

Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.							
Signed:	Officer:	LW	Date:	21/08/26	Manager:	LH	Date: 24/8/26

Application Ref:	3/2026/0488			 Ribble Valley Borough Council www.ribblevalley.gov.uk
Date Inspected:	31/07/26	Site Notice:	31/07/26	
Officer:	LW			
DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:				APPROVAL

Development Description:	Erection of 6 dwellings with associated access and landscaping.
Site Address/Location:	Land to the rear of The Nook, Snodworth Road, Langho, BB6 8DR.

CONSULTATIONS:	Parish/Town Council
A consultation response from Billington and Langho Parish Council was received 22nd July 2026 raising an objection to the proposed development. The concerns raised can be summarised as below: • Highway safety concerns with respect to the access along Snodworth Road; • The submitted plans do not show the water courses or pond within the site; • Whether the site is within the Green Belt; • The development is out of keeping with the local area; • Issues with the footpath as a result of the water table; • Wildlife activity not acknowledged in the application.	

CONSULTATIONS:	Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies
LCC Highways:	The Local Highway Authority are of the opinion that the proposed development would result in an intensified use of substandard access points, increased highway safety risks for both vehicular and pedestrian users and would not provide a safe and suitable access arrangement for the scale of development proposed.
Lancashire Fire and Rescue Service:	Provides advice with respect of access for fire appliances and water supplies for firefighting purposes to the site.
RVBC Countryside Officer:	Requests the imposition of conditions relating to tree protection measures and Biodiversity Net Gain.

CONSULTATIONS:	Additional Representations.
Approximately 22 letters of objection, from separate addresses, have been received. The concerns raised can be summarised as below: • Inappropriate development in the Green Belt; • Unjustified encroachment into the open countryside; • The site is poorly connected resulting in a reliance on private cars – increase in traffic; • Limited facilities and unsustainable location; • Highway safety issues; • Unresolved drainage and flood risk issues; • Watercourses and ponds not shown on plans; • Harm to the character of the area; • Out of keeping with surrounding properties;	

- Overbearing impact on neighbouring residents;
- Loss of privacy to immediately adjacent properties;
- Additional disturbance to a quiet area;
- Construction disturbance;
- Loss of existing habitat and impact on biodiversity;
- Light disturbance impacting biodiversity;
- Insufficient BNG strategy;
- Trees have previously been felled on the site;
- Inability of construction vehicles to safely access the site;
- Impact on existing infrastructure;
- Impact upon the safe use of the public footpath;
- There is enough housing being built in the area;
- Doesn't support local housing needs;
- Contrary to local policy;
- Approval would set a precedent for other housing schemes in the area.

RELEVANT POLICIES AND SITE PLANNING HISTORY:

Ribble Valley Core Strategy:

Key Statement DS1: Development Strategy
 Key Statement DS2: Sustainable Development
 Key Statement EN1: Green Belt
 Key Statement EN3: Sustainable Development and Climate Change
 Key Statement EN4: Biodiversity and Geodiversity
 Key Statement H1: Housing Provision
 Key Statement H2: Housing Balance
 Key Statement H3: Affordable Housing
 Key Statement DMI2: Transport Considerations

Policy DMG1: General Considerations
 Policy DMG2: Strategic Considerations
 Policy DMG3: Transport & Mobility
 Policy DME1: Protecting Trees & Woodland
 Policy DME2: Landscape & Townscape Protection
 Policy DME3: Site and Species Protection and Conservation
 Policy DME6: Water Management

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) – Updated August 2026

Relevant Planning History:

3/1984/0144: Proposed bungalow (Refused and appeal dismissed).

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:

Site Description and Surrounding Area:

The application site comprises approximately 0.54 hectares of land associated with the residential property known as The Nook. The site is located to the east of Snodworth Road and south of York Lane. Residential properties in the surrounding area include Hyburn, Dove Cottage, Nip Nook and Sondaw to the north-west, and Yorkfield together with Nos. 1 and 2 York Lane to the north-east.

The site lies outside any defined settlement boundary and is designated as Green Belt land. A Public Right of Way runs along the site's northern boundary. The site and its surroundings also contain a number of mature trees, including a group of trees along the northern boundary of the site which are protected under a Tree Preservation Order.

The site's topography slopes from its highest point in the south-eastern corner down towards the northern boundary.

Proposed Development for which consent is sought:

The application seeks full planning permission for the erection of six detached, two-storey dwellings arranged across three different house types. Each dwelling would provide four bedrooms at first floor, with the main living space and an integral garage at ground floor.

The proposed external materials include buff brick, feature stone detailing and timber cladding, with roofs finished in either grey slate roofing or blue roofing.

Vehicular access to the development would be achieved via the retention and enhancement of the existing access points from Snodworth Road and York Lane. Plots 1 and 2 would be served by the existing access serving The Nook from Snodworth Road, while Plots 3 to 6 would be accessed via the existing access point from York Lane.

The proposals also include associated hard and soft landscaping works, comprising new hedgerow, shrub and tree planting, together with the resurfacing of the existing Public Right of Way. A sustainable drainage strategy forms part of the development and includes the provision of an attenuation pond within the north-eastern part of the site. In addition, the existing watercourse along the western section of the site would be diverted as part of the proposed drainage and landscaping works.

Principle of Development:

Green Belt

The application site lies within the designated Green Belt and therefore Key Statement EN1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and national Green Belt policy contained within Section 13 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) are engaged. It is noted that the NPPF has been updated since the submission of the application. Accordingly, the proposal has been assessed against the current version of the NPPF, published in August 2026.

Key Statement EN1 relates solely to development within the defined Green Belt and states that *'the overall extent of the Green Belt will be maintained to safeguard the surrounding countryside from inappropriate encroachment. The development of new buildings will be limited to the purposes of agriculture, forestry, essential outdoor sport and recreation, cemeteries and for other uses of land which preserve the openness of the Green Belt, and which do not conflict with the purposes of its designation'*.

In addition, the NPPF states that there is a general presumption against inappropriate development in the Green Belt and advises that when considering any planning application, Local Planning Authorities (LPA) should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt.

NPPF Policy GB7 sets out that new development in the Green Belt should be regarded as inappropriate, unless it falls within a closed list of exceptions. These are as follows:

- a) *Development which is for agriculture, horticulture and forestry, or which is solely for nature conversions, restoration and/or enhancement;*

- b) The reuse, extension, alteration or replacement of an existing building, provided that the existing building is of permanent and substantial construction, is lawful in planning terms, and any extension or alteration will not result in a disproportionate increase in size compared to the original building. In the case of proposals for a replacement building, it should be for the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces;*
- c) Limited infilling in villages lying within the Green Belt;*
- d) Limited affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in this Framework or the development plan (for instance, on a rural exception site);*
- e) The redevelopment of previously developed land (including a material change of use to residential or mixed-use including residential), which would not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt;*
- f) Certain other forms of development, provided the impact on the openness of the Green Belt is minimised, and there would not be a significant conflict with the Green Belt purposes.*

The Applicant's primary case is that the erection of six new residential dwellings would constitute limited infilling in a village and would therefore represent an exception to the general presumption against inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Reliance is placed on paragraph 154(e) of the previous version of the NPPF, which permitted 'limited infilling in villages'. However, this provision has since been superseded by Policy GB7(c) of the new NPPF.

The NPPF does not define either 'limited infilling' or 'village' for the purposes of Green Belt policy. Consequently, whether a site is considered to be within a village is a matter of planning judgement, having regard to its relationship with a settlement, the character and extent of the surrounding built form, and the degree to which it is perceived as forming part of a village.

The submitted Planning Statement contends that the site is functionally and physically related to Langho, which is identified as a Tier 1 village within the Ribble Valley Core Strategy, and should therefore be regarded as forming part of that village.

Notwithstanding this, the application site lies approximately 200 metres beyond the defined settlement boundary of Langho. Whilst the site adjoins a number of existing residential properties, the character of development between Snodworth Road and York Lane is notably spacious and dispersed. Moreover, extensive areas of open countryside lie immediately to the south of the site and to the north of York Lane. These open areas make a considerable contribution to the more rural character of the locality and limit the extent to which the site can reasonably be regarded as forming part of the village.

The pattern of development in the surrounding area provides an important visual break between the main built-up area of Langho and the open countryside beyond. As a result, there is a clear sense of departure from the village, with a discernible transition from the established settlement to the surrounding countryside. In this respect, the site is characterised more by its rural setting than by any association with the compact built form of the village.

Having regard to the site's relationship with the surrounding pattern of development and the prevailing character of the locality, it is not considered to lie within a village for the purposes of Policy GB7(c). Rather than consolidating the built form of Langho, the proposal would instead introduce new residential development into an area that currently exhibits a predominantly rural character.

It is also noted that a cluster of dwellings known as York lies to the east of the site, towards the top of York Lane. However, having regard to its limited scale and absence of community facilities or services, York is more appropriately characterised as a hamlet rather than a village. Accordingly, the site cannot reasonably be regarded as lying within a village on the basis of its proximity to that group of properties.

In addition, the application relates to a relatively substantial parcel of land extending to approximately 0.54 hectares and proposes the erection of six detached dwellings. Having regard to both the size of the

site and the scale of development proposed the scheme cannot reasonably be described as 'limited infilling' for the purposes of Policy GB7(c).

Having regard to the above, the proposed development is not considered to amount to 'limited infilling', nor is the site considered to be located in a village. Accordingly, the proposal does not benefit from the exception set out in Policy GB7(c) of the NPPF.

The Planning Statement also relies, in the alternative, on paragraph 154(g) of the previous NPPF. That provision supported the limited infilling or redevelopment of previously developed land (PDL), provided that the development would cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt. This exception has now been superseded by Policy GB7(e) of the current NPPF.

Annex B of the NPPF defines PDL as:

'Land which has been lawfully developed and is or was occupied by a permanent structure and any fixed surface infrastructure associated with it, including the curtilage of the developed land (although it should not be assumed that the whole of the curtilage should be developed). It also includes land comprising large areas of fixed surface infrastructure such as large areas of hardstanding which have been lawfully developed. Previously developed land excludes: land that is or was last occupied by agricultural or forestry buildings; land that has been developed for mineral extraction or waste disposal by landfill, where provision for restoration has been made through development management procedures; land in built-up areas such as residential gardens, parks, recreation grounds and allotments; and land that was previously developed but where the remains of the permanent structure or fixed surface structures have blended into the landscape'.

The information submitted in support of the application identifies the site as forming part of the residential curtilage of The Nook. On that basis, it is accepted that the site could fall within the definition of PDL.

However, even if the site were to be regarded as PDL, this would not in itself render the development acceptable in Green Belt terms. Policy GB7(e) requires that the redevelopment of previously developed land must not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt.

In considering this matter, it is recognised that Green Belt openness has both spatial and visual dimensions. Spatial openness relates to the absence of built form, whilst visual openness concerns the extent to which development is perceived within the landscape.

The application site presently comprises a largely open area of land containing only limited built form. The proposal seeks permission for six detached, two-storey dwellings together with associated access arrangements, hardstanding, domestic curtilages and landscaping works. As a consequence, the development would result in a substantial increase in the overall amount, scale and permanence of built form within the site compared to the existing situation.

Whilst the site is bounded in part by existing residential properties and mature vegetation, it nevertheless makes a meaningful contribution to Green Belt openness by virtue of its predominantly undeveloped character. The introduction of six dwellings and their associated infrastructure would significantly erode this openness. In spatial terms, the proposal would replace a largely undeveloped area with a dense form of residential development. In visual terms, although views would be partially filtered by existing vegetation, landform and surrounding development, the scheme would remain visible from sections of Snodworth Road, York Lane and the Public Right of Way running along the site's northern boundary.

The Local Planning Authority therefore considers that the proposed development would result in substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt, both spatially and visually. Consequently, the development would fail to satisfy the requirements of Policy GB7(e).

Policy GB7(g) of the NPPF provides that development within the Green Belt should not be regarded as inappropriate where it involves grey belt land and satisfies a number of additional criteria.

Annex B of the NPPF defines grey belt as land within the Green Belt comprising PDL and/or any other land in the Green Belt that, in either case, does not strongly contribute to any of purposes (a), (b), or (d) set out in Policy GB2.

The site is not considered to make a significant contribution towards purpose (a) or (b), which seeks to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas and prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another, nor purpose (d), which seeks to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns.

Taking these factors into account, the Local Planning Authority is satisfied that the site constitutes grey belt land for the purposes of this application.

However, in order for the proposal to benefit from the exception set out in Policy GB7(g), the following additional criteria must also be satisfied:

- i. *The development would utilise grey belt land and would not fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan;*
- ii. *There is an evidenced unmet need for the type of development proposed;*
- iii. *The development would be in a sustainable location, with particular reference to Policy TR3 of this Framework; and*
- iv. *In the case of major development involving the provision of housing, the development proposed complies with Policy GB8.*

In respect of criterion (i), the Council's Green Belt evidence base is currently being updated as part of the emerging Local Plan process. At the present time, this work has not progressed sufficiently to enable a definitive assessment of whether the release of the site would fundamentally undermine the purposes of the remaining Green Belt across the borough. As such, the Local Planning Authority is unable to conclude that criterion (i) has not been met.

With regard to criterion (ii), the most recently published five-year housing land supply figure (base date 31st March 2025) indicated that Ribbles Valley Borough Council has a housing land supply of 6.2 years. However, a recent appeal decision (dated 7th January 2026) at Land to the South of Chatburn Old Road, Chatburn (APP/T2350/W/25/3372635) determined that the Council has a housing land supply of 3.45 years. Furthermore, an updated five-year housing land supply figure (base date of 31st March 2026) is due to be considered by Planning Committee on 27th August 2026 which, if approved, indicates that the Council has a housing land supply of 2.24 years. The Council is therefore currently unable to demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing land. Accordingly, there is an evidenced unmet need for additional housing in the Borough, and the proposal is therefore considered to satisfy the requirement at Policy GB7(g) (ii).

Turning to criterion (iii), the Local Planning Authority does not consider the site to comprise a sustainable location. Whilst the site lies within walking distance of Langho village centre, including local services and public transport facilities within a 10-20 minutes' walk, pedestrian connectivity is constrained by the absence of continuous footways along sections of Snodworth Road, York Lane and Whinney Lane. These routes are also characterised by a steep gradient, which limits accessibility and reduces the attractiveness of walking as a realistic alternative to the private car. Consequently, future occupiers would be likely to rely heavily on private vehicle use to meet their day-to-day needs. This is considered further below.

In relation to criterion (iv), the proposal does not constitute major housing development for the purposes of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015. The development proposes six dwellings and therefore falls below the threshold of ten or more dwellings. Accordingly, the 'Golden Rules' provisions are not applicable in this instance.

Whilst the site is considered to comprise grey belt land and the proposal would address an identified housing need; the Local Planning Authority does not consider the development to be located in a sustainable location. As a consequence, the proposal fails to satisfy criterion (iii) of Policy GB7(g) of the NPPF and cannot benefit from the grey belt exception.

Policy GB7(h) of the NPPF also states that residential development in the Green Belt should not be regarded as inappropriate where it would:

- i. *Be within reasonable walking distance of a well-connected station (applying the definitions in the glossary of Annex B);*
- ii. *Be physically well-related to the station or the settlement within which the station is located;*
- iii. *Be of a scale which can be accommodated taking into account the existing or proposed availability of infrastructure;*
- iv. *Not prejudice any proposals for long-term comprehensive development in the same location; and*
- v. *In the case of proposals for major development, comply with Policy GB8.*

Annex B of the NPPF defines a 'reasonable walking distance' for the purposes of Policy GB7 (relating to land around well-connected stations) to be '*around 800 metres, or around 10-minutes' walk time if topography, route availability and quality or physical barriers would prevent or discourage walking from up to 800 metres away [...] Where a reasonable walking distance is required to be calculated when applying Policy GB7(1)(h), and only part of the site falls within the reasonable walking distance, the subparagraph of policy GB7 only apply to the area of the site within that reasonable walking distance.*'

It also defines a well-connected stations to be '*railway stations and underground, tram and light rail stops located within a top 80 Travel to Work Area located partially or fully within England by Gross Value Added (GVA) and which, in the normal weekday timetable, are served (or have a reasonable prospect of being served due to planning upgrades or through agreement with the rail operator) throughout the daytime by at least four trains or trams per hour overall, or at least two trains or trams per hour in any one direction.*'

In this case, the application site is located approximately 965 metres from Langho railway station, equating to a walk of around 16 minutes. The site therefore falls outside the NPPF definition of a reasonable walking distance. Furthermore, Langho station is not considered to be a well-connected station for the purposes of Policy GB7(h), as it is not located within a top 80 Travel to Work Area by GVA. Consequently, the proposal fails to satisfy criterion (i) of Policy GB7(h).

In respect of criterion (ii), and for the reasons set out above, the site is not considered to be physically well-related either to Langho station or to the settlement within which the station is located. The proposal therefore also fails to meet this requirement.

Turning to criteria (iii) and (iv), it is accepted that the erection of six dwellings would be of a scale capable of being accommodated by existing infrastructure provision and would not prejudice any proposals for long-term comprehensive development of the area.

Criterion (v) is not applicable in this instance, as the proposal does not constitute major development.

Overall, whilst the proposal is considered to satisfy criteria (iii) and (iv), it fails to comply with criteria (i) and (ii). As all of the relevant requirements of Policy GB7(h) must be met for the exception to apply, the development cannot benefit from this exception and must therefore be regarded as inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

Taking account of the above, the development is considered to constitute inappropriate development within the Green Belt. By definition, inappropriate development is harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. No very special circumstances have been demonstrated that would clearly outweigh the identified harm to the Green Belt, to which substantial weight must be afforded in the planning balance.

Sustainability

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. Considerable weight is to be attached to the availability and adequacy of public transport to serve those moving to and from a proposed development. This aligns with the sustainability objectives of the NPPF, which seeks to promote sustainable patterns of growth and reduce reliance on private motor vehicles.

As set out elsewhere within this report, the application site lies outside the defined settlement boundary of Langho, a Tier 1 village within the Core Strategy. Whilst Langho contains a number of services and facilities, including a SPAR convenience shop/ post office, primary school, pharmacy and a number of beauty salons/ hairdressers, which are within approximately a 10–20-minute walk of the site, the overall range and scale of provision is limited and would not be capable of meeting the full day-to-day needs of future residents.

Importantly, pedestrian access to the village would require users to travel along Snodworth Road, York Lane and/or Whinney Lane, which are all characterised by a steep gradient and lack a continuous footway along sections of its route. These factors reduce the attractiveness and convenience of walking and raise concerns regarding pedestrian safety, particularly for more vulnerable road users. The steep gradient and limited pedestrian infrastructure would also act as a deterrent to cycling.

The nearest bus stops are located on Whalley Road within Langho, approximately 650 metres from the site. These stops are served by Service 22, which provides connections between Clitheroe and Shadsworth. However, the route between the application site and these bus stops is constrained by the same deficiencies in pedestrian infrastructure identified above. The Local Highway Authority has also advised that there is limited scope to provide additional footway connections due to existing highway constraints, meaning these issues are unlikely to be capable of mitigation.

When considered cumulatively, these factors indicate that the site does not benefit from a level of accessibility or connectivity that would make walking, cycling or public transport a realistic and attractive alternative to private car use. Future occupants would be likely to rely heavily on the private motor vehicle for access to employment opportunities, healthcare facilities, primary and secondary education, retail provision and other day-to-day services. Whilst some needs may be met through online shopping and home delivery services, this would not address the site's underlying sustainability concerns and may itself generate additional vehicle movements.

Consequently, the proposal would fail to promote sustainable travel patterns and would result in an undue reliance on the private car. The development is therefore contrary to Key Statement DMI2 and Policy DMG3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and conflicts with the sustainability objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Taking account of the above, the proposed development is considered unacceptable in principle.

Impact Upon Residential Amenity:

The site is located within the curtilage of The Nook and in close proximity to a number of existing residential properties. As such, consideration must be given to the potential for the proposed development to adversely affect the amenity of existing and future occupants.

In this regard, particular consideration has been given to Hyburn and Dove Cottage, which are situated adjacent to the site access onto Snodworth Road; Sondaw to the north of the site; and No.2 York Lane and Yorkfield, which are located adjacent to the proposed access from York Lane. Whilst The Nook

remains within the same ownership as the application site, it is proposed to be retained as a separate dwelling and therefore its residential amenity must also be taken into account.

Whilst neighbouring properties would inevitably experience some change to their outlook and a reduction in the perception of openness as a result of the introduction of new built development, the proposed dwellings have been arranged so as to maintain appropriate separation distances from surrounding residential properties. The development would retain and approximate separation distance of 26 metres from Dove Cottage and No.2 York Lane. The orientation of the proposed dwellings, together with the presence of retained intervening vegetation, would further reduce the potential for any significant adverse impacts in respect of privacy, outlook or access to natural light.

The rear elevations of Plots 1 and 2 would face towards Sondaw. However, a separation distance of approximately 21 metres would be maintained. This is considered an acceptable interface distance that would safeguard residential amenity and prevent any significant adverse impacts. Furthermore, existing planting, which is protected by a Tree Preservation Order, would provide additional screening and separation between the respective private amenity areas.

The two-storey south-western elevation of Plot 1 would face towards the gable elevation of Hyburn. This elevation would incorporate two ground floor windows serving a kitchen/ dining room and utility room, together with a first-floor bathroom window. This relationship is not considered to give rise to any unacceptable amenity impacts, given the approximate separation distance of 20 metres and the fact that the first-floor window would serve a non-habitable room. Furthermore, the ground-floor windows would benefit from screening provided by proposed boundary planting and existing intervening vegetation which is proposed for retention.

The front elevations of plots 4 to 6 would face towards the south-western gable elevation and private amenity space associated with Yorkfield. However, a separation distance of at least 26 metres would be maintained between the proposed dwellings and Yorkfield, ensuring that no significant adverse impacts would arise in relation to habitable room windows. The proposed dwellings would also be positioned a minimum of 8 metres from the shared boundary with Yorkfield. This distance, together with the retention of existing vegetation along the boundary, would minimise opportunities for direct overlooking of Yorkfield's private amenity space.

The front elevations of Plots 1 and 2 would face towards the front elevation of The Nook. Whilst the separation distance in this instance would be approximately 19 metres, this relationship is not considered to warrant refusal on these grounds alone.

Objections have been received raising concerns regarding noise and disturbance arising from both the construction phase and future occupation of the development. Whilst it is acknowledged that construction activities have the potential to generate noise and disturbance, such impacts are an inevitable part of the development process and would only be temporary until completion of the development. Should consent be granted, a condition could also be imposed requiring the submission of a construction management plan to minimise disruption to neighbouring residents.

With regard to the occupation of the development, whilst the introduction of six additional dwellings would inevitably result in some increase in activity and associated noise levels, this would not be of a scale or nature that would result in an unacceptable impact on neighbouring living conditions. Residential use does not typically generate significant levels of noise, and it is therefore considered that the proposal would not give rise to any materially harmful effects on residential amenity in this respect.

Accordingly, the proposal is considered to accord with Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy, which seeks to ensure that development does not result in unacceptable impacts upon the amenities of existing or future occupiers.

Visual Amenity/External Appearance:

Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy requires development proposals to be sympathetic to existing and proposed land uses in terms of their size, intensity and nature, as well as their scale, massing, design, architectural features and materials. The policy further emphasises the importance of density, layout and the relationship between buildings, with particular regard to visual appearance, the relationship of development to its surroundings and its impact on landscape character.

Similarly, Policy DP3 of the NPPF states that *'development proposals should respond to their context (their history, character and features of their site and its setting), so that they integrate with and enhance their surroundings; such as through the arrangement of development plots and buildings and the use of materials and architectural features'*.

The application site is characterised by varying land levels, rising from south to north. This topography is a defining characteristic of the locality and contributes to the transition between the built environment of Langho and the surrounding rural landscape.

A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) has been submitted in support of the application. The LVIA identifies open or partial views into the site from a short section of Snodworth Road in the vicinity of the existing site access, from York Lane to the east, and from the public footpath running along the site's northern boundary. Additional views are available from elevated sections of public footpaths to the south of the site. The assessment notes that longer-distance views are generally restricted by intervening vegetation, topography and existing built development.

The LVIA concludes that, although the proposal would replace part of the existing garden character of the site, the development would sit comfortably within the retained landscape character. It further states that any adverse landscape and visual effects would be largely confined to the site and its immediate surroundings and would be mitigated through the proposed landscaping strategy, with effects diminishing over time as planting becomes established.

Notwithstanding the findings of the submitted LVIA, the Local Planning Authority has concerns regarding the proposed layout, scale and design of the development.

Although the site lies in proximity to established residential development, the prevailing pattern of development within the surrounding area between Snodworth Road and York Lane is characterised by dwellings occupying relatively spacious plots, often separated by generous gaps and mature landscaping. This established grain of development contributes positively to the semi-rural character of the locality.

In contrast, the proposal would result in a notably denser form of development, with limited spacing between dwellings. The proposed scheme would therefore introduce a more compact, regimented and suburban pattern of development that it is at odds with the spacious character that presently defines the area.

Furthermore, the proposal comprises six substantial four-bedroom dwellings each incorporating a variety of roof forms and built to a maximum eaves height of approximately 6 metres and ridge height of 8.5 metres. The cumulative scale and massing of the proposed dwellings would appear visually prominent within the site and would not reflect the simpler architectural forms and relatively low-profile appearance of neighbouring properties.

Having regard to this, the proposed development would appear as an unduly intensive form of residential development that fails to respond positively to, or enhance, its immediate context. The development would neither reinforce nor respect the established pattern of built form in the locality and would result in a form of development would appear incongruous with the prevailing character and appearance of the area.

Accordingly, the proposal is considered to conflict with the requirements of Policy DMG1 or Core Strategy and Policy DP3 of the NPPF, which seek to secure high-quality development that responds positively to local character and landscape context.

Highway Safety and Public Rights of Way:

Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy requires development proposals to have regard to their transport impacts, ensuring that safe and suitable access can be provided to accommodate the scale and nature of traffic likely to be generated. The policy also seeks to protect and, where appropriate, enhance public rights of way and wider accessibility.

Policy DMG3 further requires consideration to be given to the relationship of development proposals with the Primary Route Network and Strategic Road Network. The policy also requires developments to provide adequate parking, servicing and manoeuvring facilities.

In addition, Policy TR6(4) of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that planning permission should be refused where development would result in a severe impact on the transport network, having regard to capacity and congestion, including cumulative impacts, or where it would give rise to an unacceptable impact on highway safety.

The application has been reviewed by Lancashire County Council Highways, acting as the Local Highway Authority (LHA), who have raised an objection to the proposed development on the grounds that the residual cumulative impacts on the highway network would be severe.

Site Access

The LHA note that the site is currently served by two existing access points: one from Snodworth Road and one from York Lane. Both access points also provide access to Public Right of Way FP0306022. The proposal would retain both accesses but remove the existing through-route between them. As a result, two of the proposed dwellings, together with The Nook would be accessed from Snodworth Road, whilst the remaining four dwellings would be served from York Lane.

A number of access improvement are proposed as part of the development. These include widening the access onto Snodworth Road from 3.2 metres to 4.2 metres and widening the access onto York Lane from 3.7 metres to 4.8 metres.

Notwithstanding these improvements, the LHA advises that an access serving multiple dwellings should have a minimum width of 4.8 metres. This standard cannot be achieved at the Snodworth Road access due to land ownership constraints.

Concerns have also been raised regarding visibility splays. To establish the required visibility standards, seven-day Automated Traffic Counts (ATCs) were undertaken on both Snodworth Road and York Lane. Based on these surveys, it is considered that visibility splays measuring 2 metres back from the carriageway edge for 40 metres in both directions are required at the Snodworth Road access, and 35 metres in both directions at the York Lane access.

However, the visibility splays shown on the submitted plans do not achieve these requirements. At the Snodworth Road access, there is a shortfall of 11.4 metres to the north and 11.1 metres to the south. At the York Lane access, there is a shortfall of 9.1 metres to the east and 8.9 metres to the west.

Furthermore, both access points rely on third-party land to achieve the visibility splays shown on the submitted plans. Consequently, the visibility available in practise is likely to be less than that indicated, as the applicant has no control over potential obstructions within neighbouring land. Existing walls and vegetations within third-party ownership already restrict visibility, requiring drivers exiting the site to

edge into the carriageway to observe approaching highway users. The LHA considered that this situation presents a significant risk to vehicles exiting the site and to other users of the highway, including pedestrians using the shared carriageway.

The LHA therefore concludes that the development would result in the intensified use of two access points that do not provide adequate visibility. Significant highway safety concerns are consequently raised. In addition, the access onto Snodoworth Road would remain substandard in width, with no realistic opportunity or further improvements due to land ownership constraints.

Internal Layout

The LHA notes that all six proposed dwellings would benefit from two off-street parking spaces provided on private driveways, with the dwellings also including integral garages. Plots 1 to 5 are considered to provide parking provision in accordance with the LHA's parking standards. The existing dwelling, The Nook, would also retain adequate on-site parking.

However, concerns have been raised regarding the parking provision for Plot 6. The proposed garage does not meet the recommended minimum internal dimensions of 6 metres by 3 metres and therefore cannot be relied upon as a parking space. Whilst the driveway could accommodate up to three vehicles, parking at this level would prevent vehicles from turning within the plot. This could result in vehicles having to reverse approximately 30 metres to the turning head in order to leave the site in a forward gear.

The LHA also notes that details of refuse collection arrangements have not been provided. Given the private internal road layout, refuse collection would be expected to take place from the public highway. Concerns have therefore been raised that multiple bins could be positioned within the access points or on the adopted highway on collection days, potentially obstructing access to the Public Right of Way, restricting visibility, or impeding traffic movement. It is also noted that some dwellings would be required to move refuse bins distances of up to 80 metres on collection days. The LHA considers that this may increase the likelihood of bins being left at the site entrances for extended period.

Having regard to the above considerations, it is concluded that the proposed development would intensify the use of substandard access points, resulting in an increased highway safety risk for both vehicular and pedestrian users. The proposal is therefore not considered to provide a safe and suitable access arrangement for the scale of development proposed. Concerns are also raised regarding the internal parking and refuse collection arrangements. Accordingly, the development is considered to be contrary to Policies DMG1 and DMG3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and Policy TR6 (4) of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Impact on Trees:

There are a number of mature trees within and adjoining the site, including a group of trees along the northern boundary which are protected by Tree Preservation Order No. 4 of 1977.

The application is accompanied by an Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA), which identifies 36 individual trees, 12 tree groups and six hedgerows within and adjacent to the site. Of these, one individual tree (T49) and one tree group (G54) are classified as High Quality retention category 'A'. Ten individual trees, three tree groups and one hedgerow are classified as Moderate Quality retention category 'B'. A further 23 individual trees, eight tree groups and five hedgerows are classified as Low Quality retention category 'C', whilst two individual trees are categorised as retention category 'U', indicating that they are unsuitable for retention.

The AIA identifies the trees, tree groups and hedgerows located around the site boundaries as being of particular visual importance, contributing significantly to the character of the area and providing screening from neighbouring properties and the adjacent Public Right of Way. The remaining trees and

hedgerows within the site are considered to be of lesser visual significance, although they nevertheless provide a degree of amenity and ecological value.

The proposed development would necessitate the removal of two category 'B' trees and five category 'C' trees, together with three category 'C' tree groups, two category 'C' hedgerows, sections of two further tree groups and sections of two hedgerows. In addition, the two category 'U' trees are proposed to be removed due to their poor condition, irrespective of the development proposals.

A number of retained trees would also require access facilitation pruning works. The AIA advises that these works would be relatively minor in nature and, provided they are undertaken in accordance with BS3998:2010 *Tree Work - Recommendations*, would not adversely affect the long-term health, appearance or retention value of the affected trees.

The AIA concludes that the loss of the identified trees and hedgerows would result in a moderate, localised and long-term effect on the character and appearance of the site. However, it advises that these impacts can be appropriately mitigated through replacement tree planting and a comprehensive soft landscaping scheme.

The remaining trees, tree groups and hedgerows are proposed to be retained and protected throughout the construction period in accordance with the recommendations of the AIA and the requirements of BS5837:2012 *Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction*.

No construction activity is proposed within areas outside the development boundary but within the wider landholding, and these areas would therefore function as Construction Exclusion Zones. Protective fencing would be required prior to the commencement of development to safeguard retained trees. Whilst limited sections of protective fencing would require temporary repositioning to facilitate construction activities within the Root Protection Areas (RPAs) of certain retained trees, the AIA recommends that the development be phased to ensure fencing remains in its primary protective position for as long as practicable.

Temporary ground protection would also be required within the RPAs of a number of retained trees and tree groups to prevent soil compaction and damage to root systems during construction. In addition, some proposed boundary treatments would be located within RPAs; however, the AIA provides detailed guidance on their installation to ensure impacts on retained trees are minimised.

Arboriculturally supervised excavation works, including potential root pruning, would be required within limited sections of the RPAs of certain retained trees. Such works would be undertaken using hand-operated tools only and carried out in accordance with an Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) under the supervision of a suitably qualified arboriculturist.

Similarly, areas of proposed permanent hard surfacing located within RPAs would be constructed using a suitable "no-dig" methodology to avoid disturbance to the rooting environment, again in accordance with the recommendations of an approved AMS.

Subject to the implementation of the recommended tree protection measures, the submission of an AMS and implementation of replacement planting, the majority of existing arboricultural features of value would be retained and safeguarded. The proposal is therefore considered acceptable with respect to impact upon trees.

Ecology:

A range of ecological surveys and assessments of the site have been undertaken to inform the application.

The proposal would not result in harm to any statutorily or non-statutorily designated sites of nature conservation importance. The site comprises the residential garden associated with The Nook and is predominantly characterised by habitats of relatively low ecological value, including short-mown modified grassland, areas of sparsely vegetated urban land, ornamental planting beds, shrubs and hardstanding associated with the existing driveway.

Two waterbodies and two minor watercourses are present within the site boundary. No ponds or other standing waterbodies were identified within 250 metres of the site, although a network of minor watercourses is present within the wider landscape. Whilst the MAGIC database identifies a pond within the site boundary, this feature was assessed during field survey work and found to comprise an area of wet grassland rather than a functioning pond.

The two waterbodies on site consist of an ornamental pond in poor condition, characterised by dense algal growth, and a small natural basin supporting limited aquatic vegetation which is anticipated to be highly ephemeral in nature. Neither feature is considered suitable to support breeding great crested newts. Having regard to the absence of suitable breeding habitat, the sub-optimal nature of the on-site waterbodies and the lack of functional connectivity to other ponds within the surrounding area, great crested newts have been reasonably discounted from the site.

Notwithstanding this, the presence of common amphibian species cannot be ruled out. The terrestrial habitats present within the site, together with the minor watercourses that traverse the site and surrounding landscape, may provide opportunities for dispersal and movement. Furthermore, ornamental ponds within neighbouring residential properties may support local amphibian populations. Accordingly, it is recommended that a Precautionary Method of Working (PMoW) be secured to ensure appropriate mitigation measures are implemented throughout the construction phase.

The minor streams crossing the site are considered unsuitable to support notable aquatic fauna and are therefore not considered to present a significant ecological constraint to development.

With regard to badgers, no evidence of activity was identified during the survey. No setts, latrines, snuffle holes or other field signs indicative of badger presence was recorded within the site boundary. However, the site may be utilised by commuting and foraging badgers, and it is therefore recommended that the PMoW includes appropriate safeguards and mitigation measures to protect badgers during the construction phase.

The site also offers limited potential for roosting bats. All buildings within the site were assessed as having negligible bat roost potential. Two trees, one within the site and one immediately adjacent to it, were identified as containing Potential Roost Features (PRFs). These features were categorised as PRF-I, indicating the potential to support individual bats or small numbers of roosting bats due to the limited extent of cavities present.

The site was further assessed as providing generally low value for bat foraging and commuting. The woodland and tree lines around the site boundaries provide some connectivity to the wider landscape and therefore represent the most valuable features for bats, whereas the central areas of the site are unlikely to support high levels of invertebrate prey. Whilst bats may therefore utilise the site for roosting, commuting and foraging purposes, any activity is anticipated to be limited to small numbers of common bat species. Given that the trees containing potential roost features are proposed to be retained, no further bat survey work is considered necessary.

Notwithstanding this, the ecological assessment recommends the installation of four bat boxes as a biodiversity enhancement measure. This can be secured by a planning condition requiring details of the type, specification and location of bat boxes to be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The assessment also recommends that any external lighting scheme is sensitively designed to avoid adverse impacts on bats and other nocturnal wildlife. This matter could likewise be controlled by condition.

The site contains a range of habitats capable of supporting nesting birds. A timber store building within the site was found to contain an old, disused nest, providing evidence of previous nesting activity associated with built structures. Common breeding bird species are therefore reasonably likely to be present. To avoid offences under wildlife legislation, it is recommended that vegetation clearance be undertaken outside the bird breeding season (March to August inclusive), unless a prior inspection by a suitably qualified ecologist confirms the absence of active nests. Appropriate construction-phase mitigation should also be incorporated within the PMoW.

To deliver biodiversity enhancements, the ecological assessment recommends the installation of six bird boxes within the development. Details of the type and location of the proposed bird boxes could be secured by planning condition.

Other notable mammals, including hedgehog, rabbit and fox, may utilise the site for foraging and commuting purposes. Whilst the proposed development is unlikely to result in significant impacts on these species, it is advised that precautionary mitigation measures be incorporated within the PMoW to minimise the risk of harm during construction.

The surveys also identified the presence of invasive plant species within the site. Appropriate treatment and management of these species by a suitably qualified specialist contractor will therefore be required prior to the commencement of development in order to prevent their spread.

Taking all of the above into account, the ecological assessments conclude that the site is of generally low ecological value and that, subject to the implementation of the recommended mitigation, protection and enhancement measures, the proposed development would not result in any unacceptable impacts upon protected species or biodiversity interests.

Biodiversity Net Gain:

The development is required to deliver a minimum 10% Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG), measured using the statutory Biodiversity Metric.

The submitted BNG Report concludes that the proposal would result in a net loss of 0.48 area habitat units, equivalent to a 44.4% reduction in baseline habitat value. The report identifies that the loss of existing low-distinctiveness habitats, including vegetated garden areas and bare ground, would not be adequately compensated for through on-site habitat creation and enhancement measures.

Consequently, the proposal fails to satisfy the Biodiversity Metric trading rules and does not achieve the mandatory 10% BNG requirement on-site. To achieve compliance with the statutory BNG requirements, the report subsequently identifies the need for a minimum of 0.59 additional area habitat units to be secured through off-site compensation measures.

The report states that the required off-site biodiversity units would, where possible, be secured through the purchase of units from a local habitat bank. In the event that suitable local habitat units are unavailable, it is stated that the applicant may be required to purchase statutory biodiversity credits from Natural England as a last resort.

Whilst on-site delivery of BNG remains the preferred approach, updated government guidance confirms that, from 6 August 2026, small (minor) developments that are not exempt from BNG requirements may consider on-site and off-site gains concurrently and are not required to demonstrate that on-site provision has been exhausted before relying on off-site measures. The guidance further confirms that small development includes non-major development, including residential schemes of between one and nine dwellings on sites of one hectare or less. As the proposal falls within this category, the proposed use of off-site compensation measures raises no significant concerns and is considered acceptable in principle.

Should planning permission be granted, it would be necessary to secure the submission and approval of a Biodiversity Gain Plan prior to commencement of development. This would need to demonstrate how the statutory BNG requirement would be achieved and maintained. In addition, a Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan (HMMP) would be required to secure the creation, enhancement, management and monitoring of all retained and proposed habitats for the requisite management period. The Biodiversity Gain Plan would also need to include full details of the off-site biodiversity units, including their location, delivery mechanism and long-term management arrangements, to ensure that the development achieves the required biodiversity uplift.

Drainage/ Flooding Issues:

Policy F8 of the NPPF require development proposals to incorporate appropriate sustainable drainage measures to manage surface water runoff, control flow rates and reduce flood risk. Whilst the planning system cannot require developers to address existing drainage deficiencies, it must be satisfied that development will not be at unacceptable risk of flooding itself and will not increase flood risk elsewhere.

Policy DME6 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy also states that:

Development will not be permitted where the proposal would be at an unacceptable risk of flooding or exacerbate flooding elsewhere.

Applications for development should include appropriate measures for the conservation, protection and management of water such that development contributes to:

- 1. Preventing pollution of surface and / or groundwater*
- 2. Reducing water consumption*
- 3. Reducing the risk of surface water flooding (for example the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS)).*

As a part of the consideration of water management issues, and in parallel with flood management objectives, the authority will also seek the protection of the borough's water courses for their biodiversity value.

All applications for planning permission should include details for surface water drainage and means of disposal based on sustainable drainage principles. The use of the public sewerage system is the least sustainable form of surface water drainage and therefore development proposals will be expected to investigate and identify more sustainable alternatives to help reduce the risk of surface water flooding and environmental impact.

The application site is located within Flood Zone 1, which represents the area of lowest probability of flooding from rivers and the sea. Furthermore, the site is not identified as being at risk of surface water flooding.

A Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) and Outline Drainage Strategy have been submitted in support of the application. The submitted information indicates that infiltration-based drainage techniques are unlikely to be feasible due to the presence of cohesive soils overlying sandstone bedrock, which would restrict infiltration rates. Consequently, the proposed drainage strategy is based upon the attenuation of surface water runoff and its controlled discharge to adjacent watercourses at a restricted greenfield runoff rate of 3.0 litres per second via two separate drainage networks.

The proposed drainage strategy incorporates a range of Sustainable Drainage System (SuDS) features designed to manage surface water runoff close to its source. These measures include permeable paving, rainwater butts, a shallow attenuation basin and underground geocellular storage systems. The drainage

infrastructure has also been designed to accommodate a 50% climate change allowance, thereby providing resilience to forecast increases in rainfall intensity.

Having regard to the submitted Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy, the Local Planning Authority is satisfied that an acceptable means of surface water management can be achieved. As such, it is considered that the proposal would not increase flood risk on-site or elsewhere and would accord with the requirements of Policy F8 of the NPPF and Policy DME6 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy. The proposed drainage strategy can be secured by a planning condition.

Land Contamination:

A Phase I Geo-Environmental Investigation report has been submitted with the application which outlines potential issues on the site. The report recommends that a Phase 2 intrusive geo-environmental ground investigation be carried out to quantify the identified risks. The Council's Engineers Team have not provided comments with respect to this application; however, the need for additional ground investigation can be secured by an appropriate condition being attached to any grant of planning permission.

Other Matters:

Affordable Housing/ Planning Obligations

Concerns have been raised that the proposed development would fail to meet identified local housing needs and would place additional pressure on local infrastructure, including education and healthcare services. However, having regard to the scale of the proposal, it is not considered that the development would generate impacts of such significance as to justify the refusal of planning permission in the absence of financial contributions towards education, healthcare or other community infrastructure.

In relation to affordable housing, Key Statement H3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy seeks the provision of affordable housing on residential developments of five or more dwellings outside the settlements of Clitheroe and Longridge. However, Paragraph 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that affordable housing should not be sought for residential developments that are not major developments, other than in designated rural areas where policies may set lower thresholds.

The proposed development comprises six dwellings and therefore falls below the threshold for major development. Furthermore, Langho Parish is not identified as a designated rural area for the purposes of Paragraph 64 of the NPPF. As such, the national policy position overrides the affordable housing threshold set out within the Core Strategy, and there is no policy basis upon which affordable housing can be required in this instance.

Precedent for Future Development

Concern has been expressed that the approval of this proposal could set a precedent for further development in the area. However, each planning application must be determined on its own merits, having regard to the specific characteristics of the site and the relevant provisions of the development plan and other material considerations in force at the time of determination.

Accordingly, the granting of planning permission would not automatically establish a precedent for future development on adjoining or nearby land. Any subsequent proposals would require the submission of separate planning applications and would be subject to their own assessment against the relevant planning policies and site-specific circumstances.

Conclusion and Planning Balance:

Policy S5 of the NPPF establishes that only certain forms of development are appropriate in areas outside defined settlements and identifies a range of exceptions. The policy states that such development should be approved unless the adverse impacts of doing so would substantially outweigh the benefits when assessed against the Framework's decision-making policies. However, paragraph 5 of Policy S5 makes clear that the policy does not apply to proposals within the Green Belt, which must instead be determined in accordance with the relevant Green Belt policies.

The policy further confirms that where development falls within one of the exceptions set out in Policy GB7 and is therefore not inappropriate development in the Green Belt, proposals should be approved unless the benefits are substantially outweighed by any adverse effects when assessed against the Framework's decision-making policies.

As set out earlier in this report, the proposed development is not considered to comply with any of the relevant exceptions of Policy GB7. The development is therefore regarded as inappropriate development within the Green Belt. By definition, inappropriate development is harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. No very special circumstances have been demonstrated that would clearly outweigh the identified harm to the Green Belt and any other harm arising from the proposal.

In these circumstances, Policy S5 is not engaged and there is no requirement for the Local Planning Authority to undertake the balancing exercise set out within that policy.

Notwithstanding this conclusion, even if the proposal were found to fall within one of the exceptions under Policy GB7 and were therefore assessed against Policy S5, the Local Planning Authority considers that the adverse impacts of the development would substantially outweigh its benefits when assessed against the Framework's decision-making policies.

In favour of the proposal, weight is afforded to the delivery of additional housing, particularly in the context of the Council's housing land supply position. However, the contribution would be limited to six dwellings and would therefore make only a modest contribution towards meeting the identified housing needs. Additional benefits include temporary economic activity associated with the construction phase, expenditure within the local economy and support for the construction supply chain. Whilst these benefits are acknowledged, they attract only limited weight given their scale and temporary nature.

Against the proposal, concerns arise regarding the sustainability of the site for residential development. As detailed elsewhere within this report, the site occupies a location that is poorly related to day-to-day services and facilities, with future residents likely to be heavily reliant upon private motor vehicles for the majority of their journeys.

In addition, the proposed development is considered to represent an unduly intensive form of residential development which, by virtue of its layout, scale, massing and design, would fail to respond positively to, or enhance, the character of the site and its surroundings, thus resulting in harm to the character and appearance of the area.

Furthermore, significant highway safety concerns have been identified in relation to the proposed access arrangements and the increased vehicular movements generated by the development. It has not been satisfactorily demonstrated that the site can provide a safe and suitable access for all users, and the proposal would therefore give rise to unacceptable highway safety impacts. Additional concerns have also been raised regarding the internal parking and refuse collection arrangements.

Having regard to the above, the Local Planning Authority considers that the harms arising from the proposal substantially outweigh the limited benefits associated with the delivery of six dwellings.

Accordingly, and for the reasons set out within this report, the application is recommended for refusal.

RECOMMENDATION:	That planning consent be refused for the following reasons:
01:	The proposed development does not fall within any of the exceptions set out in Policy GB7 of the National Planning Policy Framework and therefore constitutes inappropriate development within the Green Belt. Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. No very special circumstances have been demonstrated that clearly outweigh the harm to the Green Belt. The development is therefore contrary to Key Statement EN1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and Section 13 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
02:	The proposed development is considered to be in direct conflict with Key Statement DMI2 and Policy DMG3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and the overarching objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework insofar that approval would lead to the creation of up to six new residential dwellings in an unsustainable location whereby there would be a reliance on private motor vehicle by future occupiers of the dwellings to access key services and facilities.
03	The proposed development, by virtue of its overall layout, scale, massing and design would appear an unduly intensive form of residential development that fails to respond positively to, or enhance, its immediate context. The development would therefore result in visual harm to the character and appearance of the area, in direct conflict with the aims, objectives and requirements of Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and Policy DP3 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
04:	The proposed residential development of the site for six new dwellings would conflict with Policy DMG1 and Policy DMG3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and Policy TR6 of the National Planning Policy Framework insofar that the proposal would result in an intensified use of substandard access points, increased highway safety risks for both vehicular and pedestrian users, and fails to provide a safe and suitable access to the site resulting in an unacceptable impact on highway safety.