

Planning Statement

Full Planning Application for the Erection of 39.no Dwellings with Associated Access, Gardens, Parking and Landscaping areas.

Land East of Clitheroe Road, Whalley.

For Pringle Homes (Langho) Ltd.

August 2026

Job Number: 18-086

Contents

1.0	Introduction and Approach	3
2.0	The Site and Surroundings	6
3.0	Planning Background – Relevant History and Housing Applications	9
4.0	The Proposed Development.....	12
5.0	Planning Policy Context and Other Material Considerations	16
6.0	Assessment Against the Development Plan and Other Material Considerations	23
7.0	Technical Considerations	30
8.0	Conclusion	36

1.0 Introduction and Approach

- 1.1 This Planning Statement has been prepared by Maybern Planning and Development ('Maybern') on behalf of Pringle Homes (Langho) Ltd (herein referred to as "Pringle Homes" or "The Applicant") seeking full planning permission for the erection of 39.no housing units with associated works at land East of Clitheroe Road, Whalley.
- 1.2 The description of the application proposal is:
- Full Planning Application for the Erection of 39.no Dwellings with Associated Access, Gardens, Parking and Landscaping areas.*
- 1.3 This Planning Statement sets out:
- A description of the site and surroundings;
 - The scope of the development proposal;
 - The statutory and planning policy context of the site and application proposals; and
 - Assessment of the proposals against the statutory and planning policy context and other material considerations and technical matters relevant to the site proposal.
- 1.4 This Statement will summarise the nature of the site and the proposed development, and the proposals compliance with the adopted Development Plan for Ribble Valley Borough Council (RVBC) and other relevant material considerations.
- 1.5 The application is submitted following a pre-application enquiry (ref: RV/2023/ENQ/00032) held in 2023 with RVBC and a full application for 77 no. affordable housing units (ref: 3/2025/0588) which was refused on the site more recently. The adoption of feedback on both pre-application discussions and statutory consultee responses to the previous application as well as due regard to the reasons for refusal have been provided within this submission.
- 1.6 Submitted in conjunction with this Planning Statement are the following:
- Planning Application Forms and Certificate - via the Planning Portal ref PP-15020744

PLANS (Provided by MCK unless stated):

- Location Plan – Ref – 24-124 LP01
- Proposed Site Layout – Ref – 24-124-0003 Rev M
- Coloured Site Layout – Ref - 24-124-0003 Rev M
- Boundary Treatments Plan – Ref – 24-124-BT01 Rev C
- Street Scenes – Ref – 24-124-SS01 Rev C
- Waste Management Plan – Ref – 24-124-WM01 Rev B
- Material Plan – Ref – 24-124-MP01 Rev C

- Landscaping Scheme (submitted as 3 drawings ref: 7585.01 Rev F, 7585.02 Rev F, 7585.03 Rev F) prepared by Trevor Bridge Associates (August 2026)
- Topographical Survey (ref: S22-0921) prepared by JLP
- Tree Survey with TPO Analysis (June 2026) prepared by Iain Tavendale
- Tree Survey Plan with Shadow (June 2026) prepared by Iain Tavendale
- Tree Survey Plan with No Shadow (June 2026) prepared by Iain Tavendale

HOUSE TYPE PACK (Provided by MCK unless stated): Elevations and Floor Plans

- 3B Corner Turner Planning Drawings
- Bickerton Planning Drawings
- Bransfield Planning Drawings
- Bungalow Planning Drawings
- Cavendish Planning Drawings
- Farnley Planning Drawings
- Frobisher Planning Drawings
- Grantley Planning Drawings
- Haworth Planning Drawing
- Maisonettes Planning Drawings
- Marsden Planning Drawings
- Wollaston Planning Drawings
- Garage Planning Drawings

REPORTS:

- Design and Access Statement Rev C (August 2026) prepared by MCK
- Statement of Community Involvement (August 2026) prepared by Maybern
- Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy (July 2026) prepared by ReFord
- Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (August 2026) prepared by ERAP
- Assessment of Biodiversity Net Gain (August 2026) prepared by ERAP
- Statutory Biodiversity Metric (August 2026) prepared by ERAP
- Phase 1 Geo-Environmental Desk Study Report (submitted in four parts) - 24175/GEDS/03 (July 2025) prepared by REFA

- Transport Statement - (August 2026) prepared by Mode Transport Planning
- Arboricultural Impact Assessment (August 2026) prepared by Iain Tavendale
- Road Traffic Noise Assessment (July 2026) prepared by Martec Environmental Consultants
- Affordable Housing Statement (August 2026) prepared by Pringle Homes
- Draft Heads of Terms (S106) (August 2026) prepared by Pringle Homes

The Applicant:

- 1.7 Pringle Homes is a family-run housebuilding company based in Preston which specialises in the delivery of high-quality development sites in the North West, including the delivery of both market and affordable homes with involvement from Registered Providers.
- 1.8 They have successfully delivered several residential developments throughout Ribble Valley, Preston and South Ribble, including Northcote Park, Langho; Pennington Gardens, Higher Bartle; and Collinwood Gardens, Hutton. These schemes provide an attractive range of dwelling types and tenures, including both market and affordable homes, designed to meet the needs of a broad spectrum of households and delivering a high standard of design and placemaking.
- 1.9 More recently, Pringle Homes has worked closely with Ribble Valley Borough Council to deliver the approved scheme of 37 affordable dwellings at Crow Trees Farm, Chatburn, in partnership with the Registered Provider MSV. The development is now being completed, with homes actively being handed over and occupied, demonstrating within the Borough.

2.0 The Site and Surroundings

- 2.1 The application site extends to 3.42ha and comprises agricultural land lying to the east of Clitheroe Road, at the immediate northern edge of the defined settlement boundary of Whalley.
- 2.2 The land is generally flat and rises gently toward the eastern boundary away from Clitheroe Road.
- 2.3 The site is bound by the A59 to the north which sits at a higher level than the site itself on a heavily landscaped embankment which visually contains and screens the land (the A59 passes over Clitheroe Road via a bridge located just beyond the proposed site entrance). Located to the immediate east of the site is further greenfield land with the A671 beyond. To the south are residential properties and Oakhill School and its facilities and playing fields/land forming the northern extent of Whalley; a small housing development site on part of the school land has recently been completed. The western boundary comprises Clitheroe Road along which there are a small number of residential units with further greenfield land beyond to the far west.
- 2.4 The site is currently accessed via a field gate located on Clitheroe Road.
- 2.5 The site comprises of grass and scrub land that has previously been used for the grazing of livestock.
- 2.6 Figure 1 below shows an aerial view of the site within its wider built and natural environment contexts (the approximate site area indicated in red).



Figure 1: Aerial view of the approximate application site (edged red) and its wider setting

Accessibility and Service:

- 2.7 In terms of sustainability and reducing reliance on the private car, the site is well connected to Whalley and lies c.800m north of the centre of the village.
- 2.8 The development site fronts onto Clitheroe Road, an arterial route passing through Whalley and linking the settlement to the neighbouring village of Barrow (0.96km), before joining Whalley Road and continuing to the town of Clitheroe (5.5km). Clitheroe Road provides ample connections to the centre of Whalley, wherefrom connection to the A59 and the A671 are available with onward access to the wider region and services in the major centres across East Lancashire.
- 2.9 There are a range of amenities and facilities located throughout Whalley, including several small commercial convenience stores (Co-Op, SPAR and Whalley News Agents), as well as many small retail and commercial premises. Whalley also has a post office, health facilities and community buildings including numerous churches, public houses and a village hall. Larger main shops and services are located in the centres of Clitheroe, Preston and Accrington which are easily accessible via car or public transport.
- 2.10 Sports facility provision is plentiful throughout the settlement, with Whalley Sports Club located approximately 1.45km from the site (3 minute drive). Further sports provision is also present at Oak Hill Leisure, PLM Health and Fitness Gym and Whalley Golf Club all within accessible distance of the site.
- 2.11 Education provision can also be found throughout Whalley, within close radius to the site, with Oakhill School and Nursery and Whalley Pre-School as well as Whalley Church of England Primary School. Secondary Education provision can be found further afield via Saint Augustine's Roman Catholic High School and Ribblesdale High School and in Clitheroe.
- 2.12 The site is well connected to public open space with high quality greenspace in the form of Whalley Park located 1km from the site. Further open space provision can be found throughout Whalley including Spring Wood, Whalley Forrest Garden and Whalley Abbey.
- 2.13 As per Figure 4.1 of the Transport Statement, frequent bus services run along Clitheroe Road, with a bus stop located directly south of the land best serving the site. This bus stop provides significant services (Mainline and Valley Line and other local services) to a range of destinations including Clitheroe, Burnley, Preston, Shadsworth, Old Langho, Longridge and Accrington as well as Whalley centre with 4+ services per hour. Whalley bus station then provides onward linkages to other services and more destinations across East Lancashire.
- 2.14 Whalley railway station is approximately 1.1km away which offers hourly services to Rochdale via Blackburn, Bolton and Manchester Victoria and to Clitheroe. These services run from 6.30am to 11.45pm (with slightly reduced services on Sundays).
- 2.15 A primary cycle route runs along Wiswell Lane, Clitheroe Road and Station Road as they run through the centre of Whalley, providing sustainable alternative transport options to Clitheroe, Longridge, Blackburn and other local service centres within Ribble Valley.
- 2.16 In relation to walkability, there are numerous Public Rights of Way located within close proximity to the site. FP0345010, FP0345022 and FP0345023 are all within accessible proximity to the site.

Surrounding Uses:

- 2.17 Immediate uses to the south of the site and adjacent to the west of the site are residential in nature, with further open greenfield land located to the east.

- 2.18 The A59 is located across the northern boundary of the site, via a raised embankment. Beyond the A59 to the northwest of the site is Whalley, Wiswell & Barrow Cemetery and The Palm Tree Company (and associated warehouse) and further open fields.

General Technical Considerations:

- 2.19 The site lies within Flood Zone 1, the lowest classification for flood risk as defined by the Environment Agency. The northern and north eastern boundary of the site and a narrow strip of land towards the north of the site is also subject to risk of surface water flooding. The accompanying Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy considers this further and provides the proposed drainage strategy for the site.
- 2.20 The site has a relatively flat topography with the exception of the northern rising embankment area, and there are a number of trees within the site and along its associated boundaries.
- 2.21 There are no listed buildings within or adjacent to the site, nor is the site located within a Conservation Area. The nearest listed buildings in relation to the development site are located c.0.8km away, towards the centre of Whalley, at the Old Grammar School (Grade II Listed) and the War Memorial (Grade II Listed). The closest conservation area boundary is also located c.0.8km away from the site in the same location as the listed buildings identified.
- 2.22 The application site is subject to an aged Tree Preservation Order, TPO ref. 7/19/3/10 1957 Whalley. Due to the date of this order some trees are now not present or of low quality. TPO ref. 7/19/3/125 1992 Bramley Meade covers trees on the road frontage area.
- 2.23 A gas pipeline runs along the northern boundary of the site as well as along Clitheroe Road.

Development Plan Allocations

- 2.24 As per the Ribble Valley Core Strategy Proposal's Map, the site falls outside of the defined urban boundary for Whalley and is therefore designated as open countryside; although, it immediately abuts the settlement boundary. It does not comprise Green Belt, AONB or other protected landscape.
- 2.25 Whalley is identified as a Principal Settlement in the Borough as per Key Statement DS1.

3.0 Planning Background – Relevant History and Housing Applications

- 3.1 Relevant site history and other housing planning applications in the Borough are relevant to the proposals.

Pre-Application Advice

- 3.2 A formal pre-application meeting was held with RVBC in May 2023. This request was used to facilitate an opportunity to formally present and engage with the Council with regards to a residential development opportunity on the site. Whilst the development proposal submitted related to 18 no. self-build housing plots, the pre-application response provides relevant context for the site and a residential proposal.
- 3.3 The Council's response on the matter of residential principle was primarily related to the site's location within the open countryside and outside of the settlement boundary such that the Council considered the proposal to be in conflict with Key Statement DS1 (Development Strategy) and Policies DMG2 (Strategic Considerations) and DMH3 (Dwellings in the Open Countryside and AONB) of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy. It was also referenced that the residential proposal without sufficient justification to the criteria of such policies, would be in conflict with the policies and create a precedent for new dwellings outside of a defined settlement boundary. At the time of this enquiry response the Council could evidence a 5-year housing land supply (HLS).
- 3.4 The response also highlighted that the self-build units proposed were not considered as meeting a 'local-housing need' (in the context of policy DMG2), and that there was minimal demand for self-build plots in the area.
- 3.5 The response did not directly comment on whether the site was considered to be sustainably located in respect of its positioning on the immediate edge of the settlement or to other site specific technical matters.

Planning Application

- 3.6 The site has been subject to a recent planning application by Pringle Homes for the erection of 77 no. affordable dwellings with associated access, gardens, parking and landscaping areas.
- 3.7 Following submission of the application in July 2025, a range of statutory consultee responses were received. The applicant sought to discuss such responses with consultees and the LPA to address points raised. Following a meeting with officers, further information was not accepted and it was stated that no amendments would be accepted to the proposal.
- 3.8 The application thus progressed and was recommended for refusal and subsequently refused at planning committee on the 5th February 2026 for 6 no. reasons including on design, housing mix, surface water issues, road noise and BNG.
- 3.9 During the determination of the application, it has become accepted via appeal that the Council cannot demonstrate an adequate 5-year HLS and the tilted balance is to operate in the Borough.
- 3.10 Notwithstanding this decision, the development proposal to which this now submitted application relates can satisfy the reasons for refusal to the previously refused housing proposal. The relevant details regarding this can be found throughout the later sections of this planning statement.

Wider Planning History

3.11 Recent proposals for residential development within RVBC are of relevance to the now submitted proposal including the following:

- Permission in Principle ref: 3/2025/0414 - proposed residential development of up to nine dwellings - Land to the south of Old Road, Chatburn. The application site is located outside of the settlement boundary for Chatburn and within the designated open countryside.

The application was recommended for refusal by officers and was subsequently refused on the 19th June 2025. The reasons for refusal included that the proposal was considered to be in direct conflict with Policy DMG2 and DMH3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy as the proposal would lead to the creation of new residential dwellings within the open countryside without sufficient justification.

The applicant subsequently submitted an appeal (ref: APP/T2350/W/25/3372635) within which the Council's 5-year HLS was challenged.

In allowing the appeal the Inspector found that the Council's HLS position was only 3.45 years (1,130 homes) and that *"The proposed development would conflict with the spatial strategy set out in the development plan as the site lies outside the settlement boundary of Chatburn. ...I have found that the Council cannot demonstrate a 5YHLS. Accordingly, as set out in footnote 8 of the Framework, the most important policies of the development plan are considered to be out-of-date. Consequently, paragraph 11 d) of the Framework applies"*.

The Inspector also afforded substantial weight to the delivery of housing, finding that *"the proposed development would make a modest contribution to the supply of housing, of up to 9 dwellings, in an accessible location. Given the significant shortfall in the 5YHLS at this time, I afford this substantial weight. ...The adverse impact I have identified, arising from the conflict with the spatial strategy, would not significantly and demonstrably outweigh such benefits. Consequently, the presumption in favour of sustainable development applies and paragraph 11 d) indicates that permission should be granted. There are no other material considerations to override this finding"*.

- Outline application ref: 3/2025/0196 – outline application for up to 300 residential dwellings, associated access, rail station car park, green infrastructure and sustainable drainage systems (all matters reserved except for access) - Land off Longsight Road, Langho.

The application site is again located outside the settlement boundary of Langho and in the open countryside. As part of the application, it was submitted that RVBC are not able to demonstrate a sufficient 5-year HLS, that the most important policies of the development plan are out of date and that the tilted balance is engaged.

The application was recommended for refusal by officers and refused at planning committee on 26th June 2025. The reasons for refusal included the development proposal conflicting with housing exception criteria within policy DMG2 and DMH3, the site not being a sustainable location, the proposed development having significant harm upon the surrounding visual and landscape character, as well as the submission providing limited information on ecology and BNG.

Following the refusal and the submission of an appeal (ref: 6002485), the appeal was allowed on 11th June 2026 following an inquiry. The Inspector approved the appeal including on reasons of the Council being unable to show an adequate 5-year HLS. The Inspector stated that there is a serious and significant shortfall in housing delivery, and that it is unclear how and when this shortfall will be fully addressed.

The Statement of Common Ground as signed by both parties states at paragraph 6.3 that it is agreed that the Council cannot demonstrate a 5-year HLS and on this basis it is agreed that Paragraph 11d) of the National Planning Policy Framework and DS2: Sustainable Development is engaged.

The Inspector for the appeal also accepted the proposed off-site compensation to make up the BNG for the development.

On the matter of affordable housing, the Inspector commented that there is a substantial unmet need for affordable housing in the Borough and went on to conclude that even without the tilted balance the identified harm would be comfortably outweighed by the combined benefits of delivering the proposed market and affordable housing.

- 3.12 These applications demonstrate a position in the Borough that the erection of high quality market and affordable dwellings on accessible out of settlement locations, as supported by national planning policy and guidance, should be approved.

4.0 The Proposed Development

4.1 This full planning application seeks permission for the:

'The Erection of 39.no Dwellings with Associated Access, Gardens, Parking and Landscaping Areas.'

4.2 This section summarises the proposal and should be read in conjunction with the submitted plans and technical reports.

Housing Proposal – Market Housing and Policy Compliant Affordable Housing:

4.3 The land is proposed to be developed for 39 no. dwellings comprising 27 no. market dwellings and 12 no. affordable dwellings, comprising at 30% of units and policy compliant.

Housing Mix – market housing

4.4 The 27 no. market dwellings comprise a mix of four and five bed detached dwellings. House types are as follows:

Unit Type/Name	Number of Bedrooms	Number of units
Bickerton	4	5
Wollaston	4	6
Frobisher	4	6
Haworth	4	3
Grantley	4	3
Farnley	5	2
Cavendish	4	2
		27

Table 1: Market housing mix

4.5 The market housing element of the scheme will therefore comprise of:

- 91% four-bedroomed units; and
- 9 % five-bedroomed units.

Housing mix – affordable

4.6 The accommodation schedule confirms that the affordable housing mix will be as follows:

Unit Type/Name	Number of Bedrooms	Number of units	%
Maisonette GF	1	3	25
Maisonette FF	1	3	25
Marsden	2	2	16.67
Bransfield	3	1	8.33
Corner Turner	3	1	8.33
Bungalow	2	2	16.67
		12	100

Table 2: Affordable housing mix

4.7 The affordable housing element of the scheme will therefore comprise of:

- 50% one-bedroomed units;
- 33 % two-bedroomed units; and,
- 17% three-bedroomed units.

Affordable housing – tenure split

4.8 The proposed affordable housing units are likely to comprise a mix of affordable (social) rent and affordable ownership units at 50% each.

4.9 Further details of the affordable housing mix and tenure proposed on the site can be found within the submitted Affordable Housing Statement provided by Pringle Homes.

4.10 Discussions with the Council's Housing Team and planning officers would be undertaken during the determination of the application on this.

Layout, Scale and Appearance:

4.11 The dwellings will be accessed from Clitheroe Road via expansion and improvement of the existing field gate vehicular access point located at the north west boundary of the site.

4.12 The layout provides for the retention of a significant landscape belt at the north of the site with dwellings located to the south of it and extending to the southern and eastern boundaries. Dwellings are primarily set along and front onto the main site road that meanders to the south and north as it

heads eastwards through the site. A number of dwellings are also served off a small number of shared drives, including one at the western site frontage that sets units back from the road frontage and behind existing frontage trees and vegetation. A small number of the apartments will be served off a front parking court area. In light of the layout arrangement, dwellings will generally face into/within the site with large rear gardens backing onto the southern site boundary and the closest relationship with existing dwellings.

- 4.13 The proposed houses and apartments would be two storeys in height in a mix of semi-detached, detached and mews units (three or four units per run). The apartments would be located within mews units.
- 4.14 The materials palette for the units would primarily consist of stone, brick and render. All units will feature slate-like roof tile, with fascias and soffits in black woodgrain uPVC and black rainwater goods also in uPVC. Windows and doors would be Agate Grey uPVC.
- 4.15 The dwellings have generally simple elevational form featuring porches, gables and chimneys to provide detail and diversity to the street scene. Dwellings on corner locations and at the end of runs would also include outward facing facades to provide active frontages and surveillance to the street-scene. The larger units include a greater mix of design features (gables, bay windows, integral garages and footprint variations) to provide relief and interest to their larger form and massing.
- 4.16 All units would have rear gardens with the apartments also having joint garden areas to the front and rear. Access to rear gardens would be via driveways or pathways for access and bin movements.
- 4.17 Given the site size and arrangement, appropriate separation distances between main facing elevations and surrounding properties are achieved.

Access, Connectivity and Parking

- 4.18 The access point will be upgraded to a priority junction featuring a ghost right turn lane as shown in the Transport Statement access arrangement plans. Traffic calming measures are to be included along Clitheroe Road, reflecting the access point proximity to a zone where the speed limit changes from 30mph to 40mph.
- 4.19 The site access road will be provided at a 6.5m carriageway width for 10 metres into the site in line with Lancashire County Council Highways requirements (and consultation to the previous planning application). Continuing into the site the road will be provided at adoptable standard width of 5.5m and 6m corner radii.
- 4.20 There will be a 3m wide foot/cycleway on both sides of the access point reducing to 2m footways within the main site area (within the site cyclists will then use the carriageway). This arrangement also provides adequate footways throughout and along the frontage of dwellings allowing for the walkability of the site.
- 4.21 Parking to the dwellings would comprise a minimum of 1 space to one-unit apartments, 2 spaces to two and three bed units and 3 spaces to four and five bed dwellings in line with parking standards. Garages will also be provided to some units (integral or stand-alone).
- 4.22 Refuse collection points are mostly provided on a plot by plot basis, however provision can also be found adjacent to turning heads throughout the site for ease of access/egress for refuse vehicles. The location of these collection points falls within the 30m distance to all units for ease of residents, whilst also falling within a 25m proximity for refuse collectors.
- 4.23 The internal road configuration will include turning heads. Swept Path Analysis (SPA) for all turning heads confirm that waste management and emergency vehicles can turn within the site safely.

- 4.24 Raised surface areas are included along the access road for speed considerations and demarcation.
- 4.25 Secure cycle storage to dwellings will be provided by means of storage within rear gardens/garages or within dwellings.
- 4.26 Further details of site provision for access and parking are provided within the Transport Statement.
- 4.27 Existing footpaths along Clitheroe Road will be maintained and enhanced by the development.

Landscaping and Open Space

- 4.28 Areas of main Public Open Space (POS) are to be located and maintained across the site encompassing 1.16 ha. This includes a main body of greenspace along the north of the site which allows for the retention of the majority of existing mature trees on-site and via a sizable pocket of greenspace toward the site's north-east boundary (which includes a small watercourse).
- 4.29 The site layout also includes a range of landscaping and incidental open space provision to deliver a high-quality environment to the scheme. All units have on-plot gardens via rear garden space. Tree and hedge planting and the provision of grass verges throughout the site will enhance the site's open nature, whilst creating a visually attractive development.
- 4.30 The proposed development has been purposefully sited around pre-existing mature trees (where they have been deemed suitable for retention) and to avoid any potential negative impact upon these. The retention of these trees throughout the site has been of the most importance in the evolution of the proposed design (following discussions with ecologists and arboriculturist).
- 4.31 A small number of trees will be removed to allow for the development and associated infrastructure, comprising trees T10, T11, T22, T23, T24, T25, T26, T27, T28 and T55, as well as a small section of G1 (group 1) and A1 (area 1). Trees T10, T25, T26, T27 and T55 are all categorised as U quality (those in such a condition that they cannot realistically be retained as living trees in the context of the current land use for longer than 10 years) and are deemed as unsuitable for retention. Trees of low quality (Category C2) T23, T28 and a section of A1, and trees of moderate quality (Category B2) T11, T24 and a section of G1 are also set for removal, as the arboriculturist considers that some tree losses are required to permit development, whilst seeking minimal impact upon visual amenity value. Mitigation measures such as tree protection fencing will be provided during construction as identified within the Tree Protection Plan.
- 4.32 With regard to the loss of trees within the context of the Tree Preservation Order referred to within para 2.27, this is discussed further within the technical section below.
- 4.33 It is proposed that a significant number of new trees are to be planted on-site (at a 3:1 ratio), in part this will ensure appropriate mitigation in the form of replacement for those small number of trees which must be removed as a result of the development and will also afford high-quality on-site Biodiversity enhancement. Tree planting will be located in the undeveloped land at the north of the site as well as throughout the site to allow for a smooth transition to the site's surrounding greenfield nature.
- 4.34 The proposal includes hedge planting along the site road and to the front of units to create an appropriate boundary to the road as well as an appropriate boundary between the front gardens of dwellings for amenity purposes.
- 4.35 Other areas of planting as shown on the accompanying landscaping plans include wildflower meadow areas within both the northern section of the site and the western section of the site fronting Clitheroe Road. The planting is to be made up of Emorsgate EW1 woodland mix and Emorsgate EH1 hedgerow mix.

5.0 Planning Policy Context and Other Material Considerations

5.1 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that:

“In making any determination under the planning Acts, regard is to be had to the development plan, the determination shall be made in accordance with the plan unless material consideration indicates otherwise”.

5.2 Therefore, the starting point for the consideration of any planning application is the Development Plan.

5.3 It is also relevant that material considerations will include national policy as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2024), in respect of the approach to decision making and to support and aims for development relevant to specific policy topics and the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG).

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2024):

5.4 The NPPF sets out the Government’s planning policies for England and how these should be applied.

5.5 It establishes sustainable development having ‘three overarching objectives’ which are economic, social and environment objectives (Para. 8). It confirms these objectives ‘are interdependent and need to be pursued in mutually supportive ways’. In respect of the social role, there aim is to support and enhance communities through the provision of a sufficient number and range of homes for the future, whilst creating well designed/attractive places, which have strong amenity provision to benefit community wellbeing.

5.6 At the heart of the Framework is the presumption in favour of sustainable development (Para. 10). For decision-taking this means approving development where it accords with an up-to-date development plan, or where the plan is out-of-date, which by reference to footnote 7 includes for applications for housing where the LPA cannot demonstrate a 5 year supply of housing land, for granting permission unless:

- the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance (e.g. green belt or other environmental designations) provides a strong reason for refusing the development proposed; or
- adverse impacts would **significantly and demonstrably outweigh** the benefits, or policies in the Framework indicate development should be refused (Para. 11d).

5.7 NPPF paragraph 39 provides that:

‘Local planning authorities should approach decisions on proposed development in a positive and creative way. They should use the full range of planning tools available, including brownfield registers and permission in principle, and work proactively with applicants to secure developments that will improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area. Decision-makers at every level should seek to approve applications for sustainable development where possible.’

5.8 Regarding the delivery of a sufficient supply of housing, the NPPF places great importance on the Government’s objective of **significantly boosting** the supply of homes (Para. 61). It requires reference to the standard method of assessing housing needs (Para. 62) and housing planning policy (and in turn decision-making) to facilitate ‘the size, type and tenure of housing needed for different groups in the community’ (Para. 63).

- 5.9 The NPPF promotes affordable housing provision and that a mix of affordable tenures should be progressed in line with local need (Paras. 66 and 71), and that small and medium sites and windfall sites can make an important contribution to meeting the housing requirement of an area and can be built out quickly with benefits to suitable sites within existing settlements (Para. 73).
- 5.10 Para. 78 requires LPAs to identify and update housing supply to provide **a minimum** of 5 years of housing against the local housing need where strategic policies are more than 5 years old¹.
- 5.11 Paragraph 110 specifies the following:
- ‘the planning system should actively manage patterns of growth in support of these objectives. Significant development should be focused on locations which are or can be made sustainable, through limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of transport modes. This can help to reduce congestion and emissions and improve air quality and public health. However, opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary between urban and rural areas, and this should be taken into account in both plan-making and decision-making’.*
- 5.12 Paragraph 116 states that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.
- 5.13 Other key matters within the NPPF relevant to the proposals include:
- promoting walking, cycling and use of public transport (para. 117.a)
 - for development to add to the overall quality of the area, ‘including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting’ (para. 135)
 - to accord with aims for climate change and minimising flood risk in terms of locations of development and energy efficiency/ good design (para. 164 and 166).
 - to assist with protection and enhancing landscapes and trees and biodiversity including via opportunities for net gain (para. 187 and 192); and

The Development Plan

- 5.14 In accordance with Section 70(2) of the 1990 Act and Section 38(6) of the 2004 Act, the statutory development plan for the site comprises the RVBC Core Strategy (adopted 2014) (CS), which predates the issue of current NPPF, and the RVBC Housing and Economic Development DPD (adopted 2019) (HED).
- 5.15 RVBC are in early stages of a Local Plan Review with Call for Sites exercises in 2021, 2022 and 2025 and an Issues and Options release in 2022 prior to the plan preparation being suspended. This site was submitted under the Call for Sites exercises in 2022.
- 5.16 Following new government guidance and process for plan preparation, a Local Plan Scoping Consultation (Regulation 20) has been undertaken until 14th August 2026. Issues identified in the Scoping include providing for sufficient housing and affordable housing needs for the Borough including:

¹ Footnote 39 referencing use of the standard method as per NPPG. This can also increase to 20% buffer requirement in certain circumstances post July 2026.

- Housing Affordability and Demographic Change: High house prices and affordability pressures alongside an ageing population and a lower proportion of working-age residents than the regional average' (Key Issue)
- 'Finding suitable land to meet future development where land supply is significantly constrained by physical and environmental factors' (Key Challenge)
- 'Improving affordability and providing the right mix of housing helping younger people and families remain within the borough' (Key Challenge)
- 'Meeting housing needs whilst improving affordability and providing the right mix of homes' (Key Challenge)
- 'Increasing the supply and variety of housing, including affordable homes and accommodation suited to older people' (Key Opportunities)
- Meeting Local Housing Need: To ensure that enough homes are provided to meet local needs whilst improving affordability and providing a wider choice of housing type, size and tenure, including meeting the housing needs of different groups including (but not limited to) those who require affordable housing; families with children; older people; people with disabilities; people requiring specialist care; service families; gypsies and travellers; people who rent their homes and people wishing to commission or build their own homes' (Emerging Priority Themes)

5.17 Given the early stage of the Local Plan Review however, this has no current weight to the consideration of planning applications.

5.18 As a result of the recent appeal decisions referenced above (and further below) it is now acknowledged that the Council does not have a 5-year HLS. The more recent appeal has also held that on the basis of the HLS position Policy DMG2 is considered out-of-date in so far as its purpose to restrict housing on sites which fall outside of the settlement boundary.

5.19 As such the weight to be applied to the development plan and those policies relevant to housing location and supply is reduced, or policies considered out-of-date, and the 'tilted balance' of Para 11d of the NPPF is in place.

Site Designation

5.20 The application site lies outside but on the immediate edge of the settlement boundary of Whalley and is therefore open countryside, as per the adopted Whalley CS Map (2014) and HED Proposals Map (2019).

5.21 The site area is not subject to any other specific allocation e.g. for strategic employment or residential development or landscape designation.

5.22 Whalley itself is identified as one of the three key settlements of the Borough to which development is to be directed.

Plan Policies

5.23 The pertinent policies from the CS and HED relevant to the delivery of the proposals at the site are summarised below. Consideration to weight to be applied is then given below in respect of assessment of the application proposals.

- DS1 – Spatial Strategy - to focus development to the Borough's principal settlements (Clitheroe, Longridge, and Whalley).

- DS2 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development - positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the NPPF.
- EN2 – Landscape – require development schemes to be in keeping with landscape character. Development is to also reflect local distinctiveness, style and scale through development features and materials used.
- EN3 - Sustainable Development and Climate Change – to ensure that all development sustainable design and construction standard.
- EN4 - Biodiversity and Geodiversity – to conserve and enhance developments sites and surroundings biodiversity and geodiversity. Development proposals will take due action with regard to ecology and biodiversity with negative impacts avoided. Proposals which harm sites ecological and biodiversity credibility must demonstrate mitigation and compensation in line with national guidance. As a principle, all development should lead to an increase in Biodiversity net gain.
- H1 - Housing Provision – Land specifically for residential development is to be made available for the provision of 5,600 dwellings throughout the plan period. To meet this the council must deliver ‘at least 280 dwellings per year over the period 2008 to 2028’.
- H2 – Housing Balance – for a suitable mix of houses having regard to housing needs.
- H3 – Affordable Housing – for delivery of units on sites and with specific provisions for older persons accommodation.
- DMI1 – Planning Obligations – will be used to draw funding from development proposals for infrastructure/highways improvements, open space provision and education throughout the local authority. This will be done on a case-by-case basis.
- DMI2 - Transport Considerations – all new development should be located sustainably to minimise the need to travel. Developments must have strong active travel links along side public transport provision to reduce the need to travel via motor vehicle.
- DMG1 - General Considerations – all development must adhere to principles laid out below:
 - Design – to afford high quality design, to be sympathetic to surroundings, to be of correct density and layout, to use sustainable construction techniques and to follow the code for sustainable homes and lifetime homes.
 - Access – to consider all vehicular implications, to provide safe access and egress, to protect and enhance PROW’s.
 - Amenity – to not affect the current/pre-existing amenity of the development sites surroundings, to provide adequate distancing and lighting, have regard to public safety (through use of design principles), consider air quality and mitigate against any adverse impacts.
 - Environment – consider environmental impacts (specifically with regards to ecology and biodiversity).
 - Infrastructure – to not result in a net loss of any important open space, consider potential impacts upon local infrastructure provision.
- DMG2 - Strategic Considerations – a two-part policy relevant to location:

(1) - relevant to development 'in' tier 1 settlements – this is now being interpreted stringently as only applying to land 'within' a settlement boundary to the principal settlements and tier 1 villages

(2) - Outside defined settlement areas or within tier 2 villages - development to meet at least one of five criteria including:

(1) be essential to the local economy or social wellbeing of the area;

(3) is for local needs housing which meets an identified need and is secured as such

- DMG3 - Transport and Mobility – considerable weight is attached to the location and quality of *'public transport and associated infrastructure to serve those moving to and from the development'*. Developments are to offer opportune use of public transport, whilst providing adequate car parking spaces in line with current standards.
- DME1 - Protecting Trees & Woodland – require the conservation of trees and woodland and the enhancement of biodiversity.
- DME2 - Landscape & Townscape Protection –developments will be refused if they significantly harm significant landscape or landscape features.
- DME3 - Site and Species Protection and Conservation – Developments which adversely effect a sites ecological features should be refused. This also encourages the enhancement of biodiversity alongside development. This now supplemented by the national requirements of 10% net gain.
- DME6 - Water Management – development is to be strongly resisted where an unacceptable risk from flooding is present.
- DMH1 – Affordable Housing Criteria - including considerations to eligibility and provisions for occupancy.
- DMH3 - Dwellings in the Open Countryside and AONB – a criteria policy for development to be limited to (1) residential development which meets an identified local need
 - Within the CS, the local need is to be evidenced by Housing Needs Survey for a parish, the Housing Waiting List or the Strategic Housing Market Assessment
- DMB4 – Open Space Provision – all residential development over 1ha is *'expected to provide adequate and usable public open space'*.

Other Material Considerations

Housing Need in Ribble Valley and Whalley

5 Year Housing Land Supply

- 5.24 The Council published an updated 5-year HLS position for the Borough in May 2025², which takes on the new local housing need figure as per the revised standard (stock- based) methodology which was released alongside the revised NPPF (2024). As such RVBC is now required to deliver 330 units per year, compared to the past method which required the delivery of 113 units per year. This was incorporated within the most recent 5YHLS figure for the Borough, and it is currently claimed that the council can

² 5 Year Housing Land Supply (5YHLS), Ribble Valley Borough Council (May 2025)

show a 6.2 year supply. It is understood that an update 5 year HLS Statement is due to be published in August 2026.

- 5.25 Recent appeals, refs. APP/T2350/W/25/3372635 - January 2026 and 6002485 – June 2026, however confirm the Council is unable to show an adequate 5-year HLS. It is confirmed that the deliverable supply of housing throughout the Borough amounted to 1,130 dwellings, which when combined with not deducting past oversupply from the local housing need requirements, the HLS position is reduced to 3.45 years. This is the currently the most up to date figure regarding RVBC HLS.

Affordable Housing

- 5.26 Affordable housing need has until very recently been considered in the Strategic Housing and Employment Needs Assessment (SHENA) Report (2020)(Turley) setting out an annual need of 88 units per annum. This did not provide smaller area/settlement need figures.
- 5.27 In May 2025, the Council reported to Planning Committee on a new Affordable Housing Needs Assessment (AHNA) (2025)³ for the Borough. In this report it is referenced that the Borough requires a total gross need of 323 affordable unit completions per annum /total net need of 230 units per annum. As such the Borough need is now significantly higher than the position referenced in the 2020 Report of 88 units per annum. The committee report to the updated AHNA also references that ‘*there is an acute need for affordable housing within the study area*’ and that ‘*the relative lack of social rented housing [in the Borough] means it will be difficult for the Council to meet affordable housing needs when they arise*’.
- 5.28 Within the AHNA, settlement and smaller area affordable needs have now been included, and in respect of Whalley it sets out a current need of 6 units per annum comprising 30 units over the remaining 5 years on the plan period. However, it is evident that the net need of affordable dwellings within the sub area of Whalley is much higher at 13 units per annum.
- 5.29 The AHNA also sets out a suggested unit size mix for affordable housing by tenures to be followed when considering affordable schemes. This can be seen below:

Figure 5: Suggested size mix of housing by tenure – Ribble Valley			
	Affordable home ownership	Affordable housing (rented)	
		Under 65	65 and over
1-bedroom	20%	20%	50%
2-bedrooms	45%	35%	50%
3-bedrooms	30%	35%	
4+-bedrooms	5%	10%	

Table 3: Suggested size mix of housing by tenure (Affordable Housing Needs Assessment, Ribble Valley Borough Council, May 2025).

- 5.30 Alongside the evidenced need throughout the Borough and the locality, the current Housing Land Availability Survey shows that between 2024-2025 housing completion levels significantly dropped from previous levels, with only 332 new build completions during this period, down from a previous level of 508. Of completions, only 72 affordable dwellings were completed⁴. Furthermore, the study shows that Whalley, as a principal settlement, contained the least number of completions over the plan

³ Affordable Housing Needs Assessment, Justin Gardner Consulting for Ribble Valley Borough Council (May 2025)

⁴ Housing Land Availability Survey (HLAS) 2024, Ribble Valley Borough Council (April 2025)

period with only 598 completions since 2008. This is a clear material consideration to the proposal for 12 affordable dwellings in Whalley.

- 5.31 The RV Corporate Strategy 2019-2023 includes an Ambition (5) to match the supply of houses to identified needs and includes an objective for providing adequate mix of additional affordable housing throughout RV and meeting the housing needs for all sections of the community. A medium priority for mechanisms for delivering affordable housing in villages is also outlined.
- 5.32 Similarly, the Pennine Lancashire Housing Strategy 2009-2029 seeks a renaissance and steady growth in the housing market and outlines that issues of affordability are present in the Borough. Policy aims to deliver affordable housing and rural affordable housing are included.

Written Ministerial Statement December 2024

- 5.33 The WMS 'Building the Homes we Need' was made on 12th December, alongside the 2024 NPPF. It starts by stating that the Government *"has inherited an acute and entrenched housing crisis"* and continues to set out how the Government will tackle the housing crisis *"because the alternative is a future in which a decent, safe, secure and affordable home is a privilege enjoyed only by some rather than being the right of all working people"*.
- 5.34 The WMS sets out why it is raising housing targets and confirms that the revised SM *"will have the effect of altering the distribution, increasing numbers in those places facing the most acute affordability pressures while maintaining ambitious targets across the whole of the country"*.
- 5.35 The WMS stresses the importance of the plan-led system but also states:

"Rapidly driving up planning consents in the context of a system with woefully inadequate local plan coverage will increase the number of permissions secured outside of local plan allocations in the short-term. This is necessary if we are to see the scale of delivery we need to meet our commitment to 1.5 million homes. Therefore, where it applies, the presumption in favour of sustainable development must have real teeth. The changes we make today ensure that the presumption carries real weight, acting as a significant adjustment to the decision-making balance in favour of approving development".

6.0 Assessment Against the Development Plan and Other Material Considerations

- 6.1 This section assesses the proposal and its compliance with the development plan, including with reference to weight to be attached to policies in the context of the HLS position, and to other relevant material considerations.

Principle of Residential Development

- 6.2 The proposal would deliver 39 no. high quality dwellings on a highly accessible edge of settlement site.
- 6.3 The spatial strategy within Key Statement DS1 of the CS outlines that the majority of new residential development should be concentrated in the Borough's principal settlements of Clitheroe, Longridge, and Whalley; Whalley has a range of facilities and amenities and is accessible by a number of transport options and is therefore a sustainable location for further residential development in principle.
- 6.4 In this respect, in the Committee Report to the previous planning application on the site, officers concluded that *'Based on the above [review of services, public transport links and other accessibility considerations], it is considered that on balance the site is in a sustainable location to support 77 houses by virtue of the effective connections to Whalley and Clitheroe accessing the pedestrian and cyclist links, bus stops and the railway stations and as such residents would not be totally reliant on car borne travel to access their day-to-day needs such as work, education, medical, shopping and leisure facilities'.*
- 6.5 Whilst further housing development in Whalley as a main settlement would be in line with DS1 and national guidance to locate in accessible locations, the current RVBC interpretation of DS1 has been that only land within the settlement boundary is acceptable for housing development; land lying just outside the settlement boundary and designated as open countryside has been considered contrary to DS1. The potential for appropriate rounding off or sustainable extensions to settlements has also not currently been considered by RVBC to align with policy DMG2 (1) or (2) for a market housing development, whilst local needs have also been required to be demonstrated for affordable housing on open countryside sites via DMG2 and DMH3.
- 6.6 However, as the Council are not able to demonstrate a 5 year HLS position by a considerable shortfall, in line with national guidance, policies of a development plan, and particularly one more than 5 years old, can be considered out of date and of limited weight.
- 6.7 As such the development strategy and housing supply/restraint policies of the development plan are considered largely out of date and the tilted balance and presumption in favour of sustainable development apply. This reflects the position from the recent appeals referenced above and as being outlined in officer reports to committee to more recent housing planning applications and via Council appeal statements.
- 6.8 Key points in assessing whether policies are out of date include reference to:
- Whether they are overtaken by national policy position and changes – this would comprise the policies of NPPF to boost the supply of housing and to deliver identified housing needs, including for affordable housing, achieving accessible development locations including extensions to existing villages and towns where they are well located and designed and supported by infrastructure and facilities (including genuine choice of transport modes) can be supported (Para. 77).
 - Assessing the 'policies in the round' and whether they are out of date for decision making purposes.

- 6.9 In this respect, within the Inspectors assessment of the appeal referenced APP/T2350/W/25/3372635, it was concluded that whilst the proposal would conflict with the spatial strategy of the development plan due to the site lying outside the settlement boundary, as well as the proposal not meeting any of the identified considerations or exceptions which are required for residential development to be acceptable in the open countryside, the Inspector stated that:

“I have found that the Council cannot demonstrate a 5YHLS. Accordingly, as set out in footnote 8 of the Framework, the most important policies of the development plan are considered to be out-of-date. Consequently, paragraph 11 d) of the Framework applies”.

- 6.10 Furthermore, within the more recent appeal referenced 6002485, it was confirmed by the Inspector that the Council dropped their reason for refusal regarding the appeal sites open countryside designation and its alleged conflict with the spatial strategy/Key Statement DS1. This Inspector also noted that whilst the appeal development would usually be in conflict with the spatial strategy as per its location within the open countryside, the Councils lack of a 5 year HLS means that the Local Plan currently carries limited weight.
- 6.11 In respect of the proposal, the most important policies are considered to be Key Statement DS1, as well as policies H1, DMG2 and DMH3.
- 6.12 These policies are now assessed to the NPPF and current aims for the significant delivery of housing including to meet affordable needs, and against similar assessment as has been undertaken in the recent appeals and via the Courts.
- 6.13 Policy DS1 is determined to be out of date in respect of those parts limiting development to within the settlement boundaries only as it is a part of a plan strategy which is failing to deliver enough housing in the Borough to meet the local housing need in conflict with the NPPF. This Policy part should be given limited weight in the determination of the application.
- 6.14 Notwithstanding in respect of directing development to the main settlement of Whalley it is apparent that the site would form a logical extension to the settlement given its location and accessibility/sustainability profile as accepted by officers. This should be given weight.
- 6.15 Policy H1 is considered to be out of date as per the recent appeal, and housing numbers should be based on the standard methodology such that only a 3.45 year supply is present in the Borough.
- 6.16 As per the evident failings of the spatial strategy, it is considered that Policies DMG2 and DMH3 in respect of limiting housing development in the open countryside are out of date.
- 6.17 Having regard to paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF and the presumption in favour of sustainable development, where policies that are most important for determining the application are out of date, the tilted balance applies. This coincides with Key Statement DS2 of the CS which promotes the presumption in favour of development.
- 6.18 As such, planning permission should be granted unless policies of the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provide a clear reason for refusing the development proposal, or any adverse impacts of granting permission would **‘significantly and demonstrably’** outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole (our emphasis).
- 6.19 In this respect, the application site is not subject to any form of protection nor an asset of particular importance having regard to footnote 7 – i.e. it is not Green Belt or subject to other historic, environmental or ecological designation. Further it would not result in encroachment onto protected land or require review of safeguarded land boundaries.

- 6.20 It is noted that in considering the previous application on the site, officers referenced in parts of the report to committee that the tilted balance was not engaged in light of perceived surface water flood risk considerations (in the context of footnote 7). However as is demonstrated fully in the technical details section on flood risk and drainage below, further information has been provided and discussions undertaken with LCC Highways in respect of the site draining to a culvert passing beneath Clitheroe Road such that there should be no concern regarding flooding.
- 6.21 Furthermore, albeit a small are of the site is identified as being at risk of surface water flooding it is confined to a small parcel to the north of the site where no development is proposed.
- 6.22 As such any suggestion that footnote 7 of the NPPF applies to negate the tilted balance operation is now addressed. It remains the view of the applicant that the tilted balance is engaged.
- 6.23 It is also relevant that this update information addresses the reason for refusal 3 as was included within the decision notice for the previous application on the site (ref: 3/2025/0588).

Housing – need and delivery

- 6.24 The proposal is for market and affordable dwellings, the affordable provision being 30% of units as per the local policy requirement in line with policy H3.
- 6.25 There is a significant housing supply shortage in the Borough of at least 2.6 years of annual dwelling numbers (310 pa), equating to over 600 dwellings, to which the delivery of 39 no. high-quality dwellings in an accessible location will materially assist reducing.
- 6.26 There is also a significant identified need for affordable housing in the Borough. The 2025 AHNA outlines a Borough need for 323 no. affordable unit completions per annum /total net need of 230 no. units per annum. Similarly, the AHNA identifies an outstanding net need of 13 no. affordable units per annum in the sub area of Whalley.
- 6.27 The AHNA also highlights that there has been a large increase in affordable housing need throughout Ribble Valley, with a steep rise from the 88 no. affordable dwellings per annum outlined within the previous SHENA in 2020. Officers of the Council have also recognised there is an “*acute need for affordable housing within the study area*” when reporting the ANHA to committee in May 2025, and Inspectors have also recently highlighted the need.
- 6.28 Having regard to these current annual need figures, it is deemed imperative that RVBC work towards meeting the identified need to adequately provide affordable completions throughout both the Borough and the principal settlement of Whalley. A FOI request to the Council by Pringle⁵ has identified that over the last 4 years (2022-26) only 31 no. affordable houses have been delivered in Whalley⁶, only 8 units per year (averaged), and only one in the last year, therefore below the 52 no. that should have been delivered based on the 13 no. per annum need.
- 6.29 The application proposal would provide a clear contribution to the annual requirement of affordable units required throughout the Borough and in the Whalley sub area, actively providing toward meeting the outstanding affordable need immediately and the future pipeline of affordable housing need. In this respect the scheme would provide almost one year of required units to the affordable need/provision throughout the Whalley locality thus assisting in meeting the identified annual need in the short term.
- 6.30 The provision of 12 no. affordable dwellings on the edge of the principal settlement and in an accessible location will actively work towards meeting this need and should be considered as an acceptable

⁵ June 2026

⁶ Wards of Whalley and Painter Wood and Whalley Netherton

location for the proposal given the Borough's current housing land and affordable housing supply shortages.

- 6.31 Whilst the previous application for 77 no. affordable dwellings at the site was refused, that decision was made in the context that officers considered the tilted balance not to apply for reasons that have now been addressed, as outlined above and further below.
- 6.32 In line with findings to the recent appeal in Langho, the Inspector conclusions that *"there is a substantial unmet need for affordable housing in the Borough"* and *'even without the tilted balance the identified harm would be comfortably outweighed by the combined benefits of delivering the proposed market and affordable housing'*, significant weight is to be applied to the delivery of housing and meeting affordable needs, reflecting the increased national aim to boost housing delivery and cater for housing needs for all.
- 6.33 The application proposal can provide a mix of unit sizes and affordable tenures in line with Policies H2 and H3 with the final affordable tenure split to be agreed during the application process. The identification of future occupiers will also be undertaken by the appointed RP with reference to the Council need and waiting lists as outlined in the Affordable Housing Statement prepared by Pringle Homes.
- 6.34 The scheme has considered both the Whalley housing need waiting list breakdown and the suggested size mix of housing by affordable tenure as per the AHNA (2025), which primarily seeks units in 1-3 no. bed sizes (as per table 3 above). As such, the 12 no. affordable units are provided as follows:

Unit size	Number of affordable homes	Percentage of affordable provision	Percentage in AHNA (based on tenure types)
1-bedroom homes	6	50%	20%
2-bedroom homes	4	33%	35-45%
3-bedroom homes	2	17%	30-35%

Table 4 – Application Affordable Unit Provision to AHNA mix aim

- 6.35 In this respect, the scheme is generally in broad accordance with the AHNA, albeit the minor differences are not considered to materially undermine the provision of this much needed affordable housing in respect of Policy DMH1.
- 6.36 With regard to provision for older persons as outlined in Policy H3, it is outlined that 15% of dwellings should provide suitable accommodation for over-55s/adaptable homes, split between 50% affordable and market housing units. In this respect, the AHS of Pringle confirms that for the 6 no. units required, the 3 no. Grantley dwellings within the market housing provision and at least 3 affordable dwellings, including the 2 no. 2-bedroom affordable bungalows and 1 no. ground-floor affordable apartment will be provided to this accessible and adaptable standards, providing flexibility for older people and for households with changing mobility needs. It is also relevant that all affordable units (with the exception of first floor apartments) so the adaptable provision on site will be above the level referenced in Policy H3.
- 6.37 The market dwellings are four and five bed units which reflect Pringle's aims for high quality executive family homes and are reflective of their development provided at Northcote Park, Langho. In this respect, whilst most such dwellings will be four bed, they will enable potential for the growth of families, flexibility in room use and for home working and other such opportunities. There is no clear

policy requirement for market homes mix with Policy H2 only referring to the SHMA and therefore for affordable mixes.

- 6.38 The delivery of market housing and the policy compliant number of affordable housing units within this scheme is therefore considered in line with national planning policy to boost housing, meet needs and those elements of policies DS1, DMH1 and DMH3 that remain up to date for local needs housing provision and policies H2 and H3 for mix and older persons delivery.

Design and Layout

- 6.39 The scheme has been fully considered in the context of design and townscape aims for the creation of high-quality buildings and places and for sustainable development that provides better and accessible places to live, and to maintaining landscape and visual context.
- 6.40 The site is suitable for housing development in terms of topography, form and ground/site conditions and would represent a logical extension to the settlement form by way of its physical relationship to the existing settlement and built form to the south and its containment by the A59 to the north.
- 6.41 The land is visually contained by its boundary features. The northern section of the site is bound by the raised embankment on which the A59 sits, this encloses the site from the wider open countryside beyond. The western, southern and eastern boundaries to the site are aligned with hedges and light tree coverage, acting as a buffer from Clitheroe Road, the surrounding residential form and further open greenfield land to the east. These aspects confirm that the proposal would not result in encroachment into a wider open landscape or to undeveloped long-range views.
- 6.42 The layout provided acknowledges the site's limited constraints, its location and key features, as well as its immediate surroundings, reserving an area at the north for a significant area of open space where existing landscape features are to be retained alongside biodiversity enhancements.
- 6.43 Retaining this undeveloped northern section also reflects technical considerations including:
- a) The large number of valuable trees categorised as B2 within this portion of the site, retained for ecological, biodiversity and landscaping purposes. Further regard to the TPO on the site and remaining aged trees has been given since the last application and, given the date since its designation, it has been determined that it can be reasonably concluded that whilst some losses are required to permit development, any such losses will have minimal impact upon the sites visual amenity value when viewed from public areas outwith the site, as further referenced in the technical details section below.
 - b) The sites proximity to the A59 and the associated noise and vibration- again this has been further considered since the last application and the concern raised to noise levels and screening in the reason for refusal has been considered to be addressed.
 - c) The gas pipeline located along the northern boundary of the site.
 - d) The minor surface water areas.
- 6.44 This area of open space provides for ample landscaping, ecological and biodiversity benefits, and to provide adequate levels of public open space. This ensures that the proposal meets relevant requirements laid out within policies EN4, DME1, DME3, DME3 and DMD4.
- 6.45 The layout proposes an upgraded site access in a similar location to the existing farm access to the site. This will allow for appropriate adoptable standard access provision and for the retention of the Category B2 tree (T12) which is located on this frontage (and other trees).

- 6.46 The proposed layout also does not have any negative impacts upon the landscape and townscape in this area nor relevant features laid out within the criterion of policy DME2. In this respect the development proposal will not have any significant harm to main landscaping features and with specific regard to Criteria 6, the scheme is to provide adequate enhancement, replanting and landscape management with regards to the loss of trees. This is further highlighted below.
- 6.47 The dwellings are arranged to retain views throughout the site and provide a low density and organic layout along a meandering road that will provide a high quality extension to the settlement. All units generally front onto the internal highway or private driveways with variation and space to the frontages and layout provided by gardens, other incidental spaces or side driveways and garages. Visual separation along the site boundaries is also provided by the private driveway to the Clitheroe Road frontage and via rear gardens backing onto the southern boundary in particular; this arrangement also softens the development as it moves away from the settlement edge (a point raised by the Officer in the pre-application feedback meeting and in the refusal of the previous application via reasons 1 and 2).
- 6.48 Driveways and parking courts included within the layout are overlooked by units for surveillance and security.
- 6.49 The development ensures efficient use of land whilst providing a high-quality development, as per the key aim of national guidance. The density of development is 22.5dph, which generally reflects the grain and typology of the surrounding area. This density also adheres closely to that laid out within the Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) (2021), in which the average dph for Whalley is referenced at 29.2dph.
- 6.50 The scale and height of the units at one and two storeys also ensures that the proposed development sits comfortably within the site context and surroundings to enable a sensitive visual appearance and vernacular.
- 6.51 As previously outlined, the form and mix of units including one bed apartments, two and three bed semi-detached and mews units and four and five bed houses, all mixed across the site would provide a housing mix to meet local needs, aspirational and executive family dwellings and for good community making as encouraged in local and national guidance.
- 6.52 The design and materials of the units have also taken clear cues from the local townscape and surrounding properties as referenced in the DAS, including the simple elevations, use of gables, pitches and porches. The use of stone or render with slate-like roofing as the materials palette would fully align with the predominate vernacular of the immediate surroundings and the village and result in a high-quality appearance to the site. This will help the development meet Key Statement EN2. Pringle Homes has delivered market and affordable housing locally both as part of the Northcote Park development, and more recently at the Crow Trees Farm development where the house types have been very well received.
- 6.53 The site features a large amount of landscaping via the inclusion of new and replacement trees and hedgerows and wildflower meadow area, which enable a green setting for the site development and retain 'soft' views of the site from the surroundings.
- 6.54 From the above and relevant information in the DAS, landscaping plans and ecological assessment it is considered the development of the land for residential units as proposed is in accordance with the design and townscape and landscape policies of the development plan including policies H2, H3, and relevant criteria of policies DMG1 and DME2 and the NPPF.

Impact on Amenity of Neighbouring Occupiers

- 6.55 The full scope of the application proposals would not result in any significant impact on the amenity of neighbouring residents. This reflects the location and separation of the proposed units from

surrounding properties and the retention of existing and provision of additional boundary landscaping and visual screening that would be provided (especially with regards to dwellings located to the immediate south of the site). The distancing between the dwellings proposed on the south of the site and the nearest existing dwelling on-site is 35.9m.

- 6.56 The lighting of the site can be appropriately designed to prevent light spill beyond site boundaries for visual amenity (as well as for ecology considerations). This can be secured via a suitably worded planning condition.
- 6.57 Noise and vibration considerations for the development of the land due to the proximity to the A59 are referenced below and confirmed to be acceptable. As referenced previously, the layout has been designed with regards to this and affords an adequate stand-off for the dissipation of noise and vibration. A number of short sections of acoustic boundary treatments, either in timber, brick or stone materials are proposed as recommended in the noise assessment.
- 6.58 Further, a Construction Management Plan would be utilised pursuant to a suitably worded planning condition to ensure that amenities are respected during the construction process.
- 6.59 As such, the proposals accord with the relevant amenity criteria of policies of the CS and the aims for high- quality design in NPPF.

Conclusion

- 6.60 As above, the scheme immediately abuts the principal settlement of Whalley and is a highly sustainable and accessible location.
- 6.61 In light of the Council's housing land supply position, main housing locational policies relevant to the site are considered out of date as per para 11(d) of the NPPF and the tilted balance is engaged.
- 6.62 There is also a significant level of local housing need identified both within Whalley and across the wider Borough. The proposal will provide the policy compliant number of affordable dwellings (12 no.) in broad alignment with the identified need (mix and tenure) in accordance with the adopted development plan (where housing policies remains up to date).
- 6.63 The proposed scale and layout of the development has been designed with due consideration to the site's key characteristics, surroundings and technical constraints. The scheme is also designed to protect neighbouring and future residents' amenity.
- 6.64 The following section provides further assessment in relation to technical considerations.

7.0 Technical Considerations

Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy

- 7.1 The development plan and NPPF include policies on flood risk and drainage. These policies state that proposals should where possible be directed away from areas which are at the greatest risk of flooding and should not increase flood risk elsewhere.
- 7.2 A Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy (FRA & DS) has been prepared by ReFord to support the planning application. This report confirms that the site lies within Flood Zone 1, therefore giving the site the lowest risk of river and sea flooding. Although the FRA demonstrates that there is a watercourse within the north eastern section of the site, and that there is an ordinary watercourse c.110m from the northwest corner of the site, risk associated with fluvial flooding to the proposed development is identified as being very low. The site also lies at very low risk from flooding in relation to canals and reservoirs, and sewer run off and pluvial runoff.
- 7.3 The risk of groundwater flooding has also been assessed as low, there is no historical record of any sewerage flooding occurring.
- 7.4 A small area of the northern part of the site has been identified in the recently published Environment Agency Maps to be subject to a high surface water flood risk. The scheme has regard to this and the area is retained in the landscaped area at the north with no development proposed across that area of the site. It does not affect any housing or access areas of the site and in line with national guidance (para 177 of the NPPF), there is not considered to be a requirement for sequential test information.
- 7.5 The FRA and DS has also assessed the surface water run-off potential from the site development areas (hardstanding and developed areas). Surface water runoff from the development will be controlled for all rainfall events up to the 1 in 100-year critical storm, including a 50% allowance for climate change, before being discharged at the existing greenfield runoff rate. Consequently, the development will not increase flood risk either upstream or downstream, and the residual flood risk associated with the proposed drainage strategy is considered to be low.
- 7.6 A proposed drainage strategy has been prepared which illustrates the site's surface water will be drained toward the north west of the site via a new surface water sewer that will connect (via Clitheroe Road) to an existing watercourse via the manhole where it lies within culvert under the western side of Clitheroe Road approx. 110m from the northwestern corner of the site.
- 7.7 Necessary easement widths to enable connection to this system have been reflected in the layout. The submitted DS design can therefore be fully detailed and agreed pursuant to a suitably worded planning condition.
- 7.8 Foul discharge would also be dealt with via the same route travelling through the site toward the north western boundary and Clitheroe Road. This will then adjoin and utilise the existing foul sewer that lies on Clitheroe Road approx. 100m to the north of the northwestern corner of the site. A suitably worded planning condition could also be utilised to cover this requirement.
- 7.9 The FRA and DS considers relevant matters and confirms that the development of the site can be appropriately designed and managed to not result in flood risk in line with policy DM6 of the CS and climate change and flooding policies of the NPPF and can utilize and build upon the existing drainage regime in the area for an efficient use of infrastructure.
- 7.10 At the time of determination of the previous application at the site, there was an outstanding objection from the LLFA and this also formed a reason for refusal of that application. In the time since that refusal,

the proposed strategy for the discharge of surface water has been further clarified and this is set out within the submitted FRA & DS. Importantly it has been confirmed that the culverted watercourse is in the ownership of the County Council and that there is no in-principle objection to the proposed connection to it (subject to the appropriate permission(s)). As such it is anticipated that this will be further considered by the relevant consultees during the determination period of this application.

Trees and Landscaping

- 7.11 The development plan and NPPF outline that trees should be maintained wherever possible, or replacement provision made if losses were to occur.
- 7.12 The site has been surveyed for the presence and health and standard of trees by Iain Tavendale, this was initially undertaken in January 2025 and informed the previous application. An updated survey/walkover was undertaken in June 2026 to assess trees in full leaf and account for any changes as may have taken place in the intervening period.
- 7.13 The assessment highlights 2 tree preservation orders within the site; Tree Preservation Order 1957 No.1 and Tree Preservation Order Bramley Meade off Clitheroe Road Whalley 1992. (Tree Preservation Order 7/19/3/128 1993 Bramley Meade Lodge is outside of but immediately to the south of the application site).
- 7.14 Tree Preservation Order No.1 is now 69 years old and the Bramley Meade Order is 34 years old. The accuracy of the No.1 Order is now questioned and to assist in identifying relevant trees the submitted Tree Survey includes a full analysis of the TPO trees.
- 7.15 A total of 9 trees are proposed for removal in order to facilitate development; see the table extract below (please refer to the submitted Impact Assessment for full details);

BS5837 CAT	TREE No's	TOTAL
Cat – A High Quality	None	0
Cat – B Moderate Quality	T11 & T24 + part G1	2 trees + small section of G1
Cat – C Low Quality	T23 & T28 and sections of A1	2 trees and small sections of A1
Cat – U Poor Quality	T10, T22, T25, T26, T27 & T55	6 trees.

- 7.16 Replacement trees are indicated on the landscaping scheme provided by TBA, currently 67 trees are proposed along with replacement and new hedges. The levels of new planting at the site and species are detailed in the TBA plans. It is anticipated that a management plan will be secured by way of a condition to any planning permission granted.
- 7.17 The Arboricultural Impact Assessment makes recommendations for erecting tree protection fences to retained trees and hedges to ensure there is no undue harm during the construction process. An Arboricultural Method Statement is also recommended for construction works in close proximity to retained trees which could be secured and provided via a suitably worded planning condition.
- 7.18 Provision for trees would therefore be in line with policies DMG and DME1 of the CS and the NPPF.

Ecology and Biodiversity Net Gain

- 7.19 ERAP Consulting Ecologists (ERAP) have assessed the site and prepared a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal assessing the site's habitats and potential to support wildlife.
- 7.20 The Preliminary Ecological Assessment (PEA) has found that the proposals will have no adverse direct or indirect effect on statutory or non-statutory designated sites for nature conservation.
- 7.21 With regards to vegetation and habitat, only common and widespread plant species were found. None of the habitats present within the site are representative of semi-natural habitat or are an irreplaceable habitat. As such, no priority habitats, ancient/veteran trees or notable species were found.
- 7.22 Specifically, the site was found to be made up of improved / modified grassland. Modified Grassland C makes up the largest section of the site (2 ha), whilst Modified Grassland A is located within the northeastern corner of the site and Modified Grassland B throughout the northern margin. Further vegetation habitats located within the site include Blackthorn Scrub, Tall Forbs, Woodland and individual trees. As per the report, it is highlighted that the progression of the layout has had due regard to the conservation and retention of as many trees and area of woodland as possible, with development being focused primarily within the Modified Grassland C for ecology and BNG purposes.
- 7.23 The report also highlights that some tree removal is unavoidable and is to be focused upon those representing poor health/condition. As such, the extent of removal would not have a significant adverse effect upon the ecological function of the woodland, tree groups and scrub.
- 7.24 With regards to animal life on-site, the presence of badgers is reasonably discounted, whilst the woodland within the site is deemed to be of 'moderate' suitability for use by foraging bats (no bat roosts were found on trees located throughout the site). The site was also deemed to have sub-optimal conditions for ground nesting birds and poor-quality habitat for reptiles (also no data record of reptiles onsite were found). Lastly, no water voles were found onsite.
- 7.25 With regards to the above, the PEA highlights potential recommendations and ecological enhancement methods to be carried out through the detailed site design and implementation. This includes the protection of existing high quality vegetation, the appropriate use of lighting and mitigation measures for species present.
- 7.26 It is concluded within the PEA that the proposed development at the site is feasible and acceptable in accordance with the identified ecological considerations and relevant planning policy. The mitigation hierarchy has been applied and any adverse effects on designated sites for nature conservation are reasonably discounted. Furthermore, appropriate mitigation/compensation to address any impacts upon ecologically valuable habitats (namely tree loss) and protected species are feasible and can be secured.
- 7.27 ERAP have also prepared a Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Assessment, along with a Biodiversity Metric to assess the sites baseline ecological value and the potential gain/loss of BNG onsite as a result of the proposals.
- 7.28 Following the previous refusal on the site, where there was a reason related to BNG on the basis of part of the gain being secured off-site, further correspondence has been received from Officers including with reference to consultation with Greater Manchester Ecology Unit (the ecological consultee engaged by the Council). Whilst that correspondence is relevant to the previous application, the principle of what has been agreed is that the Council/GMEU require quotation(s) from relevant habitat banks for the deficit level to be met such that the delivery of off-site BNG can be confirmed. It is anticipated that such quotations will be submitted to the Council during the determination period of the application.

Ground Conditions

- 7.29 The NPPF provides that where a site is affected by contamination, responsibility for securing a safe development rests with the developer/ landowner. The NPPG also states that local authorities should use conditions to secure the adequate remediation of contaminated land.
- 7.30 REFA have produced a Phase 1 Geo-Environmental Desk Study Report (24175/GEDS/03) in light of the above.
- 7.31 This study has identified through historical mapping data and review of records that the site has been unused and has been natural grassland since 1848; as such the site has not undergone any development proposals (with the exception of the introduction of the gas pipeline), and there are no records of detrimental contamination on the land. There is also no coal mining activity in the area.
- 7.32 There are limited records of contamination considerations in surrounding areas and as such the site is considered to be of low-medium risk for contamination or ground gas from surrounding uses/developments.
- 7.33 A phase 2 site investigation is recommended and from which a remediation strategy could be formulated along with verification proposals if necessary. This could be secured pursuant to a standard planning condition for submission of such information prior to development commencing.
- 7.34 In light of the above, provisions in line with Policies DMG1 and EN3 of the CS can therefore also be met.

Landscaping

- 7.35 Trevor Bridge Associates (TBA) have produced a Landscaping Scheme in support of the planning application. The proposed layout includes significant new planting that will enhance the biological focus of the site and also provide for a scheme that sits well with the landscape and visual context of the site and wider area.
- 7.36 The plans include provision to maintain a large landscaped and habitat area along the entirety of the northern section of the site (north of the proposed access road), as well as along the site's western boundary fronting Clitheroe Road. This area is to include heavy tree planting, grass and turf provision, native hedge and shrub planting, Emorsgate EW1 woodland mix and Emorsgate EH1 hedgerow mix (these are to be provided around the retained trees throughout these sections of the site), as well as the retention of existing trees and hedgerow.
- 7.37 Additional incidental landscaped areas are also proposed along the internal road and to the front and side garden boundary areas, in the form of tree and hedge planting to provide a high quality and an active green frontage to the streetscene and boundary definition to units.
- 7.38 Due regard to the native species list of the Ecology Assessment has been undertaken in the provision of the landscaping proposals.
- 7.39 Hard landscaping provision including fencing to rear garden areas and unit boundaries and brick and stone walls to garden areas on key corner plots to the road and has also been included in the scheme, for attractive street scenes, plot separation and acoustic barriers.
- 7.40 Full regard has therefore been given to the principles of the Development Plan in respect of landscaping, ecology and good design via policies EN3 and DMG1 as well as to the aims of NPPF.

Noise and Vibration

- 7.41 The site is located to the immediate south of the A59 which lies on a raised embankment running to the north of Whalley. With this being an arterial route across East Lancashire for vehicular mobility, the potential for noise and vibration has been assessed by Martec Environmental, along with considerations to potential for road noise from the highway of Clitheroe Road.
- 7.42 From this assessment and updated review of the current proposals it has been concluded that the site can be developed for housing as is proposed on the layout plan. Assessed noise levels place the site under “Medium Risk” for both daytime and nighttime noise. Following this, it is outlined by Martec that planning permission can be granted subject to measures that ensure no significant adverse noise impacts will occur in the finished development.
- 7.43 In this respect (and to mitigate night-time levels) it is concluded that the use of closed thermal glazing with Mechanical Extract Ventilation (MEV) or a Positive Input Ventilation (PIV) system to opening windows will be required for all habitable rooms to achieve the necessary internal noise levels.
- 7.44 It is also concluded that rear garden amenity areas would be sufficiently protected from external noise levels and would fall within ‘ideal range’ with the inclusion of a 2.5m acoustic barrier within certain locations across the northern extent of gardens that are side-on to the north of the site and to the northern side of plots 2-3, and a small section to the south of Plot 1 in the boundary area fronting towards Clitheroe Road (as referenced in the report). These are also set out in the submitted Boundary Treatment Plan accordingly.
- 7.45 In relation to the previous application on the site, there was at the time of determination, an outstanding objection from the Council’s EHO in respect of the Noise Assessment and the associated mitigation measures. The applicant’s consultant has reviewed feedback and has requested an on-site meeting with the EHO to seek to fully address those concerns and it is anticipated additional information may be submitted during the course of the application.
- 7.46 Given the above the proposed development is demonstrated to be acceptable in respect of noise and vibration considerations and to accord with the amenity criteria of policy DME1 of the CS and relevant amenity considerations of the NPPF.

Sustainability

- 7.47 Achieving sustainable and energy efficient provisions within the development has been a key factor within the scheme development and on to its delivery as outlined above in relation to building design, use of materials, site landscaping and the accessibility of the site by a choice of means.
- 7.48 Further details of this can be found within the Design and Access Statement provided by MCK Associates.

Transport Statement

- 7.49 The development plan outlines that new development should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing highways, public transport and with safe and secure access for all. The NPPF also encourages accessibility by a choice of means and that development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where residual cumulative impacts are severe.
- 7.50 Mode has prepared a Transport Statement (TS) to support the planning application. In summary, the TS concludes that:

- There were no objections raised by LCC Highways to the previous 77 no. affordable housing scheme at the site. Thus, it is not considered this position would alter for this application and the proposal remains in accordance with relevant national and local policy aims with regards to transport and highways matters.
- The site is accessible by a multitude of sustainable transport modes. This includes walking, cycling, and public transport, affording alternatives to car travel. Bus stops are close by within a c100m walk, enabling opportunity for access by bus to Whalley centre as well as Clitheroe and other surrounding villages.
- The access road for the site will be taken from a new priority junction with a right-turn ghost island from Clitheroe Road. This access will achieve visibility splays in line with Manual for Streets guidance. This access road will also include traffic calming measures and turning heads alongside associated internal highways layout.
- A traffic calming scheme is proposed along Clitheroe Road to enforce the 30mph speed limit.
- Refuse collection vehicle and a fire tender are able to safely access and manoeuvre throughout the site as evidenced within the swept path analysis.
- Car parking is to be provided to adoptable standards.

- 7.51 The development has also been assessed in terms of traffic generation and capacity of the adjacent network and to recent safety records. From the assessment the development proposal is calculated to *'generate 23 two-way trips during the AM peak period and 21 two-way trips during the PM peak period'* i. Based on this traffic impact analysis, it is concluded that the proposed development will have a low impact on the local highway network during the peak periods and will not result in a 'unacceptable' or 'severe' impact on the operation of the highway network or highway safety, which according to paragraph 116 of the NPPF is the threshold under which development should not be prevented or refused.
- 7.52 To supplement the details above, Mode have also provided a detailed preliminary site access drawing and a swept path analysis to evidence the visibility splays and vehicle sizings referenced above, whilst showing the adequate space provision made for manoeuvring vehicles.
- 7.53 Based on the above, it is concluded that the proposed development would have a negligible impact on the local highway network and is highly accessible such that there should be no highways or transportation reasons to preclude the grant of planning permission and the scheme accords with the relevant criteria of CS policies DMG3, DM12 and DMG1 and para 116 of the NPPF.
- 7.54 In the course of the determination period for the previously scheme at the site, the Highways Authority requested widening of the main access road into the site to 6.5m for the first 10m. As such this has been accommodated in the now proposed site layout and access plans to the application.

Technical Considerations Summary

- 7.55 From the above and assessment of the submitted technical reports, there are no technical matters which would preclude the grant of planning permission for the proposed development.
- 7.56 It is anticipated that a series of planning conditions to a grant of planning permission would be relevant and would be generally in line with standard technical matters that are covered by planning conditions.

8.0 Conclusion

- 8.1 The development has been assessed against relevant up to date policies of the development plan and found to be in accordance. However, given the Borough Housing Land Supply position, other housing policies and locational elements of housing policies are out of date such that the tilted balance of national planning policy is in place and relevant.
- 8.2 Other material considerations weigh in favour of the proposals including the national aims for boosting the supply of housing and meeting specific housing needs.
- 8.3 In respect of the three elements of sustainable development of NPPF, the proposal provides significant relevant benefits as follows:

Social

- Provision of 27no. deliverable market dwellings to boost the Council's housing supply and to assist in addressing the significant shortfall;
- Provision of 12no. affordable dwellings positively contributing toward an identified and current need throughout both the locality of Whalley and the wider Borough, with units to be retained in local occupancy in perpetuity;
- An experienced RP is in detailed discussions with the applicant for transfer of the affordable homes to assist in addressing the localised and borough wide need in this respect;
- Delivery of a range of house types and sizes including bungalows and adaptable homes for varying household sizes and accessibility levels;
- Provision of usable public open space on the site for the benefit of residents and the wider community;
- Delivery of a high quality and secure living setting;
- Support to local facilities and services – via new population and consumer expenditure;
- No material harm to public views; and
- No undue harm to existing residential amenity;

Economic

- Local jobs support for construction companies and related local suppliers during the construction process; and
- Consumer expenditure from future residents to support local businesses;

Environmental

- Accessibility by a range of means with cycle, foot and bus accessibility to the site and to nearby facilities and services possible to minimize car journeys and emissions;

- Significant biodiversity gain and provision of landscaping and new tree and hedgerow planting to the site whilst maintaining key trees on and around the site;
 - No undue flood risk to arise and relevant drainage provision to be made;
 - No harm to heritage assets;
 - No undue harm to any environmental assets, habitats or protected species as demonstrated within the ecological survey, with appropriate mitigation measures to be implemented in accordance with the survey;
 - Delivery of a high-quality built environment that respects neighbouring uses and amenity; and
 - Development of a character and scale which is in keeping with the locality in terms of built and natural environment
- 8.4 Having regard to the Borough housing land position and the main policies of the development plan relevant to the proposals being out of date, para 11(d) of the NPPF thus engages the tilted balance requiring planning permission to be granted unless:
- 'i) the policies of the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance, as defined in Footnote 7, provide a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; or
 - ii) any adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies of the Framework taken as a whole'
- 8.5 The site is not subject to specific protection under this context and there are clear benefits that a grant of planning permission would deliver in line with the Framework.
- 8.6 The clear housing land and affordable housing need in the Borough and area that is evident in the most recent housing need study and appeal decisions provides significant weight to support the proposal.
- 8.7 The supporting technical information to the application also demonstrates that the proposal accords with design, landscape and technical policies of the CS and NPPF.
- 8.8 There are no significant adverse impacts of the proposal and in line with the tilted balance the application should be approved.
- 8.9 Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the Council grants planning permission without delay.