

Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.

Signed:	Officer:	MC	Date:	01/10/2026	Manager:	LH	Date:	2/10/26
----------------	-----------------	-----------	--------------	-------------------	-----------------	-----------	--------------	----------------

Application Ref:	3/2026/0545			 Ribble Valley Borough Council www.ribblevalley.gov.uk
Date Inspected:	19/08/2026	Site Notice:	19/08/2026	
Officer:	MC			
DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:				APPROVAL

Development Description:	Retrospective change of use of East Barn from Use Class E(g)(i) to a live/work unit (sui generis)
Site Address/Location:	Brows Barn The Brows Farm Higher Road Longridge PR3 2YX

CONSULTATIONS:	Parish/Town Council
No response received.	

CONSULTATIONS:	Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies
LCC Highways:	No objection subject to conditions relating to the submission of surfacing details for the car parking areas and provision of secure cycle storage.
RVBC Environmental Health Officer:	EH advises that a noise and odour assessment may be required if the residential element does not have agricultural workers tie.
CONSULTATIONS:	Additional Representations.
None received.	

RELEVANT POLICIES AND SITE PLANNING HISTORY:

Ribble Valley Core Strategy:

Key Statement DS1 – Development Strategy
Key Statement DS2 – Sustainable Development
Key Statement EN2 – Landscape
Key Statement EN5 – Heritage Assets
Key Statement H1 – Housing Provision
Key Statement H2 – Housing Balance
Key Statement EC1 – Business and Employment Development
Key Statement DMI2 – Transport Considerations

Policy DMG1 – General Considerations
Policy DMG2 – Strategic Considerations
Policy DMG3 – Transport and Mobility
Policy DME4 – Protecting Heritage Assets
Policy DMH3 – Dwellings in the Open Countryside and AONB
Policy DMB1 – Supporting Business Growth and the Local Economy
Policy DMB3 – Recreation and Tourism Development

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Relevant Planning History:

3/2024/0034 (wider site)

Approval of details reserved by conditions 3 (ground/floor levels), 6 (highway access surfacing) and 15 (bin stores) of planning permission 3/2018/0812.

Approved

3/2024/0463 (wider site)

Approval of details reserved by condition 4 (external materials) of planning permission 3/2018/0812.

Approved

3/2021/1016

Proposed change of use from office hub to dwelling. Resubmission of 3/2021/0445.

Refused

3/2021/0445

Proposed change of use from office hub to dwelling.

Refused

3/2018/1144 (wider site)

Discharge of conditions 3 - Details of existing and proposed levels to be submitted prior to commencement and condition 17 - details of retaining walls at a scale of 1-20 from planning consent 3/2018/0812

Approved

3/2018/0812 (wider site)

Erection of log cabins and camping pods on agricultural land and formation of new access and track to service them. Resubmission of planning application 3/2018/0341.

Approved with Conditions

3/2018/0341 (wider site)

Erection of log cabins and camping pods on agricultural land and formation of new access and track to service them.

Withdrawn

3/2016/0860 (wider site)

Erection of agricultural unit for housing livestock and supplies etc

Approved with Conditions

3/2016/0758

Prior notification of agricultural or forestry development - proposed building (under schedule 2 part 6 of the Town and Country General Permitted Development Order 2015) for erection of agricultural unit for housing of livestock and supplies.

Withdrawn

3/2016/0283

Conversion of redundant barn and shippon to form offices (amendments to previous permission 3/2015/0263).

Approved with Conditions

3/2015/0425

Discharge of conditions No.5 (bat and bird boxes), no.8 (section details) and no.14 (rooflights) of planning permission 3/2014/0671.

Approved

3/2015/0263

Conversion of barn to form offices.

Approved with Conditions

3/2014/0671 (wider site)

Conversion of redundant barn to form 1 dwelling and associated site works.

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:

Site Description and Surrounding Area:

The application site is located at Dilworths Brow Farm, accessed off Higher Road, Longridge, and being located approximately 0.8 miles outside the defined settlement boundary of Longridge. The site is also located within the Forest of Bowland National Landscape. There are also a number of Public Rights of Way within the vicinity of the site, including footpath FP0302022 which runs immediately to the west of the application site.

The building comprises a stone-built former barn and shippon that was converted for use as an office hub pursuant to planning consent 3/2016/0283. The barn was originally part of Brows Farm and is located to the south-east of the original farmhouse, historically known as Dilworth Brows, now known as Brows Farm, which is Grade II Listed.

The building is currently being used for a range of uses, including residential in association with the holiday let accommodation to the south-east of the site and as an office in association with the applicants haulage company.

The site is also located within the adopted Longridge Neighbour Development Plan area.

Proposed Development for which consent is sought:

This is a full planning application for retrospective planning permission for the change of use of the building to a live work unit (sui generis).

At ground floor level, there is a managers office, w/c, storage room with a staircase which leads to two bedrooms and a bathroom. A separate external access at ground floor level provides access to a kitchen, reception and meeting/waiting area. The separate kitchen/waiting and meeting area is also used in association with the holiday let business, in addition to residential use.

It should be noted that planning permission was refused 2021 for the change of use of the building to residential which were refused on the grounds that the application did not demonstrate that there would be no harm to the rural economy and failed to comply with Key Statement EC1, DMH4 and DMB1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.

The plans have been amended prior to the determination of the application to correct an error in the size of the garden area and location of parking. The red line boundary has been slightly amended to include the parking and access to the parking area.

Principle of Development:

The site lies outside of the settlement boundary of Longridge and therefore Policy S5 of the NPPF is engaged.

1. Only certain forms of development should be approved outside settlements, as set out in the following list. These 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 in this Framework:

This includes the following:

b. Development for rural businesses and services, including tourism, where a location outside settlements is shown to be necessary

d. The redevelopment of previously developed land (including a material change of use to residential or mixed-use including residential)

The proposal is for a change of use to a mixed-use development, comprising a live/work unit. In relation to criterion 'b', the tourism use is already established within the wider site and therefore the regularisation of the ancillary use of this building for tourism purposes, adjacent to the holiday lets would be an appropriate location. Criterion 'd' allows for the redevelopment of previously developed land, which the site would comprise and this includes the change of use to a mixed-use (live/work) which includes an element of residential as part of the live/work unit. As such, the proposal is considered to fall within the scope of Policy S5(d).

Policy E2 of the NPPF is also of relevance which states:

1. To support business growth, substantial weight should be given to:

a. The economic benefits of proposals for commercial development which allow businesses to invest, expand and/or adapt; especially where this would support the economic vision and strategy for the area, the implementation of the Industrial Strategy, support improvements in freight and logistics and/or reflect proposals for Industrial Strategy Zones and AI Growth Zones

Policy E4 of the NPPF also states:

1. In applying policy E2, the sustainable growth of businesses in rural areas should be supported, including through:

a. The conversion of existing buildings and well-designed new buildings;

b. The development and diversification of agricultural and other land-based businesses;

c. Facilities to support rural leisure and tourism and measures to retain and expand accessible local shops and services; and

d. Development to maintain and enhance farm viability and sustainability and support domestic food production, such as improved accommodation for livestock, on-farm reservoirs, greenhouses, polytunnels, farm shops and temporary accommodation for seasonal workers (where this accommodation is ancillary to the agricultural use and not for permanent occupation).

2. Development proposals to meet business needs in rural areas may need to be located outside settlements, and in locations that are not well served by public transport. In these circumstances:

a. Development proposals should take opportunities, where they exist, to use previously developed land, and sites that are physically well-related to existing development; and

b. The siting and design of development should be appropriate having regard to the character of its surroundings.

The application would involve the change of the site from office to a mixed-use development, retaining an element of employment. The scheme would support the existing rural tourism facility at the site in accordance with criterion E4(1)(b) and would constitute previously developed land and is well related to existing residential and commercial development.

There are also a number of Policies within the Ribble Valley Core Strategy which are engaged.

Key Statement EC1 also states:

Developments that contribute to farm diversification, strengthening of the wider rural and village economies or that promote town centre vitality and viability will be supported in principle.

Policy DMG2 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy states:

development outside of the Borough's defined settlement areas 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.*

The office use is existing and thus the assessment under Policy DMG2 remains only to the live/work unit. The applicant has provided a justification for the need for the live/work unit, on the basis that the applicant is required to be based on site to attend to the needs for occupiers of the holiday let, in addition to staff facilities within the building in connection with the holiday let accommodation.

The Council are satisfied that the additional accommodation in the form of a check in desk, waiting area and kitchen/laundry facilities for maids/cleaners for the holiday lets would constitute an extension of the existing tourism use and would fall within the scope of criterion '4' of Policy DMG2.

Policy DMB1 is also of relevance which states:

Proposals that are intended to support business growth and the local economy will be supported in principle. Development proposals will be determined in accord with the core strategy and detailed policies of the LDF as appropriate.

The borough council may request the submission of supporting information for farm diversification where appropriate.

The expansion of existing firms within settlements will be permitted on land within or adjacent to their existing sites, provided no significant environmental problems are caused and the extension conforms to the other plan policies of the LDF.

The expansion of established firms on land outside settlements will be allowed provided it is essential to maintain the existing source of employment and can be assimilated within the local landscape. There may be occasions where due to the scale of the proposal relocation to an alternative site is preferable.

Proposals for the development, redevelopment or conversion of sites with employment generating potential in the plan area for alternative uses will be assessed with regard to the following criteria:

- 1. The provisions of policy DMG1, and*
- 2. The compatibility of the proposal with other plan policies of the Ldf, and*
- 3. The environmental benefits to be gained by the community, and*
- 4. The economic and social impact caused by loss of employment opportunities to the Borough, and*

5. Any attempts that have been made to secure an alternative employment generating use for the site (must be supported by evidence (such as property agents details including periods of marketing and response) that the property/ business has been marketed for business use for a minimum period of six months or information that demonstrates to the council's satisfaction that the current use is not viable for employment purposes.)

The approved use constitutes an employment use as an office space. The current unauthorised use is a mixed use, which still includes an element of employment space (office) and the ground floor office would still be used by the applicants employees. Notwithstanding this, the first-floor employment accommodation would now be lost and the applicant has failed to demonstrate that attempts have been made to secure an alternative employment generating use for the site or that the property has been marketed for business use for a minimum period of six months to demonstrate that the approved office use is not viable from employment purposes.

The scheme therefore fails to comply with Policy DMB1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.

As the scheme includes an element of residential, the proposal should also be assessed under Policy DMH3.

Within areas defined as open countryside or AONB on the proposals map, residential development will be limited to:

- 1. Development essential for the purposes of agriculture or residential development which meets an identified local need. In assessing any proposal for an agricultural, forestry or other essential workers dwellings a functional and financial test will be applied.*
- 2. The appropriate conversion of buildings to dwellings providing they are suitably located and their form and general design are in keeping with their surroundings. Buildings must be structurally sound and capable of conversion without the need for complete or substantial reconstruction.*

In respect of the above, the building has already been converted from that of an agricultural use to that of an employment use, as such the support given by Policy DMH3(2) cannot be engaged. Furthermore, the proposal does not meet any of the exception criterion embodied within Policy DMH3(1), as such and in this respect the support afforded by the Policy cannot be engaged.

Policy DMH4 relates to the conversion of barns and other buildings to that of residential dwellings. Whilst it is recognised that the building has already been converted it should be noted that one of the exception criteria, that supports such conversions states that proposals will be supported where it can be demonstrated that *'there would be no detrimental effect on the rural economy'*. This approach is further embodied within Key Statement EC1 which states that *'proposals that result in the loss of existing employment sites to other forms of development will need to demonstrate that there will be no adverse impact upon the local economy'*. In this respect, as per the previously refused scheme, the proposal would result in the loss of employment floorspace to a residential accommodation as part of the live/work unit) and accommodation associated with the tourism use. As such, whilst the amount of employment floorspace as approved may be no longer required for the applicants business, the applicant has failed to demonstrate that there will be no detrimental impact resultant from the loss of the current employment use.

As such, the proposal fails to comply with Policy DMH4 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.

Turning to the sustainability, Key Statement DMI2 states that:

New development should be located to minimise the need to travel. Also it should incorporate good access by foot and cycle and have convenient links to public transport to reduce the need for travel by private car'.

Policy DMG3 requires considerable weight to be attached to the availability and adequacy of public transport and associated infrastructure to serve those moving to and from the development.

Policy TR3 of the NPPF also states that:

1. So that development is located where it can support sustainable patterns of movement, enable good accessibility for different users and make the most of existing and proposed transport infrastructure, development proposals should reflect the following principles, taking into account the vision for the site, the type of development and its location:

a. Development proposals which could generate a significant amount of movement, in the context of the area within which they would be situated, should be in locations that are sustainable (or which can be made so, taking into account planned improvements, including any provided for as part of the development itself). This means the location should limit the need to travel, particularly by private car, and offer a genuine choice of transport modes for residents and users, unless the nature of the development would make this impractical;

b. Opportunities should be taken to utilise existing or proposed transport infrastructure in optimising the amount or density of development which can be accommodated in different locations, especially where this can support more walking, wheeling, cycling and public transport use;

c. Any significant adverse impacts from the development on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion), or on highway safety, should be mitigated to an acceptable degree using a vision-led approach;

d. The environmental impacts of traffic and transport infrastructure should be identified, assessed and taken into account – including taking opportunities to avoid or mitigate any adverse environmental effects, and to secure net environmental gains such as reductions in air pollution; and

e. In rural areas, opportunities to improve walking, wheeling, cycling and public transport and enhance the connectivity of an area should be taken where they exist and can be supported by the development proposed.

2. The Connectivity Tool (Connectivity Tool - GOV.UK) should be used alongside other relevant quantitative or qualitative evidence in assessing the connectivity of particular locations proposed for development.

Also of relevance is Policy CC2 of the NPPF which states that:

1. In order to contribute to climate change mitigation and the transition to net zero, development proposals should, where relevant to the proposal:

a. Accord with policies TR3 and TR4 so that sustainable patterns of movement are prioritised, opportunities are taken to improve walking, wheeling, cycling and public transport, and infrastructure is provided to support the transition to zero-emission vehicles

The site is located outside of the settlement boundary and is not considered to be within walking distance to the settlement of Longridge due to the fact that users of the site would have to navigate an unlit road with no footpath to access key services and facilities within Longridge or to reach the nearest bus stop. The site is also not within walking distance to a railway station and as such, is not considered to be located in a sustainable location. Conflict is therefore identified with Key Statement DMI2 and Policy DMG3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy as well as Policy TR3 and CC2 of the NPPF.

Notwithstanding this, it is important to recognise that the lawful use of the building is an office which would likely generate regular traffic movements during the week. The change of use of part of the building to a live/work unit with an element of employment floorspace and ancillary accommodation to support the existing tourism facility would not likely generate any more significant traffic movements compared to the existing employment use.

As such, whilst conflict has been identified, the resultant harm/ impact is reduced / offset by the previous use.

Impact Upon Residential Amenity:

Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy states that, development must:

1. *Not adversely affect the amenities of the surrounding area.*
2. *Provide adequate day lighting and privacy distances.*
3. *Have regard to public safety and secured by design principles.*
4. *Consider air quality and mitigate adverse impacts where possible.*

Policy LNDP3 of the Longridge Neighbourhood Plan also states that proposals should:

Have no significant adverse impact on residential amenity for existing and future resident or do not contribute to, or suffer from, adverse impacts arising from noise.

With regards to the NPPF, Policy P3 states that:

1. *Development proposals should be appropriate for their location, taking into account the likely effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment, whether these effects are on or off-site; and whether this is as a result of the development itself or the product of preexisting conditions in its vicinity. In assessing the potential effects of pollution, consideration should be given to the potential sensitivity of the site, and its intended occupiers and users, as well as that of the environment and population in the surrounding area (including where certain groups could be particularly vulnerable to its effects, such as children and older people).*
2. *Within this context development proposals should:*
 - a) *Provide healthy living conditions for occupiers and users in terms of adequate access to light and avoiding exposure to levels of air, noise, artificial light or other sources of pollution which could have an unacceptable adverse effect on health and the quality of life. Where necessary suitable mitigation measures should be incorporated to secure acceptable living conditions;*
 - b) *Not give rise to, or contribute to, an unacceptable level of access to daylight and sunlight for neighbouring residents and occupiers, or unacceptable levels of air, noise, artificial light, water, soil or other forms of pollution on or beyond the site. Adverse impacts of this nature should be avoided where possible, or else mitigated to an acceptable degree. Where possible, opportunities should be taken to reduce pollution affecting the wider area (such as through traffic and travel management or improved external lighting);*
 - c) *Sustain and contribute to compliance with relevant limit values or national objectives and targets for air pollutants including PM2.5. Development proposals should take account of Air Quality Management Areas and be consistent with the objectives of relevant Air Quality Action Plans, Clean Air Plans and Local Air Quality Strategies;*
 - d) *Mitigate and reduce to a minimum potential adverse impacts resulting from noise, not result in levels of noise exposure which would have a significant observed adverse effect, and maintain the character of tranquil areas (those areas that have remained relatively undisturbed by noise from human sources and are prized for their recreational and amenity value for this reason);*
 - e) *Limit any adverse impact from artificial light on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes (those areas entirely, or largely, uninterrupted by artificial light) and nature; and*
 - f) *Assess and mitigate impacts where the development could have an unacceptable adverse effect on water quality, especially in relation to sensitive water bodies such as chalk streams.*
3. *In applying this policy, it should be assumed, unless there is clear evidence to the contrary, that separate regulatory regimes for the control of pollution will operate effectively, as set out in policy DM7. This means that it will be appropriate to take into account emissions limits set through those other regimes.*

The closest neighbouring residential properties are 'West Barn' to the west and 'The Farm House' and 'Annexe The Farm House' to the northwest.

The proposed development would not result in any new window/door openings or extensions. The first floor accommodation would change from an office use to a residential use associated with the live/work unit.

Due to the position of the first-floor window on the east facing elevation in relation to neighbouring first floor windows, the change of use to bedroom accommodation is not considered to result in any adverse overlooking for existing or future occupiers.

It should be noted that there is a public footpath which runs immediately between the two properties so the adjacent residential properties are already overlooked to an element by users of the footpath.

The Environmental Health Officer has raised some concern with regards to potential noise/odour issues associated with the residential element of the scheme. The site lies adjacent to a working farm and as such, unless the dwelling includes an agricultural worker's tie, they consider that a noise/odour impact assessment should be submitted.

The applicant has confirmed that they own the farm and therefore whilst the residential use has not been justified for agricultural purposes, it is unlikely that the proposed change of use would require a noise/odour assessment as the occupier would be the owner of the agricultural enterprise.

Even if the owner of the residential accommodation which forms part of the proposed live/work unit were to change, or the land was sold separately from the agricultural land, including the adjacent barn, there are already existing surrounding residential properties, including west barn, which did not require such assessment as part of the planning application to convert the barn.

As such, given the existing presence of surrounding residential accommodation, within the immediate vicinity of the application site, the impact is no greater than that for future occupiers compared to existing and any noise/odour issues would not warrant refusal of the scheme.

The proposal is therefore considered to accord with Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy, Policy LNDP3 of the adopted Longridge Neighbourhood Development Plan and Policy P3 of the NPPF.

Visual Amenity/External Appearance:

Policy DMG1 also states that all development must:

- 1. be of a high standard of building design which considers the 8 building in context principles (from the CABE/english heritage building on context toolkit.*
- 2. be sympathetic to existing and proposed land uses in terms of its size, intensity and nature as well as scale, massing, style, features and building materials.*
- 3. consider the density, layout and relationship between buildings, which is of major importance. particular emphasis will be placed on visual appearance and the relationship to surroundings, including impact on landscape character, as well as the effects of development on existing amenities.*
- 4. use sustainable construction techniques where possible and provide evidence that energy efficiency, as described within policy dme5, has been incorporated into schemes where possible.*
- 5. the code for sustainable homes and lifetime homes, or any subsequent nationally recognised equivalent standards, should be incorporated into schemes.*

In addition, Policy DMG2 also states that:

In protecting the designated area of outstanding natural beauty the council will have regard to the economic

and social well being of the area. However the most important consideration in the assessment of any development proposals will be the protection, conservation and enhancement of the landscape and character of the area avoiding where possible habitat fragmentation. Where possible new development should be accommodated through the re-use of existing buildings, which in most cases is more appropriate than new build. Development will be required to be in keeping with the character of the landscape and acknowledge the special qualities of the AONB by virtue of its size, design, use of material, landscaping and siting. the AONB management plan should be considered and will be used by the council in determining planning applications.

Policy DME2 also states that:

Development proposals will be refused which significantly harm important landscape or landscape features.

Policy LNDP3 of the adopted Longridge Neighbourhood Development Plan states that:

All new development proposals will only be supported when they are of good design that responds positively to the local character and distinctiveness of the surroundings.

Policy LNDP6 also states:

Development proposals should, where relevant and appropriate, take the following into account:

- a) Protection of the area's undulating landform, in particular, by avoiding development on hilltops and ridgelines and by minimising vertical elements;*
- b) Conservation and enhancement of geodiversity. In particular, by having strong regard to soils and landforms;*
- c) Landscaping and screening of development should seek to incorporate, with suitable enhancement, existing vegetation and landform. Any additional planting should use native plant species appropriate to the location and setting in terms of type, height, density and the need for on-going management;*
- d) Use should be made of local materials and styles, particularly in prominent locations, such as the urban fringe and in areas with townscape of heritage value, a particular valued vernacular, or of good quality;*
- e) Existing field patterns should be retained;*
- f) Retention of existing rights of way such as footpaths and bridleways;*
- g) Restoration and management of key landscape features such as field ponds, hedgerows, walls and semi natural woodland; and*
- h) New development must take account of known surface and sub-surface archaeology, and ensure unknown and potentially significant deposits are identified and appropriately considered prior to, and during, development.*

Key Statement EN2 relates to the Forest of Bowland National Landscape and states:

The landscape and character of the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty will be protected, conserved and enhanced. Any development will need to contribute to the conservation of the natural beauty of the area.

The landscape and character of those areas that contribute to the setting and character of the Forest of Bowland Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty will be protected and conserved and wherever possible enhanced.

As a principle the Council will expect development to be in keeping with the character of the landscape, reflecting local distinctiveness, vernacular style, scale, style, features and building materials.

Policy N4 of the NPPF states:

1. Development proposals within Protected Landscapes should be limited in scale and extent and sensitively located and designed to avoid harm to the statutory purposes and special qualities of the Protected Landscape. Substantial weight should be placed on the importance of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of these areas, and to conserving and enhancing wildlife and cultural heritage in National Parks and the Broads.

2. Proposals for major development within Protected Landscapes should be refused other than in exceptional circumstances, and where it can be demonstrated that the development is in the public interest. To inform a decision about whether exceptional circumstances exist, consideration of such proposals should include an assessment of:

a. The need for the development, including in terms of any national considerations such as maintaining a sufficient supply of minerals, and the impact of permitting it, or refusing it, upon the local economy;

b. The cost of, and scope for, developing outside the Protected Landscape, or meeting the need for the development in some other way; and

c. Any detrimental effect on the environment, the landscape and recreational opportunities, and the extent to which it could be moderated.

3. Where, exceptionally, proposals for major development are approved within Protected Landscapes, steps should be taken to mitigate potential adverse impacts on their special qualities and statutory purposes, including on features such as tranquillity and dark skies.

4. Development proposals within the setting of Protected Landscapes should be sensitively located and designed to avoid or minimise adverse impacts on the Protected Landscape.

The development does not result any external alterations to the building. However, it is noted that part of the land surrounding the building is being used as a garden area (this was confirmed within the delegated officer report for planning permission ref: 3/2021/0445).

Concerns were raised within the delegated report (planning ref: 3/2021/0445) regarding the additional visual impact due to the extension of the planning unit and creation of a private garden area. However, it should be noted that the garden area would be similar in extent to the existing garden area for 'West Barn' and the introduction of a garden area would not be out of keeping with the semi domestic character of the immediate surroundings.

As such, taking into consideration the sites surroundings, which are also residential in character, the granting of the change of use to a live/work unit, to include an element of garden space is not considered to diminish the special qualities of the Forest of Bowland National Landscape or encroach into any open countryside that would result in a harmful urbanising impact.

As such, the proposal is considered to accord with Key Statement EN2 and Policies DMG1, DMG2 and DME2 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy, as well as Policies LNDP3 and LNDP6 of the adopted Longridge Neighbourhood Development Plan.

Heritage:

The proposed development would be within the setting of the Grade II Listed Building 'Dilworth Brows Farmhouse'.

Policy HE4 of the NPPF states:

- 1. Heritage assets, as an irreplaceable resource, should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance. To achieve this, development proposals which would affect the significance of heritage assets, including any contribution made by their setting should:*

- a) *Maintain or secure a use consistent with their conservation, taking into account the importance of maintaining the assets, the positive contribution they can make to sustainable communities including local economies, and the positive contribution they can make to local character and distinctiveness; and*
 - b) *Avoid (or if that is not possible, minimise) harm to the significance of heritage assets, and instead conserve this significance.*
2. *Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (including from development within its setting) should have a clear and convincing justification in accordance with the policies in this chapter.*
 3. *Where there is evidence of deliberate neglect of, or damage to, a heritage asset, the deteriorated state of the asset should not be taken into account in any decision relating to the asset.*
 4. *Proposals for enabling development, which would otherwise conflict with other policies in this Framework and/or those in the development plan, but which would secure the future conservation of a heritage asset, should be considered on the basis of whether the conservation benefits outweigh the disbenefits of departing from the policies concerned.*

Policy HE5 states:

1. *Development proposals affecting heritage assets should be accompanied by an assessment of the significance of the assets affected (including any contribution made by their setting) and of the potential effect of the proposal on their significance. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is necessary to understand the potential effect of the proposal on their significance. The relevant historic environment record should be referred to in making this assessment, and appropriate expertise employed where necessary.*
2. *Assessments of the potential effects of development proposals on the significance of heritage assets (including through effects on their setting) should identify whether proposals would be likely to:*
 - a) *Have a positive effect, which is where the significance of a heritage asset would be enhanced, or better revealed; or*
 - b) *Have no effect on the significance of a heritage asset; or*
 - c) *Result in harm to the significance of a heritage asset, either from work affecting the asset itself or from development within its setting. The degree of harm should be identified: substantial harm would occur where the development proposal would seriously affect a key element of the asset's significance; or*
 - d) *Cause the total loss of the significance of a heritage asset.*
3. *In making this assessment it is the effect on a heritage asset's significance rather than the scale of the development which should be considered.*
4. *Decision-makers should be satisfied that assessments accurately reflect the effects on heritage assets caused by development proposals.*
5. *Where a development proposal involves, or has the potential to involve, a heritage asset with archaeological interest, an appropriate desk-based assessment should be undertaken and, where necessary, a field evaluation. These should be used to help understand the asset's significance and the potential effect of the proposal on this, which should inform the design, mitigation and implementation of the development.*

Policy HE6 of the NPPF states:

1. *Proposals affecting designated heritage assets 1. When considering the potential effect of a development proposal on the significance of a designated heritage asset, substantial weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential effect amounts to a positive effect, harm, substantial harm, or total loss of its significance.*
2. *Development proposals which would have a positive effect on a designated heritage asset should be supported.*
3. *Any harm to a designated heritage asset will be a matter of considerable importance and weight, which should be dealt with in accordance with paragraphs 4 to 6 of this policy.*
4. *Where a development proposal would harm the significance of a designated heritage asset the effect on the asset and its significance should be weighed against any public benefits resulting from the proposal. Important public benefits can include securing the long-term reuse of a vacant or underused listed building, and enabling energy efficiency and low carbon heating measures to be employed.*
5. *Where a development proposal would cause substantial harm to, or the total loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset, consent should be refused unless it can be demonstrated that the harm is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh the harm or loss, or if all of the following apply:*
 - a) *The nature of the heritage asset would otherwise prevent all reasonable uses of the site;*
 - b) *No suitable use for the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation;*
 - c) *Conservation by grant-funding or some form of not for profit, charitable or public ownership is not possible; and*
 - d) *The harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the asset back into use.*
6. *Within this context, development which would cause substantial harm to, or the total loss of, the significance of grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional; while development which would cause substantial harm to, or the total loss of, assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, registered battlefields, grade I and II* listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional.*

Policy DME4 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy states the following:

Alterations or extensions to listed buildings or buildings of local heritage interest, or development proposals on sites within their setting which cause harm to the significance of the heritage asset will not be supported.

Any proposals involving the demolition or loss of important historic fabric from listed buildings will be refused unless it can be demonstrated that exceptional circumstances exist.

Policy LNDP4 of the adopted Longridge Neighbourhood Development Plan also states that:

All of the town's heritage assets, including the three Conservation Areas, will be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance.

The application has been supported by a heritage statement which identifies the adjacent Grade II listed farmhouse as dating from 1839 and comprising a traditional two storey appearance with 2 bays, with a number of projecting quoins, and a square stone section gutter that is lead lined.

The site is physically separated from the adjacent barn by an access track but the buildings do still read as a historic farmstead due to the close relationship between the converted barns and the farmhouse.

Nonetheless, the proposed change of use is not considered to result in any harm to the setting of the adjacent Grade II listed building as there are no further external alterations proposed to the building and the existing garden area would be mostly confined behind the existing barn, with only a small, narrow section to the east of the barn.

As such, the proposal is considered to comply with the above policies.

Highways/Parking:

Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy states that all development must:

- 1. Consider the potential traffic and car parking implications.*
- 2. Ensure safe access can be provided which is suitable to accommodate the scale and type of traffic likely to be generated.*
- 3. Consider the protection and enhancement of public rights of way and access.*

In addition, Policy DMG3 states that:

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

Policy TR3 of the NPPF:

Any significant adverse impacts from the development on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion), or on highway safety, should be mitigated to an acceptable degree using a vision-led approach.

The LHA have provided comments on the scheme and raise no objection, noting the history of the site. They recommended two conditions which outline that the parking area is surfaced to a specification accepted by the local planning authority and storage for two bicycles is secured by way of planning condition.

The plans have been amended prior to the determination of the application which shows two parking spaces to the south of the site. Given the significant distance from the highway, it would not be reasonable to request details of surfacing materials but it would be reasonable to request that the spaces are retained for the parking of vehicles.

As such, the proposal is considered to accord with Policies DMG1 and DMG3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy subject to conditions.

Other matters:

The site is considered to be exempt from the need to provide 10% mandatory Biodiversity Net-Gain as it would impact on less than 25sqm of on-site habitat.

Observations/Consideration of Matters Raised/Conclusion:

The proposal would result in the partial loss of an employment site and it has not been demonstrated that the site has been sufficiently marketed for employment use or that the proposal would have no impact on the rural economy, contrary to Key Statement EC1 and Policies DMG2 and DMH4 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.

Notwithstanding this, Policy S5 of the NPPF supports the re-use of buildings for a mixed use which includes an element of residential and the proposed scheme is for a live/work units, including residential.

Policy S5 states that development which falls within criteria 1 should be approved unless benefits of doing so would be substantially outweighed by any adverse effects.

As noted above, the proposal would result in the loss of employment floorspace. However, the employment use at the site would not cease entirely as the site is still being used as an office for members of staff in association with the applicant's haulage company. As such, whilst this would weigh against the proposal, given an element of employment is being retained (in the form of a live/work unit), this would not substantially outweigh the benefit of providing a mixed-use development in compliance with Policy S5 of the NPPF.

In addition, the site is located in an unsustainable location but the reliance on private motor vehicle for trips to and from the site is considered to be no worse than the lawful use as an office. As such, this would not constitute an adverse effect that would substantially outweigh the benefit and the tilted balance weighs in favour of the proposal.

The application is therefore recommended for approval subject to conditions.

RECOMMENDATION:	That the application be granted subject to condition(s).
------------------------	--