

Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.

Signed:	Officer:	BT	Date:	7/9/26	Manager:	LH	Date:	8/9/26
----------------	-----------------	----	--------------	--------	-----------------	----	--------------	--------

Application Ref:	3/2026/0469			 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 temporary siting (3 years) of five shipping containers for B8 storage.
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.
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

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Relevant Planning History:**3/2026/0468:**

Proposed erection of a two-storey self-build dwelling and associated annexe following demolition of existing workshop buildings (Refused)

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 temporary siting (three years) of five shipping containers for storage.

Principle of Development:

Policy S5 (1) (d) of the NPPF (2026) allows for developments outside of settlement areas where the development in question would involve the redevelopment of previously developed land and in this instance the proposed development would be sited on previously developed land. Notwithstanding this,

Policy S5 (1) also states that acceptable forms of development outside of settlements should be approved unless the benefits of doing so would be substantially outweighed by any adverse effects when assessed against the national decision making policies of the NPPF.

In this instance, the application's supporting information states that the proposed shipping containers are required to provide storage for ongoing light-industrial activity at the site however no further information pertaining to these existing activities was provided in support of the original application submission. Consequently, further information was sought from the applicant with regards to the nature of the existing light industrial activities allegedly being undertaken at the site including details of the period of operation of the existing industrial activities, employee numbers and vehicle movements to and from the site. Additional information has since been provided by the applicant which states that the proposal would generate two part-time jobs and involve only limited vehicle movements, along with confirmation that the applicant seeks temporary planning consent for the proposed shipping containers in order to assess how the additional storage would operate alongside the existing commercial use of the site before considering any longer-term arrangements. The additional correspondence received is otherwise limited in terms of detail and does not provide any specific information with regards to the nature of the existing light industrial activities being undertaken at the proposal site or how the quantity of storage being proposed relates to these activities. As such, it remains unclear as to what benefits would be derived from approval of the proposed development.

In addition, and having regard to the decision making policies of the NPPF, Policy TR3 seeks to direct development to sustainable locations where possible however in this case the proposal site lies within the open countryside and as such is not considered to be sustainably located. In addition, whilst Policy E4 (2) (a) and (b) of the NPPF allows for developments outside of settlements for the purpose of meeting business needs it is not considered that sufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that the proposed development would be required to facilitate an existing business operation. In a similar vein, whilst Policy DMG2 of the Core Strategy allows for small scale developments in rural areas where a local need or benefit can be demonstrated it is not considered that this has been adequately evidenced, nor would the proposed development meet any of the other exceptions for development outside of settlement areas permitted under Policy DMG2. Moreover, Key Statement DM12 and Policy DMG3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy require new development to be located to minimise the need to travel however as conveyed above the proposed development is considered to be sited in an unsustainable location.

In light of all of the above, it is considered that any benefits (which in any case have not been established in this instance) arising from the proposed development would be substantially outweighed by the harm arising from the conflict with Policies TR3 and E4 (2) (a) and (b) of the NPPF and Policies DMG2 and DMG3 of the Core Strategy with regards to sustainable development and meeting rural business needs. Consequently, the proposed development would fail to satisfy the requirements of Policies SP5 (1), TR3 and E4 (2) (a) and (b) of the NPPF and Policies DMG2 and DMG3 of the Core Strategy and is therefore considered to be unacceptable in principle.

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 shipping containers would be sited approximately 25-30 metres away from the nearest neighbouring property of Healings Farm, with the shipping containers also being screened from the aforementioned neighbouring property behind an existing gable roofed building. As such, it is not anticipated that the introduction of the proposed shipping containers to the site would have any undue impacts upon neighbouring amenity with regards to loss of outlook or natural light.

Consequently, it is not considered that the proposed development would be harmful to the amenity of any neighbouring residents. 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 application site comprises a mixture of buildings, all of which are predominantly industrial in appearance. The proposed shipping containers would be industrial in appearance and sited in close proximity to other buildings within the site. In addition, the shipping containers would be modest structures in terms of their height and would collectively comprise a similar footprint to other buildings within the site. As such, the proposed containers would read as congruent and proportionate additions to the application site.

Consequently, it is not considered that the proposed development would be harmful to the visual amenities of the area and would therefore satisfy the requirements of Policy DP3 (1) of the NPPF and Policy DMG1 of the Core Strategy.

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:

BNG

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

Observations/Consideration of Matters Raised/Conclusion:

Insufficient information has been provided with regards to the benefits that would be derived from approval of the proposed development. Furthermore, the proposed development would be sited in an unsustainable location and in this instance it is not considered that sufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that the proposed development would be required to serve an existing rural business operation. Consequently, it is considered that any benefits arising from the proposed development would be substantially outweighed by the harm arising from the conflict with Policies TR3 and E4 (2) (a) and (b) of the NPPF and Policies DMG2 and DMG3 of the Core Strategy with regards to

sustainable development and meeting rural business needs. The proposed development would therefore fail to satisfy the requirements of Policies SP5 (1), TR3 and E4 (2) (a) and (b) of the NPPF and Policies DMG2 and DMG3 of the Core Strategy and as such is considered to be unacceptable in principle.

RECOMMENDATION: That planning consent be refused for the following reason:

- 01:** Insufficient information has been provided with regards to the benefits that would be derived from approval of the proposed development. Furthermore, the proposed development would be sited in an unsustainable location and in this instance it is not considered that sufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that the proposed development would be required to serve an existing rural business operation. Consequently, it is considered that any benefits arising from the proposed development would be substantially outweighed by the harm arising from the conflict with Policies TR3 and E4 (2) (a) and (b) of the NPPF and Policies DMG2 and DMG3 of the Core Strategy. The proposed development would therefore fail to satisfy the requirements of Policies SP5 (1), TR3 and E4 (2) (a) and (b) of the NPPF and Policies DMG2 and DMG3 of the Core Strategy and as such there is no justification for allowing the development outside of a settlement boundary.