

Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.

Signed:	Officer:	MC	Date:	30/09/2026	Manager:	LH	Date:	2/10/26
----------------	-----------------	-----------	--------------	-------------------	-----------------	-----------	--------------	----------------

Application Ref:	3/2026/0606			 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:	Proposed construction of a Class E commercial unit.
Site Address/Location:	Land at Warwick Street, Longridge, PR3 3EB

CONSULTATIONS:	Parish/Town Council
No objection	

CONSULTATIONS:	Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies
LCC Highways:	No objection subject to Construction Management Plan condition.
RVBC Environmental Health Officer:	No objection subject to conditions given the history of the site and absence of noise complaints.

CONSULTATIONS:	Additional Representations.
One objection has been received raising the following concerns: - Concerns regarding parking issues due to close proximity of businesses and residents - The access should be from Berry Lane rather than Warwick Street	

RELEVANT POLICIES AND SITE PLANNING HISTORY:

Ribble Valley Core Strategy:

Key Statement DS1 – Development Strategy
Key Statement DS2 – Sustainable Development
Key Statement EC1 – Business and Employment Development
Key Statement EC2 – Development of Retail, Shops and Community Facilities and Services
Key Statement EN5 – Heritage Assets
Key Statement DMI2 – Transport Considerations

Policy DMG1 – General Considerations
Policy DMG2 – Strategic Considerations
Policy DMG3 – Transport and Mobility
Policy DME2 – Landscape and Townscape Protection
Policy DME4 – Protecting Heritage Assets
Policy DME6 – Water Management
Policy DMB1 – Supporting Business Growth and the Local Economy
Policy DMR2 – Shopping in Longridge and Whalley

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Longridge Neighbourhood Development Plan

Relevant Planning History:

3/2026/0105 (adjacent to site)

Certificate of Lawfulness for proposed use of the first floor of the building and associated land as Class E(d) (indoor sport, recreation or fitness).

Permission Not Required

3/2023/0784 (adjacent to site)

Change of use of Unit 2 from retail unit (Class E) to a Hot Food Takeaway (Sui Generis) with installation of extraction equipment. Shop front alterations to units 1 and 2 (pursuant to variation of condition 5 of 3/2023/0055 (delivery times) to allow deliveries between 7am and 11pm from Berry Lane)

Refused

3/2023/0785 (adjacent to site)

Approval of details reserved by condition 6 (refuse collection) of planning permission 3/2023/0055.

Approved with Conditions

3/2023/0055 (part of red line boundary)

Change of use of Unit 2 from retail unit (Class E) to a Hot Food Takeaway (Sui Generis) with installation of extraction equipment. Shop front alterations to units 1 and 2.

Approved with Conditions

3/2021/1160

Demolition of an extension, polytunnels and storage building and erection of extension to existing retail premises (use class E) at ground floor and five apartments above. Conversion of upper floor of existing building to create two apartments.

Refused

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:

Site Description and Surrounding Area:

The site is located within the settlement of Longridge on a former retail unit which was damaged by fire on the 28th of April 2021 and was part of the former Swift's Hardware store. The site access is off Warwick Street and through the yard area to the side and rear of the adjacent polytunnels. The site is also located adjacent to the main town centre boundary. The site is also located within the Longridge Conservation Area and within the adopted Longridge Neighbourhood Plan area.

The ground floor of 53-57 Berry Lane (behind the site) is occupied by Domino's Pizzas hot food takeaway (a sui generis use) and Mobi Village a retail shop Class E (a) use. The planning statement also indicates that the first floor has a Class E Commercial use. To the east of the site adjacent to Warwick Street is a single storey unit, clad in dark coloured corrugated sheet, used in connection with the Florists shop at 51 Berry Lane. In addition, residential development is located to the south and east of the site.

The polytunnels and yard areas are within an area allocated as an existing employment site (also allocated for employment within the Longridge Neighbourhood Plan) but the proposed unit is located outside of the site allocation.

Proposed Development for which consent is sought:

The proposed development is for a new commercial unit on the proposed footprint of the former unit which was damaged by fire. The size of the proposed unit would be approximately 6.2m x 11m and would have an eaves height of approximately 3.5m and a total height of approximately 4.6m to the ridge. The building would be constructed of metal cladding with a shop front facing Warwick Street with glazing and a doorway facing the existing polytunnels. A bin storage area comprising 2no. 110 ltr Euro bins is provided within the yard and there is a loading area to the west of the polytunnels which is included within the red line boundary.

Principle of Development:

The site is located within the settlement of Longridge. Policy S4 of the NPPF states:

1. *Development proposals within settlements should be approved unless the benefits of doing so would be substantially outweighed by any adverse effects, when assessed against the national decision-making policies in this Framework.*
2. *In applying policy S4, the circumstances in which the benefits of approving development are likely to be substantially outweighed by adverse effects include (but are not restricted to) situations where the development proposal would:*
 - a. *Have a substantial adverse impact in relation to:*
 - i) *The allocation or safeguarding of land or buildings for particular uses in the development plan, unless there is no reasonable prospect of an application coming forward for the allocated use, or there is evidence that the safeguarding is no longer appropriate; or*
 - ii) *The application of the policies in this Framework for existing recreational land and facilities (HC7), Local Green Space (HC8), areas of particular importance for biodiversity and geodiversity (N6), Protected Landscapes (N4) and development within residential curtilages (L2(1)(d)).*
 - b. *Involve the whole or partial loss of undeveloped land which is used for a cemetery or burial ground; or for water storage and/or flood risk management (unless suitable compensatory provision is made that does not increase the risk of flooding either on or off-site); or*
 - c. *Fail to comply with one of the national decision-making policies which state that development proposals should be refused in specific circumstances.*

The proposal is for employment development just outside of the main town centre boundary so in principle, is considered to accord with Policy S4 of the NPPF.

Policy TC3 of the NPPF also states:

1. *A sequential test should be applied to proposals for main town centre uses for which planning permission is required, where these are neither in an existing centre nor in accordance with an allocation for that purpose in an up-to-date development plan.*
2. *The sequential test means that main town centre uses involving new development should be located within town centres identified in the development plan; then, if this is not feasible, in edge of centre locations; and only if suitable sites are not available (or expected to become available within a reasonable period) should out of centre sites be considered. When considering edge of centre and out of centre locations, preference should be given to accessible sites which are well connected to the town centre by sustainable transport modes.*

Whilst strictly speaking the town centre sequential test should be applied, given that the site is located immediately adjacent to the town centre boundary and has a previous commercial use, it is not considered that the failure to satisfy this sequential test would be a reason to refuse planning permission as the principle of a Class E use on the site is accepted and established.

With regards to the commercial units, Key Statement EC1 states that:

'Employment development will be directed towards the main settlement of Clitheroe, Whalley and Longridge as the preferred locations to accommodate employment growth together with land at Barrow Enterprise Site, the Lancashire Enterprise Zone at Samlesbury and locations well related to the A59 corridor.'

Key Statement EC2 also states that:

'Development that supports and enhances the vibrancy, consumer choice and vitality and unique character of the area's important retail and service centres of Clitheroe, Longridge and Whalley will be supported in principle.'

The applicant has not confirmed which use within Use Class E the proposed new unit would comprise. However, given the site had been previously used for retail for some time, there is no objection to the use of the land for commercial/employment use within Use Class E.

With regards to the sustainable location, 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 also states that:

'In making decisions on development proposals the local planning authority will, in addition to assessing proposals within the context of the development strategy, attach considerable weight to:

The availability and adequacy of public transport and associated infrastructure to serve those moving to and from the development –

- 1. the relationship of the site to the primary route network and the strategic road network.*
- 2. the provision made for access to the development by pedestrian, cyclists and those with reduced mobility'*

Given the sites central location, immediately adjacent to the town centre of Longridge, the site is considered to be in a sustainable location, with good access on foot and by public transport for users of the site.

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 also states proposals should:

Have no significant adverse impact on residential amenity for existing and future residents.

The building would replace a unit of a similar size and scale, in an area where the immediate surroundings are prominently commercial. As such, the proposed new unit is not considered to result in any adverse impact to amenity by way of loss of light, overshadowing, overlooking or overbearing impact.

The site is located in an area predominantly occupied by commercial businesses and as such, given its historical retail use, the Environmental Health Officer does not request any additional information in relation to noise/odour. They do recommend conditions in relation to the control of dust/fumes/noise/vibration (which does not meet the tests) and restriction on construction hours/deliveries.

The specific use within Class E has not been specified and therefore has the potential to be used for a range of uses, including indoor sport and recreation which has the potential to result in noise/disturbance to the nearby residential receptors. The Council consider it appropriate to restrict the use of the premises to 07:00 – 20:00, restrict the noise levels of the site, ensure doors are fitted with self-closing mechanisms and restrict the playing of live/amplified music to protect the amenity of the nearby residential receptors.

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

Visual Amenity/External Appearance and Heritage:

Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy provides additional general design guidance as follows:

'All development must be sympathetic to existing and proposed land uses in terms of its size, intensity and nature as well as scale, massing and style...particular emphasis will be placed on visual appearance and the relationship to surroundings, including impact on landscape character.'

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

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.

The site is also located within the Longridge Conservation Area whereby there are further considerations:

Policy DME4 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy is of relevance which states:

Proposals within, or affecting views into and out of, or affecting the setting of a conservation area will be required to conserve and where appropriate enhance its character and appearance and those elements which contribute towards its significance.

This should include considerations as to whether it conserves and enhances the special architectural and historic character of the area as set out in the relevant conservation area appraisal. Development which makes a positive contribution and conserves and enhances the character, appearance and significance of the area in terms of its location, scale, size, design and materials and existing buildings, structures, trees and open spaces will be supported.

In the conservation areas there will be a presumption in favour of the conservation and enhancement of elements that make a positive contribution to the character or appearance of the conservation area.

Key Statement EN5 states that:

There will be a presumption in favour of the conservation and enhancement of the significance of heritage assets and their settings. The Historic Environment and its Heritage Assets and their settings will be conserved and enhanced in a manner appropriate to their significance for their heritage value; their

important contribution to local character, distinctiveness and sense of place; and to wider social, cultural and environmental benefits.

This will be achieved through:

- Recognising that the best way of ensuring the long term protection of heritage assets is to ensure a viable use that optimises opportunities for sustaining and enhancing its significance.*
- Keeping Conservation Area Appraisals under review to ensure that any development proposals respect and safeguard the character, appearance and significance of the area.*
- Considering any development proposals which may impact on a heritage asset or their setting through seeking benefits that conserve and enhance their significance and avoids any substantial harm to the heritage asset.*
- Requiring all development proposals to make a positive contribution to local distinctiveness/sense of place.*
- The consideration of Article 4 Directions to restrict permitted development rights where the exercise of such rights would harm the historic environment.*

Policy LNDP4 of the adopted Longridge Neighbourhood Plan area states:

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

Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990:

Given the proposal has the potential to affect a Designated Heritage Asset, special regard must also be given to the statutory duties imposed on the authority, pursuant to national legislation, particularly in respect of the preservation and enhancement of such assets.

The principle statutory duty under the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended by s.58B (1) of Levelling-up and Regeneration Act 2023) is to preserve or enhance the special character of heritage assets, including their setting. As such, in determining applications that affect designated heritage assets, the authority must consider the duties contained within the principle Act which states the following;

Conservation Areas - Section 72 (as amended the Levelling-up and Regeneration Act 2023):

In considering whether to grant planning permission the local planning authority shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the conservation area. This includes preserving or enhancing any feature, quality or characteristic of the asset or setting that contributes to the significance of the asset.

National Planning Policy Framework (December 2026):

Policy HE4 of the NPPF relates to securing the conservation of heritage assets and states that:

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 also states that:

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 is also of relevance and states:

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.*

The proposed new structure would be single storey with metal cladding. The appearance of the building is fairly industrial in character and lacks any architectural interest. However, the building would be sited immediately adjacent to similar structures and would be similar in character and appearance to the previous building on the site. The character of this part of Warwick Street is predominantly industrial in character and the proposed new structure is therefore considered to have a neutral impact on the character and appearance of the street scene. This part of the Longridge Conservation Area is not considered to be of any historical or architectural interest in terms of the rear yards to the buildings on Berry Lane and as such, the introduction of a metal clad container style building would not result in any more visual harm than the existing level.

The proposal is therefore considered to have no effect on the significance of the Longridge Conservation Area and the proposal accords with Key Statement EN5 and Policies DMG1 and DME4 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy, Policy LNDP3 and LNDP4 of the adopted Longridge Conservation Area and Policies HE4, HE5 and HE6 of the NPPF.

Highways and Parking:

Ribble Valley Core Strategy Policy DMG3 states that:

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

In addition, Policy DMG1 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’.*

The proposal does not include any off-street parking a part of the scheme but does include a loading area which is existing. There have been concerns raised from a neighbour with regards to the potential increase in traffic and parking issues that may arise from the introduction of a new commercial unit on Warwick Street.

The Local Highway Authority have provided comments on the scheme and note that no changes are proposed which would materially alter traffic generation, servicing demand, or parking demand when compared with the lawful former use of the site. They note that there are also parking restrictions on the surrounding roads to control on street parking and having regard to the scale and nature of the proposal, the LHA considers that the development is unlikely to result in a material increase in vehicular movements on the surrounding highway network.

They recommend that a Construction Management Plan condition be added to any grant of permission and therefore subject to the above, the proposal is considered to accord with Policies DMG1 and DMG3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.

Landscape/Ecology:

The proposal falls within the 'de minimis' exemption as the site area is less than 0.2 hectares in size. As such, the proposal is not required to provide the mandatory 10% Biodiversity Net-Gain.

Observations/Consideration of Matters Raised/Conclusion:

As such, taking account of the above matters, the proposed change of use is considered to accord with the relevant Policies outlined in the Ribble Valley Core Strategy, the adopted Longridge Neighbourhood Development Plan and the NPPF.

RECOMMENDATION:

That planning permission be granted subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions.