

Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.								
Signed:	Officer:	MC	Date:	02/10/2026	Manager:	LH	Date:	2/10/26

Application Ref:	3/2026/0676			 Ribble Valley Borough Council www.ribblevalley.gov.uk
Date Inspected:	16/09/2026	Site Notice:	16/09/2026	
Officer:	MC			
DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:				REFUSAL

Development Description:	Permission in principle application for the erection of up to 4 dwellings.
Site Address/Location:	Land adjacent to Daniels Farm, Preston Road, Longridge, PR3 3BL.

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

CONSULTATIONS:	Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies
LCC Highways:	The Local Highway Authority does not raise an objection to the principle of development and advises that mitigation measures should be secured for highway safety to protect pedestrians on the network and to amend the plot layout to ensure no obstruction to the public footpath occurs at stage 2.
Health & Safety Executive:	Does not advise against the granting of planning permission.
Lancashire Fire & Rescue:	General comments made in relation to building regulations.

CONSULTATIONS:	Additional Representations.
One objection has been received raising the following concerns:	
- Loss of green belt land - Strain on infrastructure - Impact on roads and congestion	

RELEVANT POLICIES:
Ribble Valley Core Strategy:
Key Statement DS1: Development Strategy
Key Statement DS2: Sustainable Development
Key Statement EN3: Sustainable Development and Climate Change
Key Statement EN4: Biodiversity and Geodiversity
Key Statement DMI2: Transport Considerations
Key Statement H1- Housing Provision
Key Statement H2 – Housing Balance
Policy DMG1 – General Considerations
Policy DMG2 – Strategic Considerations
Policy DMG3 – Transport & Mobility
Policy DME1 – Protecting Trees and Woodlands
Policy DME2 – Landscape and Townscape Protection

Policy DME3 - Site and Species Protection and Conservation
Policy DMH3 – Dwellings in the Open Countryside and AONB

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Adopted Longridge Neighbourhood Development Plan

Relevant Planning History:

3/2021/1246

Outline planning application for the erection of two self build dwellings following demolition of existing agricultural buildings (access details applied for only).

Refused – Appeal Dismissed

3/2021/0194

Change of use of one agricultural building to one dwelling under class Q (a) and (b).

Approved with Conditions

3/2019/1089

Change of use of two agricultural buildings to two dwellings under class Q (a) and (b).

Refused

3/2018/0915

Application for outline planning permission with some matters reserved for a residential development of 3 dwellings, following demolition of agricultural buildings including access.

Refused – Appeal Dismissed

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:

Site Description and Surrounding Area:

The application relates to Daniels Farm which is accessed via a track leading off Preston Road (B6243) in Longridge. The application site is located outside of any defined settlement boundary being within land designated as open countryside.

The farmstead consists of agricultural buildings and a yard. To the west of the site is the dwelling known as Alston Fold Farm and to the south-east is a cluster of buildings, including residential dwellings.

Public Right of Way (FP 108) runs up the access track from Preston Road and adjoins FP 107 which runs north through the application site.

Proposed Development for which consent is sought:

This application is for Permission in Principle for up to 4 no. dwellings. It should be noted that there have been several applications at the site for residential development, as noted within the planning history section of this report, including two dismissed appeals.

Principle of Development:

Permission in Principle applications may only deal with the principle of development and are not applications for planning permission. Any other details relating to any other material planning consideration are to be dealt

with within any future Technical Details application. Planning practice guidance confirms the scope of permission in principle as being limited to matters of location, land use and amount of development. As such these matters have been assessed as follows:-

Location

The application seeks permission in principle for the erection of up to 4 no. dwellings. As such, it is necessary to consider whether the location of the proposed new dwellings would be compatible with the overall spatial strategy for housing growth within the borough as identified within the currently adopted development strategy.

When considering the principle of a new residential dwelling, Key Statement DS1 states that:

The majority of new housing development will be:

- *concentrated within an identified strategic site located to the south of Clitheroe towards the A59; and the principal settlements of:*
- *Clitheroe;*
- *Longridge; and*
- *Whalley.*

In addition to the strategic site at Standen and the Borough's principal settlements, development will be focused towards the Tier 1 Villages, which are the more sustainable of the 32 defined settlements:

- *Barrow*
- *Billington*
- *Chatburn*
- *Gisburn*
- *Langho*
- *Mellor*
- *Mellor Brook*
- *Read & Simonstone*
- *Wilpshire*

The first part of Policy DMG2 states that:

'Development should be in accordance with the core strategy development strategy and should support the spatial vision.

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

The second part of this policy requires development within the tier 2 villages and outside the defined settlement areas to meet at least one of six considerations which are listed as follows:

- 1. The development should be essential to the local economy or social well-being of the area.*
- 2. The development is needed for the purposes of forestry or agriculture.*
- 3. The development is for local needs housing which meets an identified need and is secured as such.*
- 4. The development is for small scale tourism or recreational developments appropriate to a rural area.*

5. *The development is for small-scale uses appropriate to a rural area where a local need or benefit can be demonstrated.*
6. *The development is compatible with the enterprise zone designation'.*

Policy DMH3 seeks to limit residential development in the open countryside and National Landscape to development essential for the purposes of agriculture or residential development which meets an identified local need.

In this instance, the site is located within the open countryside, over 500m from the settlement of Longridge. The proposal would not be for local needs housing or meet any of the other exceptions for allowing development outside of the settlement boundary within the designated countryside, as such the proposal would conflict with both policies and the Development Plan's spatial strategy for directing residential growth and fails to accord with policies DS1, DMG2 and DMH3.

There has been concerns raised from a neighbour that the proposal would result in the loss of Green Belt land. However, the land is not designated as Green Belt.

With regards to the NPPF, Policy S5 is also of relevance. Policy S5 similarly states that only certain forms of development should be approved outside settlements and provides a list of exceptions. It also advises that these should be approved, unless the benefits of doing so would be substantially outweighed by any adverse effects, when assessed against the national decision-making policies in the Framework.

It is not considered that the proposal falls within any of exception criteria outlined within Policy S5. The proposal is not considered to constitute previously developed land (criterion d) as the existing use of the land is agricultural. It is also not considered to constitute limited infilling within groups of houses (criterion e) given the extent of the red edge and sprawl of the development beyond the extent of existing residential curtilages.

Lastly, the scheme is not to fall within the scope of criterion 'j' as the scheme is not considered to be physically well-related to the existing settlement of Longridge.

As such, the proposal fails to accord with any of the exceptions outlined in Policy S5(1) of the Framework.

Furthermore, the accessibility and sustainability of the site must also be assessed.

Key Statement DMI2 states that:

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

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

Policy TR3 of the NPPF also states that:

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

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

- b. Opportunities should be taken to utilise existing or proposed transport infrastructure in optimising the amount or density of development which can be accommodated in different locations, especially where this can support more walking, wheeling, cycling and public transport use;*
- c. Any significant adverse impacts from the development on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion), or on highway safety, should be mitigated to an acceptable degree using a vision-led approach;*
- d. The environmental impacts of traffic and transport infrastructure should be identified, assessed and taken into account – including taking opportunities to avoid or mitigate any adverse environmental effects, and to secure net environmental gains such as reductions in air pollution; and*
- e. In rural areas, opportunities to improve walking, wheeling, cycling and public transport and enhance the connectivity of an area should be taken where they exist and can be supported by the development proposed.*

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

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

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

a. Accord with policies TR3 and TR4 so that sustainable patterns of movement are 28 prioritised, opportunities are taken to improve walking, wheeling, cycling and public transport, and infrastructure is provided to support the transition to zero-emission vehicles.

The site is located approximately 500m from the settlement boundary of Longridge.

The sustainability of the site has been previously assessed at appeal (APP/T2350/W/22/3304074) whereby the Inspector noted the following:

"Although the appeal site is not in or immediately adjacent to a settlement, it is not remote from dwellings and buildings. The proposal would also be within several hundred metres walking distance of Preston Road where there are further dwellings, a public house and a restaurant. However, the primary school is further than a short or convenient walk, being on the opposite side of the busy Preston Road and without any apparent safe opportunities for children to cross. Grimsargh and Longridge, which offer a range of shops and services, while connected by a footway, are even further from the appeal site. Preston Road does not appear overly conducive to cycling, but nonetheless the proposal would be within cycling distance of settlements and there are bus stops within walking distance that offer regular services to Longridge and Preston via Grimsargh. Therefore, there would be opportunities for future occupiers to make some journeys by more sustainable transport modes. Even so, taking into account the limited local shops and services and the realities of living in the countryside, there would be a likely heavy reliance on, and a consequent increase in, private vehicle journeys from this location."

An updated assessment must be made, taking into consideration any changes to the surrounding area since the appeal. It should be noted that the public house opposite the site has now closed. Planning permission for the conversion of the building has been granted for the conversion to 3 no. dwellings under planning ref: 3/2025/0981. The benefits of re-using a building were weighed against the unsustainable location of the site.

Permission in Principle has also recently been refused at 'Spout Farm' approximately 0.8km to the north of the site for up to 9 dwellings. This application (planning ref: 3/2026/0247) was refused for the following reason:

- 1. The proposal is considered to be in direct conflict with Key Statement DMI2 and Policy DMG3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and Paragraph 115 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) insofar that approval would lead to the creation of up to nine new residential dwellings in an unsustainable location whereby there would be a reliance on private motor vehicle by occupiers of the dwellings to access key services and facilities.*

This application is currently at appeal and awaiting decision (appeal ref: 6016459).

The site is approximately a 22-minute walk from a local convenience store at Mardale Road. However, this convenience store does not offer post office facilities and the post office is located over 30 minutes away by foot. Whilst the site is located within walking distance to a local pub, the site is located over a 20-minute walk to the nearest secondary school. The closest primary school by foot is Alston Lane Catholic Primary school which would involve walking along Preston Road which is a busy main road out of Longridge towards Grimsargh. The Inspector has already noted that the primary school is located on the opposite side of the busy Preston Road and without any apparent safe opportunities for children to cross. In addition, the closest community centre/hall is located over 20 minutes away by foot.

When reviewing the bus services, there is a bus stop at the end of the lane at Preston Road, opposite the former White Bull pub. It is noted that this is a frequent service running from 5.46am approximately to midnight approximately every half hourly in the morning, every 10-15 minutes during the day and every half hourly again in the evenings.

Whilst there is a frequent bus service into Longridge and Preston, it is not considered that the bus route should be solely relied upon for the purposes of assessing whether a site is in a sustainable location. The walking route into Longridge to access key services and facilities and the primary school in the opposite direction is not considered to be an attractive mode of transport due to the busy nature of the road and the distance from the application site to such facilities.

As such, future occupiers of the dwellings are likely to rely on private motor vehicle to access key services and facilities, and the site is not considered to be a suitable or sustainable location for housing. It has been established at appeal that the site is a countryside location and therefore the construction of up to 4 no. new dwellings could generate a significant amount of movement, in the context of the rural area.

As such, notwithstanding the frequent bus service, due to the distance and undesirable walking conditions to the site from schools and key services/facilities, the granting of new dwellings in this location would not minimise the need to travel and would likely be reliant on private motor vehicle.

As such, the proposal is contrary to Key Statement DMI2 and Policy DMG3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and Policies TR3 and CC2 of the NPPF.

Land use

Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy requires development proposals to be sympathetic to existing and proposed surrounding land uses in terms of their size, intensity, nature, scale, massing, design, appearance and use of materials.

The policy also emphasises the importance of density, layout and the relationship between buildings, with particular regard to visual appearance, the character of the surrounding area, and impacts on landscape character.

Policy DMG2 further requires development within the Open Countryside to respect and complement the character of the landscape, recognising the special qualities of the area through appropriate siting, scale, design, materials and landscaping.

Similarly, Policy DP3 of the National Planning Policy Framework seeks to ensure that development proposals respond to their context (the history, character and features of their site and its setting), so that they integrate with and enhance their surroundings.

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

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

In principle, the proposed residential use of the site would not be incompatible with the pattern of surrounding land uses. Whilst it is noted that concerns have been previously raised at appeal with regards to the visual impact on the character of the landscape that the introduction of additional dwellings would have, having regard to the site's relationship with the surrounding built form and land uses, it is considered that the proposed residential use would, in principle, represent an acceptable use of the land as the proposed dwellings would be sited within the context of existing residential development. Any detailed design of such dwellings would be reserved for the Technical Details Consent stage.

Amount of development

Policy DMG1 states:

Whilst matters relating to layout, scale, appearance and landscaping are not for consideration at the Permission in Principle stage and would instead be assessed through any subsequent Technical Details Consent application, it is nevertheless necessary to consider whether the amount of development proposed is acceptable in principle.

The indicative site layout submitted in support of the application demonstrates that there would be 4 no. large, detached dwellings within the site, together with associated parking and private amenity space. Whilst the layout is illustrative only, it provides a useful indication that the proposed quantum of development could be accommodated within the site without resulting in a cramped form of development.

Notwithstanding this, concerns have been previously raised at appeal with regards to amount of development (planning ref: APP/T2350/W/19/3221621). This appeal was for an outline application for a residential development of 3no. dwellings, following demolition of agricultural buildings. It should also be noted that the red line boundary for that appeal was smaller than this application for Permission in Principle and did not include the area of land to the north-east of 'Alston Fold Farm'.

The Inspector stated the following:

"Whilst the proposed dwellings would be seen in context with a small group of dwellings, along with the other domestic paraphernalia that would be likely to appear, the proposed development would significantly change the appearance of the site, having an urbanising effect upon it. The proposal would amount to significant new development in the open countryside and would not maintain the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside."

In addition, the Inspector acknowledged that "the appeal site is much more closely aligned with its surrounding rural characteristics than the much more built-up settlement of Longridge."

Having regard to the findings of the previous appeal at the site, granting Permission in Principle for up to 4 no. dwellings would introduce further built form to the north of the site, within the open countryside. When viewed in the context of its surroundings, the amount of development, being up to 4 no. new dwellings, in the countryside location would be compete with the rural character of its surroundings, comprising a single large, detached dwelling to the west and a small cluster of converted barns and farmhouse to the east.

Overall, it is considered that whilst the land use may be appropriate in such location, when viewed in the context of the rural character of the site, the addition of 4 no. new dwellings would erode the intrinsic rural character of the surrounding countryside, contrary to Policies DMG1 and DMG2 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy, Policy LNDP3 of the Longridge Neighbourhood Plan Area and Policy DP3 of the NPPF.

Impact Upon Residential Amenity:

This application relates solely to principle of development and whether the proposal would align with the spatial and locational strategy of the borough.

As such, the impact upon the amenity of the occupiers of surrounding residential properties does not fall to be assessed within the scope of this application and would be reserved for consideration/assessment following the submission of 'Technical Matters'.

Visual Amenity/External Appearance:

This application relates solely to the principle of development. Given the nature of a Permission in Principle application, detailed matters relating to the design, layout, scale, appearance and landscaping of the proposed development are not under consideration at this stage. Consequently, it is not possible to undertake a full assessment of the proposal's impact on the character, appearance and visual amenities of the area.

Any effects arising from the detailed design of the scheme fall outside the scope of the current application and would instead be considered through any subsequent Technical Details Consent application, at which stage a comprehensive assessment of the development's visual impacts and external appearance could be undertaken.

Highways and Parking:

The Local Highway Authority (LHA) has been consulted on the application and has provided comments regarding the proposed means of access to the site.

The LHA note that the site is accessed via an unnamed privately maintained access lane which serves Alston Fold Farm. A 7 day Automatic Traffic Count was undertaken in 2024 to assess speeds along Preston Road whereby the observed 85th percentile speeds were recorded at 37.2mph northbound and 39.1mph southbound, which require splays of 2.4m by 56m northbound and 61m southbound. The LHA consider these splays to be achievable at the existing site access arrangement.

The LHA considers that improvements are required to the existing highway infrastructure to accommodate pedestrian movements on Preston Road to the nearby bus stops. These improvements include the relocation of bus stops and provision of a central pedestrian island to improve safety for pedestrians crossing Preston Road.

The LHA also that the Public Right of Way runs through the site and are obstructed by the plots shown on the indicative site layout. Either the plot layout must be amended at stage 2 or a footpath diversion order must be made by the applicant.

Notwithstanding concerns raised by a neighbour in relation to increase traffic/congestion, the LHA does not raise an objection to the principle of development and advises that mitigation measures should be secured for highway safety to protect pedestrians on the network and to amend the plot layout to ensure no obstruction to the public footpath occurs at the stage 2 Technical Details Consent.

Landscape/Ecology:

Appropriate surveys would be required to be undertaken (Preliminary Ecological Appraisal) and submitted in support of any subsequent 'Technical Matters' submission to determine whether the proposal is likely to result in adverse impacts upon protected species or species of conservation concern.

In addition, at the 'Technical Matters' stage, the applicant would be required to demonstrate how the proposal would achieve the mandatory 10% Biodiversity Net-Gain or provide an appropriate reason for exemption.

Other matters

Comments from Lancashire Fire & Rescue Service have been provided, noting that the proposals must comply with all relevant building regulations. This should be incorporated into the design/layout but would not be considered under this stage and would be dealt with at the technical details stage.

Conclusion and Planning Balance:

Policy S5(4) of the NPPF states that:

“Development proposals which do not fall within one of the categories set out in this policy should only be approved in exceptional circumstances, where the benefits of the proposal would substantially outweigh the adverse effects, including to the character of the countryside and in relation to promoting sustainable patterns of movement.”

In assessing the benefits of the proposal, it is important to note that the Council is currently unable to demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing land. The Council's most recently published housing land supply position (base date 31 March 2026) confirms a supply of 2.24 years. As such, there is an identified shortfall in housing delivery within the Borough, and the provision of four additional dwellings would make a contribution towards meeting this need. However, the benefits of this would be relatively modest given the limited scale of the development.

The proposal would also generate temporary economic benefits during the construction phase, including expenditure within the local economy and support for the construction industry and associated supply chains. Whilst these benefits are recognised, only limited weight is attached to them given their modest scale and temporary duration.

Balanced against these benefits is the site's unsustainable location and the impact on the landscape character that would arise from the amount of development proposed. As discussed above, the site does not benefit from a level of accessibility or connectivity that would make travel by walking or cycling sufficiently safe, convenient or attractive to materially reduce dependence on the private motor vehicle. Whilst there are some opportunities to use public transport (bus) to access key services and facilities within Longridge and the nearby settlement, this should not be solely relied on to justify the development.

It has already been established at appeal that future occupants would be heavily reliant on car, and there would consequent be an increase in, private vehicle journeys from this location. This represents a significant adverse impact and results in conflict with Key Statement DMI2 and Policy DMG3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy, together with Policy TR3 and CC2 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

It is also considered that the amount of development proposed is incompatible with its surroundings whereby the introduction of up to 4 no. new dwellings would erode the intrinsic rural character of the surrounding countryside, contrary to Policies DMG1 and DMG2 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy, Policy LNDP3 of the Longridge Neighbourhood Plan Area and Policy DP3 of the NPPF. This also represents a significant adverse impact.

Taking all of the above considerations into account, the Council acknowledges that the development would contribute towards addressing the Borough's housing shortfall. However, that contribution would be limited by the modest scale of the scheme. By contrast, significant harm has been identified above.

Even if the proposal were to constitute limited infilling (in accordance with Policy S5(1)(e)), it is considered that this adverse effect would substantially outweigh the benefits of the development as such this would still not result in the issuing of a permission in principle.

Accordingly, having regard to Policy S5 of the National Planning Policy Framework and the Development

Plan as a whole, the application is recommended for refusal.

RECOMMENDATION: That Permission in Principle be refused.

01: The proposal is considered to be in direct conflict with Key Statement DMI2 and Policy DMG3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and Policies S5, TR3 and CC2 of the NPPF insofar that approval would lead to the creation of up to 4 no. new residential dwellings in an unsustainable location whereby there would be a reliance on private motor vehicle by occupiers of the dwellings to access key services and facilities.

02: The amount of development proposed is incompatible with its surroundings whereby the introduction of up to 4 no. new dwellings would erode the intrinsic rural character of the surrounding countryside, contrary to Policies DMG1 and DMG2 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy, Policy LNDP3 of the Longridge Neighbourhood Plan Area and Policy DP3 of the NPPF.