

Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.

Signed:	Officer:	MC	Date:	02/10/2026	Manager:	LH	Date:	6/10/26
----------------	-----------------	----	--------------	------------	-----------------	----	--------------	---------

Application Ref:	3/2026/0607			 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:	Conversion of storage building to two bedroom single storey dwelling and garage.
Site Address/Location:	George Street Longridge PR3 3JS

CONSULTATIONS:	Parish/Town Council
Town Council:	No response received.

CONSULTATIONS:	Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies
LCC Highways:	No objection on highways grounds subject to conditions for the garage to be kept available for the parking of vehicles and the provision of an EV charging point.
Lead Local Flood Authority:	Inappropriate consultation
RVBC Countryside Officer:	No objection to the findings of the bat survey
RVBC Environmental Health:	No objection provided that the mitigation measures outlined in the sound insulation assessment are adhered to.

CONSULTATIONS:	Additional Representations.
No additional representations received.	

RELEVANT POLICIES AND SITE PLANNING HISTORY:**Ribble Valley Core Strategy:**

Key Statement DS1: Development Strategy
Key Statement DS2: Sustainable Development
Key Statement DMI2: Transport Considerations
Key Statement EC1: Business And Employment Development
Key Statement EN5: Heritage Assets

Policy DMB1: Supporting Business Growth And The Local Economy
Policy DMG1: General Considerations
Policy DMG2: Strategic Considerations
Policy DMG3: Transport And Mobility
Policy DME3: Site And Species Protection And Conservation
Policy DME4: Protecting Heritage Assets

Longridge Neighbourhood Development Plan

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Relevant Planning History:

3/2024/0883

Proposed conversion of former joiners workshop to two-bedroom, single-storey dwelling and garage.
Refused

3/2014/0861:

Change of use from B2 to Body Art Studio (Sui Generis). Refurbishment/restoration external elevations of outrigger.
Approved with Conditions

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:

Site Description and Surrounding Area:

The site is located within the principal settlement of Longridge and is current occupied by a vacant building which has been historically used as a joiner's workshop and yard but more recently used as a storage building. The site is accessed off George Street and forms part of the designated Local Employment Site (no. 10 Industrial and Commercial Units – (Forrest's Yard) in the adopted Longridge Neighbourhood Plan.

The site is also located within the Longridge Conservation Area with terraced residential properties to the south an east of the site and industrial/commercial immediately adjoining the northern and western boundaries.

Proposed Development for which consent is sought:

The proposed development is for the conversion of the building to a two-bedroom, single storey dwelling with garage. The proposal includes the erection of a low-level wall to create a formalised garden area and alterations to existing window and door openings. Two rooflights are also proposed to the existing flat roof to the rear of the site.

To the eastern part of the site, in front of the existing building is a wall and gate which forms part of the yard to one of the adjacent properties. The existing gate is proposed to be infilled and the gate repositioned to the front elevation of the wall.

Principle of Development:

Key Statement DS1 relates to new housing development and seeks to direct new housing development within an identified strategic site and the principal settlements of Clitheroe, Whalley and Longridge in addition to Tier 1 Villages which are the more sustainable of the Borough's 32 defined settlements.

Policy DMG2 also states that '*Development proposals in the principal settlements of Clitheroe, Longridge and Whalley and the tier 1 villages should consolidate, expand or round-off development so that it is closely related to the main built-up areas, ensuring this is appropriate to the scale of, and in keeping with, the existing settlement*'.

Policy S4 of the NPPF also 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 site is located in the settlement of Longridge whereby there is no in principle objection to residential development and the proposal accords with the strategic hierarchy for residential development within the Borough. There are other residential properties within close proximity to the site and therefore the proposed development would be broadly compatible with the type of development within the immediate vicinity of the site with respect to the residential use proposed.

Notwithstanding the above, the site is designated for employment within the adopted Longridge Neighbourhood Development Plan. Policy LNDP14 of the adopted Neighbourhood Plan states that the use of the designated sites for business uses will be supported. Whilst the building was previously used as a joiners workshop (Use Class B2) the submitted details indicate that this is now used for storage (Use Class B8). This change of use is considered lawful under Schedule 2, Part 3, Class I of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015. The change of use to residential would result in the loss of an employment generating use. As such, it is necessary to consider the social, economic and environmental impacts arising from the loss of the existing employment site to an alternative form of development.

Policy DMB1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy states that:

‘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.)’.*

Key Statement EC1 of the Core strategy states:

'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.'

Policy S4 also safeguards land for particular use, 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. In this case, this would be as a designated site for employment within the Longridge Neighbourhood Development Plan.

An assessment against Criterion 1 of Policy DMB1 shall be made later in this report.

The Council previously raised concerns with regards to the acceptability of the scheme when assessed against criterion 2 of Policy DMB1. No information was provided in support of the application to demonstrate that loss of the employment unit would not result in any adverse impacts upon the local economy. Furthermore, no information was provided to demonstrate that retention of the existing industrial unit would not be economically viable.

The application has now been supported by evidence of marketing for employment use which shall be discussed in more detail later in this report.

With regards to Criterion 3 of Policy DMB1, the site lies immediately adjacent to a number of residential receptors and in this instance it could be argued that a residential use of the workshop building as proposed could potentially result in a reduced output of noise levels and odour omissions (relative to the existing use of the site) therefore a residential use of the building could in this respect acceptable in relation to Criterion 3 of Policy DMB1.

With regards to criterion 4 and criterion 5 of Policy DMB1, the previous application was refused as it had not assessed the loss of employment use or demonstrated that the property had been marketed to secure an alternative employment generating use.

A letter and marketing details have been submitted as part of the application from HDAK Commercial Property Consultants dated 6 May 2026. The letter states that they were instructed in March 2025 to market the premises in the hope of finding a suitable commercial tenant. They note that a 'to let' board was erected on the building and marketed on their website as well as promoting the site on national websites. A mailshot to potential interested parties was also undertaken to all commercial estate agents.

The letter states that the response was limited and despite a number of enquiries being received and several parties viewing externally, no party came forward wanting to carry out a more detailed inspection. Constraints identified included the restricted vehicular access and the residential nature of the street was the primary reason for the lack of interest. The enquiries included a Joiner/Building contractor, Gymnasium operator and Ceramic Tile wholesaler.

The letter states that market conditions and occupiers' requirements continue to change, and George Street no longer provides a suitable commercial opportunity. The property was marketed for 10 months and was taken off the market in February 2026.

The Council are satisfied that the site is no longer required for employment purposes as it has been marketed for a 10 month period with no realistic up-take. The proposal would still conflict with Policy LNDP14 of the adopted Longridge Neighbourhood Development Plan as the site is designated for employment use but this is outweighed by the additional marketing evidence submitted with this application which demonstrates an employment use is no longer viable.

Whilst conflict is identified with LNDP14 of the adopted neighbourhood plan, this would not warrant refusal of the application and the proposal is considered to accord with Policy S4 of the NPPF and Key Statement EC1 and DMB1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.

Policy DMG1 also states that development must:

'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'.

The previous application raised concerns with regards to the land use of the site being unsuitable for residential development. The delegated report noted that George Street provides a separation between the industrial site and the residential terraced properties opposite the application site and it was not considered that the proposed building would be appropriate for conversion to residential in this location as the land use would conflict with the surrounding industrial land uses, contrary to Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.

A further assessment of the quality of accommodation will be assessed below. Notwithstanding this, the updated NPPF puts greater emphasis on allowing development within settlements, unless the benefits of doing so would be substantially outweighed by any adverse impacts. Paragraph 1 of the NPPF states that it is a material consideration of critical importance. In addition, the Council has a housing land supply of 2.24 years and therefore the proposal would provide a dwelling that would contribute to the Council's housing stock.

Given the updated NPPF which supports development in settlements, a full assessment needs to be made of any adverse effects which would substantially outweigh the benefit of providing a new residential unit within a settlement. This shall be assessed later in the report.

Turning to 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 28 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 within walking distance to Longridge Town Centre with good access to key services and facilities, as well as public transport to other nearby towns and the City of Preston. As such, the site is sustainably located and the proposed change of use accords with Key Statement DMI2 and Policy DMG3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and Policies TR3 and CC2 of the NPPF.

Impact Upon Residential Amenity:

Ribble Valley Core Strategy Policy DMG1 provides specific guidance in relation to amenity and states that all 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 adopted Longridge Neighbourhood Plan also states that proposals should have no significant adverse impact on residential amenity for existing and future residents.

Neighbour amenity

The neighbouring properties that could be impacted by the proposed development would be numbers 21, 21A and 23 Inglewhite Road and numbers 1-5 George Steet.

There are no external alterations/additions to the site/building which would likely adversely impact the amenity of neighbouring properties by way of harmful overshadowing and loss of light. The existing timber door to the front elevation would be upgraded with a ‘false’ window sit behind the existing masonry. As such, there would not likely be any adverse impact by way of harmful overlooking and loss of privacy.

Similarly, whilst there would be existing ground floor windows overlooking the rear of number 21, 21A and 23 Inglewhite Road, this is not deemed significantly more harmful than existing as the windows are already in situ and the first-floor windows are already overlooked by the public footpath and existing industrial unit.

It would be reasonable to remove permitted development rights to the property in the interest of neighbour amenity to prevent alterations to the property which may result in harmful overlooking.

The site has been vacant since 2022 and as such, the change of use to residential would increase the number of comings and goings from the site when compared to existing levels, however this is considered to be no worse than the use of the site for commercial use.

The Air Source Heat Pump originally proposed as part of the refused scheme has now been removed.

Future occupiers’ amenity

Policy LNDP3 of the Longridge Neighbourhood Plan states that the proposed development should not adversely impact the amenity of future residents, and this is reinforced by Policy DMG1 of the Core Strategy.

The proposed dwelling would have two bedrooms which would look out on to the existing parking area, bin storage area and the tarmac area fronting the garage, with brick walls facing the windows. The amended scheme also now includes a grassed area to the west of the site to provide an area of amenity space for future residents. The amenity space would not be fully private given the height of the proposed new wall but it would nonetheless be an improvement upon the refused scheme.

Concerns were also previously raised with regards to the low level of light to the living, dining and kitchen areas, as well as the poor outlook proposed and lack of daylight to the rear part of the building which was considered to result in poor living accommodation for future occupiers. The applicant has not made many changes to the internal layout of the dwelling or increased the number of windows/rooflights which would help to increase light levels when compared to the refused scheme. Notwithstanding this, each habitable room would be served by a window at ground floor level and as such, whilst the light levels could be improved upon, this is not considered to substantially outweigh the benefit of providing a new dwelling when assessed under Policy S4 of the NPPF. The outlook is also considered to be improved upon the refused scheme as the site plan shows an area of soft landscaping within the yard. Again, whilst the outlook from the bedroom and living rooms are not considered to be high quality, this would not substantially outweigh the benefits of the development.

The application has now been supported by a sound insulation assessment which states that an enhanced party wall construction has been proposed to provide an increased level of sound insulation between the proposed residential dwelling and the adjoining commercial unit. The noise assessment concludes that, subject to the adoption of the recommended mitigation measures for the party wall and building envelope constructions, the proposed dwelling is not expected to be subject to any significant adverse noise impacts from the adjacent commercial units.

The Environmental Health Officer is satisfied that provided that the recommendations outlined in the report are adhered to, the proposal would be acceptable from a noise perspective. Subject to an appropriately worded planning condition, the proposal is considered to accord with Policy LNDP3 of the Longridge Neighbourhood Plan and Policy DMG1 of the Core Strategy.

Visual Amenity/External Appearance and Heritage Considerations:

Ribble Valley Core Strategy Policy DMG1 provides specific guidance in relation to design and states:

'All development must be sympathetic to existing and proposed land uses in terms of its size, intensity and nature as well as scale, massing, style [and] 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.'

Policy LNDP3 of the adopted Longridge Neighbourhood Development Plan 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'.

Key Statement EN5 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy 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'.

In addition, Policy DME4 states that:

'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'.

Policies 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.*

Finally, the principle statutory duty under the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (s.72) is to preserve or enhance the special character of heritage assets, including their setting.

The proposal would include the erection of a new 1.1m high stone wall to create a small area of amenity space. This is considered to have a neutral impact on the character of the surrounding area and the Longridge Conservation Area given the presence of similar features within the vicinity of the site and the urban character. One of the existing windows would be infilled with a rendered panel and the application form indicates that new windows would now be timber which is an improvement upon the refused scheme which originally proposed uPVC.

New vertically boarded doors would still be proposed to the front elevation and fixed shut and a new timbered garage door would be created as well as a small timber framed and glazed porch, which would sit behind the new stone wall. Following concerns raised with regards to the insertion of timber fixed doors to the front elevation which was not considered to constitute a high standard of design, the drawings have been amended to include a panel of ceramic glass on adjacent to the proposed timber boards to improve the visual appearance of the dwelling. The timber boarding and ceramic glass would be recessed within the wall and would give the appearance of a timber door and window and subject to details being secured by way of condition, is considered to be an improvement beyond the refused scheme.

Overall, the amended scheme is considered to be an improvement and would utilise more appropriate materials of construction, including timber window. In addition, the boundary wall would be constructed of stone rather than render and the scheme would have improved amenity space for future residents.

The impact on the Longridge Conservation Area is considered to be neutral. The existing building is not considered to be of any significant heritage of architectural value and the proposal has been amended to improve upon the design of the conversion by introducing stonework, timber windows and retaining some elements of the industrial heritage of the building.

As such, the proposal accords with Key Statement EN5 and Policies DMG1 and DME4 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy as well as Policy LNDP3 of the adopted Longridge Neighbourhood Plan 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 site has an existing access and would provide parking for 2 no. vehicles in front of the property.

The Local Highway Authority (LHA) have been consulted on the application and concludes that there are no highway grounds to support an objection as set out by NPPF.

They note that there is an existing dropped kerb off George Street but there is no footway on this side of George Street with just a narrow service strip between the access and the carriageway. It is therefore unlikely that pedestrians will walk on this side of the road as there is a footway in front of the dwellings opposite.

The highway authority would expect two adequately sized off-road car parking spaces to be provided for a dwelling with two bedrooms. The proposed garage is considered adequately sized internally to provide one car parking space, plus secure cycle storage. A further parking space can be provided on the driveway in front of the garage. Two further spaces are indicated across the front of the site. Whilst there may be adequate visibility for a driver exiting the space in front of the dwelling's gable end, visibility from the second space could be obstructed by the adjacent red brick building. To ensure that adequate car and cycle parking is retained on site the highway authority requests that this is controlled by a separate condition to protect future parking provision and they recommend a condition that the parking areas including garage shall be kept available for the parking of vehicles ancillary to the enjoyment of the household and shall not be used for any use that would preclude the ability of their use for the parking of private motor vehicles.

They also note that the EV charging point should be fitted in line with the Dept for Transport's guidance regarding Electric Vehicle Charging in Residential and Non-residential Buildings. However, this would be covered by separate legislation.

Subject to conditions, the proposal therefore complies with Policies DMG1 and DMG3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.

Landscape/Ecology:

Policy DME3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy states that development proposals that are likely to adversely affect Wildlife Species Protected by law will not be granted planning permission.

Exceptions will only be made where it can clearly be demonstrated that the benefits of a development at a site outweigh both the local and the wider impacts. Planning conditions or agreements will be used to secure protection or, in the case of any exceptional development as defined above, to mitigate any harm, unless arrangements can be made through planning conditions or agreements to secure their protection.

The application has been supported by an updated bat survey report and method statement.

A preliminary bat roost assessment survey was carried out on 25th March 2026 and the building and surrounding habitat was observed to have a low level of bat roost potential. Previously an emergence survey was carried out on 16th July 2024 and recorded no bats emerging from the building. An extremely low level of bat activity was observed with a single Common Pipistrelle recorded foraging around trees to the east. Given the results of the follow up survey and observations of the previous emergence survey it was considered that survey effort is appropriate to characterise the roost potential of the building and that the presence of a significant or low conservation value bat roost is unlikely.

The report concludes that it is considered unlikely that significant or low conservation value roosts are present within the building, however given the building offers low potential and the opportunistic nature of Pipistrelle bats it is recommended that proposed works are carried out under supervision. As such, a condition should be added to any grant of permission for the works to be undertaken in accordance with the recommendations outlined in the bat survey report.

With regards to biodiversity net-gain, the development is exempt from having to achieve the Mandatory Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) requirement as the development is for a change of use. The submitted proposed plans indicate that the existing hardstanding would remain rather than involve new surfacing. As such, the development is considered to be De Minimis for the purposes of BNG assessment.

Other Matters:

Flood Risk

Policy DME6 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 site is at risk of surface water flooding and has been accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA).

The FRA states that the 1 in 100yr + cc (design flood event) surface water flood map shows the pixelated flood extent marginally impinging on the east and south facade of the building and levels within the site are circa 200mm above levels on George Street which suggests it would be very unlikely flooding would occur here at any significant depth. Existing (and proposed) floor levels at the garage entrance and the residential access to the west are currently measured 200mm and 150mm above the existing external ground level accordingly. The 1 in 1000yr surface water flood map paints a very similar picture to that assessed above with minor impingement shown on the east and south facade of the building.

With regards to mitigation measures, the FRA indicates that the finished floor levels would be set at or above the existing Architect has indicated that proposed finished floor levels (FFLs) will be set at or above the existing FFLs. Other mitigation measures are suggested including raising electrical sockets, boilers and meter units, using cement based or magnesium oxide plaster boards fitted horizontally at ground floor, using lime render to the walls rather than traditional plaster, solid ground floor construction and non-return valves.

Notwithstanding the above, no drainage details have been provided and as such, it would be reasonable to secure details of drainage by way of condition to ensure flood risk would not be increased elsewhere.

Telegraph Pole

There is a telegraph pole located within the application site. Openreach were consulted on the previous planning application and they considered the pole is protected under code rights afforded under the Telecommunications Act, separate from planning however they would require that no encapsulation of the pole occurs, and that unrestricted access is afforded at all times. They also state that should this be an issue, then the developer will need to engage with Openreach and meet the costs of re locating the equipment.

It is considered that this could be added as an advisory note to the decision notice of any grant of planning permission.

Observations/Consideration of Matters Raised/Conclusion:

It is for the above reasons and having regard to all material considerations and matters raised that the application is recommended for approval.

RECOMMENDATION:	That planning consent be granted subject to conditions.
------------------------	---