight, and is not considered significant enough to outweigh non-compliance with the Core Strategy and NPPF, namely with regard to Key Statements DS1 and DMI2 and Policies DMG2, DMG3 and DMH3 of the Core Strategy and Policy SP5 (1) and (4) of the NPPF (2026).

Impact Upon Residential Amenity:

Policy DMG1 of the Core Strategy requires all proposals for development to consider the effects of development upon existing amenities.

In this instance, the proposed dwelling would be sited approximately 45-50 metres away from the nearest neighbouring property of Healings Farm, with the proposed annex sited considerably further away to the South of the proposed dwelling. As such, an acceptable relationship would be in place between the proposed dwelling and annex and nearest neighbouring receptor to circumvent any potential issues of overlooking and loss of privacy and natural light. In addition, analysis of the submitted plans indicates that all habitable spaces within the proposed dwelling and annex would be served by a sufficient quantity of natural light and outlook.

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

Visual Amenity/External Appearance:

Policy DP3 (1) of the NPPF states:

'Development proposals should respond to their context (the history, character and features of their site and its setting), so that they integrate with and enhance their surroundings.'

In addition, Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley 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, including impact on landscape character.'

In this instance, the proposed development would involve the demolition of three former light industrial buildings and construction of a detached dwelling. The existing buildings to be demolished comprise a single storey mono-pitched roof building and two nissen huts with cylindrical roof profiles. On plan form, this grouping of buildings effectively forms an 'L' shaped footprint however from a visual perspective the buildings within the grouping are individually discernible by virtue of their mono-pitched and cylindrical roof profiles therefore the collective bulk and massing of the grouping of buildings is evenly distributed within the site. In addition, the site section drawings submitted in support of the application shows the existing roofscape of buildings within the application site as incrementally descending in height from Healings Farm through to the buildings to be demolished in line with the

site's descending North-South topography. As such, the existing grouping of buildings within and around the application site read as largely cohesive and proportionate in terms of their collective bulk, massing and height.

In contrast, whilst the proposed dwelling would comprise a similar footprint to the collective footprint of the single storey mono-pitched roof building and two nissen huts to be demolished, it would comprise a two storey component standing at 7.2m in height in comparison to the existing mono pitched roof building and nissen huts which comprise heights of 4.2m and 3.4m respectively. As such, the proposed dwelling, by virtue of its footprint, height, bulk and massing, would noticeably exceed the collective size of the buildings to be demolished and all of the other buildings within and around the application site by a considerable measure. Furthermore, whilst the proposed annex building would be comparatively modest in terms of its footprint and height, its addition to the site would nonetheless exacerbate the overall bulk and massing effect of the proposed development. Moreover, whilst the height of the dwelling's projecting gable components have been reduced to single storey elements relative to the design proposed for the dwelling refused under previous application 3/2025/0155, the dwelling's two storey component would nonetheless disrupt the existing descending roofscape of buildings within the application site, as shown on the proposed site section drawing submitted in support of the application.

Taking account of the above, it is considered that the proposed dwelling would read as a disproportionate, over dominant and incongruous addition to the application site in the context of the site's existing built form which in turn would be harmful to the visual amenities of the area. The proposed development would therefore fail to satisfy the requirements of Policy DP3 (1) of the NPPF (2026) and Policy DMG1 of the Core Strategy.

Notwithstanding the visual harm identified from the proposed development, it is acknowledged that the development allowed under planning appeal ref: APP/T2350/W/23/3334523 would allow for the addition of a sizeable two storey dwelling to the site and must therefore be treated as material planning consideration as part of the assessment of this application. For reference, analysis shows that the dwelling allowed on appeal comprises a footprint of 159 m2 and height of 7.2 metres. In contrast, the dwelling proposed under this application would comprise a considerably larger footprint of 291 m2 and unlike the development allowed on appeal, the current proposal also includes the introduction of annex accommodation to the site which would further exacerbate the overall bulk and massing effect of the proposed development. Consequently, the development proposed under this application is not considered to be comparable to that of the development allowed under planning appeal ref: APP/T2350/W/23/3334523 on the basis that implementation of the currently proposed development would result in greater harm to the visual amenities of the area, relative to the development which could be implemented by virtue of the allowed appeal. For this reason, it is not considered that a viable fallback position exists in this instance to justify the visual harm that would arise from the development proposed under this application.

Highways and Parking:

LCC Highways have reviewed the proposal and have raised no issues with the proposed development with respect to access, vehicle parking provision or general highway safety. The LHA have made a request for conditions to be imposed with respect to construction management, access, parking arrangements, cycle storage and use of the proposed annex building. Accordingly, it is not considered that the proposed development would have any undue impacts upon highway safety as such the proposal satisfies Policy DMG1 of the Core Strategy (highways).

Landscape/Ecology:

Protected species

A preliminary ecology and bat survey carried out at the application site on 13/1/22 and again on 1/9/23 found no evidence of any bat related activity within the proposal site or target buildings (mono-pitched roof building and x 3 Nissen huts) with the target buildings in question being deemed as holding negligible roosting potential for bats. In addition, no other ecological constraints were identified within or around the proposal site. An updated survey was subsequently undertaken at the application site on 18/2/25 which identified no changes from the previous survey findings. As such, no concerns are raised with respect to impacts upon ecology from the proposed development.

BNG

The development is exempt from having to achieve the mandatory Biodiversity Net Gain requirement as it is a self-build application, however this would need to be secured with a legal agreement in order for the exemption to apply.

Observations/Consideration of Matters Raised/Conclusion:

The proposal fails to satisfy the requirements of Key Statements DS1 and DMI2 and Policies DMG2, DMG3 and DMH3 of the Core Strategy and Policy SP5 (1) and (4) of the NPPF (2026) with respect to new residential development within the countryside and in an unsustainable location and in this instance it is not considered that a viable fallback position exists to justify the principle of development proposed under this application.

Furthermore, the proposed dwelling, by virtue of its footprint, height, bulk and massing, would read as a disproportionate, over dominant and incongruous addition to the application site in the context of the site's existing built form which in turn would be harmful to the visual amenities of the area. Moreover, it is not considered that a viable fallback position exists to justify the visual harm that would arise from the development proposed under this application. The proposed development would therefore fail to satisfy the requirements of Policy DP3 (1) of the NPPF and Policies DMG1 and DMG2 of the Core Strategy.

It is for the above reasons and having regard to all material considerations and matters raised that planning consent be refused.

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

- | | |
|------------|--|
| 01: | The proposal fails to satisfy the requirements of Key Statements DS1 and DMI2 and Policies DMG2, DMG3 and DMH3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and Policies SP5 and TR3 of the NPPF (2026) with respect to new residential development within the designated countryside and in an unsustainable location for housing. In this instance it is not considered that a viable fallback position exists to justify the principle of development proposed under this application. |
| 02: | The proposed dwelling, by virtue of its footprint, height, bulk and massing, would read as a disproportionate, over dominant and incongruous addition to the application site in the context of the site's existing built form which in turn would be harmful to the visual amenities of the area. Moreover, it is not considered that a viable fallback position exists to justify the visual harm that would arise from the development proposed under this application. The proposed development would therefore fail to satisfy the requirements of Policy DP3 (1) of the NPPF (2026) and Policies DMG1 and DMG2 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy. |