

Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.								
Signed:	Officer:	EP	Date:	16/10/2026	Manager:	LH	Date:	19/10/26

Application Ref:	2026/0687			 Ribble Valley Borough Council www.ribblevalley.gov.uk	
Date Inspected:	02/10/2026	Site Notice:	02/10/2026		
Officer:	EP				
DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:					REFUSAL

Development Description:	Permission in principle application for a bespoke self-build dwelling.
Site Address/Location:	1 Bramley View Clitheroe Road, Whalley, BB7 9AL

CONSULTATIONS:	Parish/Town Council
No representations received in respect of the proposal.	

CONSULTATIONS:	Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies
LCC Highways:	
The Local Highways Authority have raised no objection to the proposal	
CONSULTATIONS:	Additional Representations.
2 letters of representation from individual addresses have been received objecting to the proposal on the following grounds: - Concerns in respect of the standard of the existing road - Impact upon character of the area - Inadequate parking provision - Impacts upon ecology and wildlife - Loss of views - Land is not 'garden area' as stated	

RELEVANT POLICIES AND SITE PLANNING HISTORY:
Ribble Valley Core Strategy: Key Statement DS1: Development Strategy Key Statement DS2: Sustainable Development Key Statement DMI2: Transport Considerations Policy DMG1: General Considerations Policy DMG2: Strategic Considerations Policy DMG3: Transport & Mobility Policy DMH3: Dwellings in the Open Countryside and AONB National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
Relevant Planning History: 2025/0414: Permission in Principle for one dwelling within garden area.

2022/0898:

Discharge of condition 6 (scheme for storage of manure) from planning permission 3/2022/0287. (Refused)

2022/0287:

Partial demolition of existing stable buildings and erection of a new stable building. (Approved)

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:**Site Description and Surrounding Area:**

The application relates to an area of land located outside of and to the west of the defined settlement limits of Barrow, with the land to which the application relates benefitting from an open countryside designation. The site is bounded to the north and west by existing greenfield agricultural land with the site being bounded to the east by existing residential development that front Clitheroe Road. The site is predominantly greenfield in nature with some existing structures being located to the south and southwest of the application site.

Proposed Development for which consent is sought:

The application seeks 'Permission in Principle' (PiP) consent for the erection of one residential dwelling within the application site. Given the application seeks consent solely for matters pertaining to the principle of the development, no details in respect of the proposed layout, configuration nor external appearance of the dwelling are required to be submitted for consideration at this stage.

Principle of Development:

The application seeks permission in principle for the erection of one residential dwelling at land to rear of 1 Bramley View, Clitheroe (Barrow). The application site lies to the west of and outside of the defined settlement limits of Barrow, being within land that benefits from an open countryside designation. As such, both policies DMH3 and DMG2 are primarily, but not solely, engaged for the purposes of assessing the compatibility of the principle of the development with the adopted development plan.

Policies DMH3 and DMG2 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy seeks to restrict residential development within the open countryside and AONB to that which meets a number of explicit criterion, with Key Statement DS1 setting out the overall spatial and locational aspirations for general (including residential) development within the Borough.

Policy DMG2:

Policy DMG2 is two-fold in its approach to guiding development. The primary part of the policy DMG2(1) is engaged where development proposals are located 'in' principal and tier 1 settlements with the second part of the policy DMG2(2) being engaged in circumstances when proposed development is located 'outside' defined settlement areas or within tier 2 villages, with each part of the policy therefore being engaged in isolation and independent of the other dependant on the locational aspects of a proposal.

The mechanics and engagement of the policy are clear in this respect insofar that it contains explicit triggers as to when the former or latter criterion are applied and the triggers are purely locational and clearly based on a proposals relationship to defined settlement boundaries and whether, in this case, such a proposal is 'in' or 'outside' a defined settlement.

Given the majority of the application site is located outside of any defined settlement boundary, it is the secondary element of Policy DMG2 that is engaged (Policy DMG2(2)) which states that:

Within the tier 2 villages and outside the defined settlement areas development must meet at least one of the following considerations:

- 1. The development should be essential to the local economy or social wellbeing 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.*

It is clear from the submitted details that the proposal could not be argued as being 'essential to the local economy or social wellbeing of the area' nor could it be considered that the proposal 'is needed for the purposes of forestry or agriculture'.

In respect of the matter of 'local need', no evidence has been provided to suggest that the proposal would align with the definition of 'local needs housing' as defined within the Adopted Core Strategy which states that 'Local needs housing is the housing developed to meet the needs of existing and concealed households living within the parish and surrounding parishes which is evidenced by the Housing Needs Survey for the parish, the Housing Waiting List and the Strategic Housing Market Assessment'.

In light of the above matters, it cannot be considered that the proposal meets any of the exception criterion contained within Policy DMG2 in relation to the creation of new dwellings outside of defined settlement limits.

Policy DMH3:

Given the majority of the application site is located outside of any defined settlement limits, Policy DMH3 is also engaged in parallel and in concert with Policy DMG2. In this respect Policy DMH3 states that:

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

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

As with the inherent criterion within Policy DMG2, the proposal would fail also to meet criterion 1 of Policy DMH3 insofar in that it would not represent 'development essential for the purposes of agriculture or residential development which meets an identified local need', with the proposal also failing to meet exception criterion 2 or 3.

In light of the above it cannot be argued that the proposal meets any of the exception criterion contained within either Policies DMG2 nor DMH3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy in relation to the creation of new dwellings outside of defined settlement limits.

Policy S5(1) of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), updated August 2026, 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.

Relevant to this application are the following exceptions:

e. Limited infilling within groups of houses;

h. Residential and mixed-use development which would:

i. Be within reasonable walking distance of a well-connected station (applying the definitions in the glossary at Annex B);

ii. Be physically well-related to the station of the settlement within which the station is located;

iii. Be of a scale which be accommodated taking into account the existing or proposed availability of infrastructure; and

iv. Not prejudice any proposals for long-term comprehensive development in the same location.

j. Development which would address an evidenced unmet need (including, but not limited to, development proposals involving the provision of housing where the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites or scores below 75% in the most recent Housing Delivery Test), and where the development would:

i. Be physically well-related to an existing settlement (unless the nature of the development would make this inappropriate) and be of scale which can be accommodated taking into account the existing or proposed availability of infrastructure; or

ii. Comprise major development for freight and logistics purposes which accords with policy E3.

In this case, the site is located approximately 100m west of the row of residential properties fronting Clitheroe Road and it is bounded by undeveloped land to the north, west and south. As such, the proposal is not considered to constitute limited infilling within a group of houses and therefore would not accord with exception (e) of Policy S5(1) of the NPPF.

In relation to exception (h), Annex B of the NPPF defines a 'reasonable walking distance' for the purposes of Policy S5 to be 'around 800 metres, or around 10-minutes' walk time if topography, route availability and quality or physical barriers would prevent or discourage walking from up to 800 metres away [...]. Where a reasonable walking distance is required to be calculated when applying Policy S5 (1) (h), and only part of the site falls within the reasonable walking distance, the sub paragraph of policy S5 only apply to the area of the site within that reasonable walking distance.'

It also defines a well-connected station to be 'railway stations and underground, tram and light rail stops located within a top 80 Travel to Work Area location partially or fully within England by Gross Value Added (GVA) and which, in the normal weekday timetable, are served (or have a reasonable prospect of being served due to planning upgrades or through agreement with the rail operator) through the daytime by at least four train or trams per hour overall, or at least two trains or trams per hour in any one direction'.

The proposal site lies approximately 1.2km from Whalley railway station, equating to a walking time of approximately 23 minutes. The site therefore falls significantly beyond the reasonable walking distance threshold identified in the NPPF.

In addition, Whalley railway station is not considered to be a well-connected station for the purposes of Policy S5, as it is not located within a top 80 Travel to Work Area by GVA. The proposal therefore fails to satisfy exception (h).

Exception (j) relates to development addressing an evidenced unmet need. The most recently published five-year housing land supply figure (base date 31st March 2026) indicates that the Council has a housing land supply of 2.24 years. The Council is therefore currently unable to demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing land and accordingly, there is an evidenced unmet need for additional housing in the Borough.

Notwithstanding this, the proposal site is not physically well-related to an existing settlement. The intervening areas of undeveloped land, creates a clear and appreciable degree of physical separation between the site and the nearest settlements.

Accordingly, whilst the proposal would make a modest contribution towards meeting the Borough's housing needs, it would fail to satisfy criterion i. of exception (j). The proposal therefore cannot be regarded as compliant with Policy S5(1) (j) of the NPPF.

Having regard to the above, the proposal is not considered to fall within any of the categories of development identified in Policy S5(1). In such circumstances, paragraph 4 of Policy S5 provides that development proposals outside those categories should only be approved in exceptional circumstances, where the benefits of the proposal substantially outweigh the adverse effects, including impacts on the character of the countryside and the promotion of sustainable patterns of movement.

In addition to the above, Policies DMI2 and DMG3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy require new development to be located to minimise the need to travel, with good access by foot and cycle and convenient links to public transport. Considerable weight is to be attached to the availability and adequacy of public transport to serve those moving to and from a proposed development.

This aligns with the sustainability objectives of the NPPF. The site is located within the Open Countryside, approximately 100m to the west of the defined settlement limits of Barrow which is a Tier 1 settlement. Whilst Barrow does benefit from some key facilities required to meet the daily needs of future occupants such as a convenience store, pub, village hall and primary school, these services alone do not automatically equate to sustainability. The nearest convenience store is 1.1km (17-minute walk) from the site at the Asda petrol station, aside from this travel outside of the settlement is required for the provision of food and larger supermarkets. The primary school is 1km away (14 minute walk). Barrow also doesn't have a post office.

The nearest bus stops to the proposal site are at The Eagle and Whitacre Lane approximately 1650 away from the site. This bus route would provide a service to neighbour settlements and beyond. Albeit the service is more limited in the evenings and weekends.

As such, whilst there is a bus service with stops close to the application site, the limited services available in Barrow means occupiers would be reliant on neighbouring settlements, as such the proposed development would be in direct conflict with Policies DMI2 and DMG3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and the NPPF.

Land Use/Amount of Development

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.

Although an indicative site layout plan has not been submitted in support of the application, the plot is considered capable of accommodating a single detached dwelling, together with associated parking and private amenity space. It is therefore considered that the proposed quantum of development could be accommodated within the site without resulting in a cramped form of development.

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

application, it is nevertheless necessary to consider whether the amount of development proposed is acceptable in principle.

It is therefore also relevant to consider at this stage whether or not the amount of residential development could be successfully integrated within the landscape. In this respect, it is not considered that the introduction of a new residential development at the proposal site would be acceptable, as the site currently maintains open, countryside views.

Whilst it is noted that the proposal site currently sits adjacent to a stable building, the location of the dwelling would require the construction of a substantial new access track leading from the existing access off Clitheroe Road. This, together with the dwelling itself, the associated hardstanding for parking and introduction of gates/walls/ fences to separate the residential curtilage from the adjacent land that would form part of such residential scheme would result in a harmful urbanising impact, diminishing the rural countryside landscape. The proposed site is a significant distance from the existing ribbon of development across Clitheroe Road and would appear anomalous in its position.

It is worth noting that application 3/2025/0414 was refused due to harm on the character of the open countryside without sufficient justification. This scheme was positioned in a land parcel substantially closer to the settlement boundary and existing residential development in a less isolated position. The proposed siting in this current application is worse in respect to harm to the openness of the landscape given the previous scheme was located immediately adjacent to the edge of the settlement boundary. Whilst some justification is provided in respect to contributing towards housing in the absence of a 5-year supply, the harm to the open countryside is not outweighed.

As such, the proposed development is considered to be in conflict with Policies DMG1 and DMG2 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.

Impact Upon Residential Amenity:

The remit of assessment of the application is limited to solely that of the principle of the development and as to whether the proposed development would align with the spatial and locational aspirations for residential development within the borough.

As such, matters relating to the potential for adverse impact(s) upon nearby residential amenities resultant from the development, cannot be fully determined nor assessed at this stage and will be reserved for consideration/assessment at any subsequent pursuant 'Technical Matters' submission(s).

Visual Amenity/External Appearance:

The remit of assessment of the application is limited to solely that of the principle of the development and as to whether the proposed development would align with the spatial and locational aspirations for residential development within the borough.

As such, matters relating to the potential for adverse impact(s) upon the character or visual amenities of the area resultant from the development, cannot be fully determined nor assessed at this stage and will be reserved for consideration/assessment at any subsequent pursuant 'Technical Matters' submission(s).

Highways and Parking:

The Local Highways Authority have raised no objection to the proposal stating the following:

Proposal:

The application seeks to build a new dwelling on land to the rear of Bramley View accessed via an unnamed privately maintained access on Clitheroe Road. The Highway Authority would request that the red edge is extended to include the unnamed privately maintained access up to where it joins Clitheroe Road.

Access

The proposed dwelling would be accessed from the unnamed privately maintained road which currently serves the rear of 1 – 3 Exton Terrace and 1 – 10 Bramley View. The access road is unmade and will likely deteriorate during the construction phase of the dwelling as such measures to mitigate this would be requested at stage 2, should the application be approved, to include pre-commencement and post completion surveys with any damage repaired within an agreed timetable following completion. The refuse collection arrangements should be provided at stage 2 to ensure that the maximum distances for residents and operatives to move waste is not exceeded.

The on-street parking around the site is not restricted and both the access road and Clitheroe Road has 7.5 – 8.5m wide carriageways which allow on-street parking to take place without causing an obstruction to traffic flow.

Sustainability

Bus services M2 (Burnley – Clitheroe), 280 (Preston – Skipton) and 22 (Clitheroe – Shadsworth) runs along Clitheroe Road with bus stops within approximately 150m from the centre of the site. Services 280 and 22 are subsidised however by Lancashire County Council.

The Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Policy (LCWIP) for Ribble Valley includes Clitheroe Road as a strategic route between Whalley and Barrow.

The nearest primary school and food convenience shop are located 1km to the north of Barrow. This exceeds the recommended walking distance. The local and employment facilities are located in Clitheroe which is approximately 5km to the north which can be accessed by bus travel and/or cycling.

The dwelling will require a secure, covered cycle store and an electric vehicle charging point to support and promote sustainable travel.

Parking

The dwelling will require off-street car parking with 1 space provided for 1 bedroom, 2 spaces for 2-3 bedrooms and 3 spaces for 4+ bedrooms. Single garages, included those which are integrated, should be 3m wide by 6m long internally to count as a parking space.

Conclusion

Lancashire County Council, acting as the Highway Authority, does not raise an objection regarding the proposed development and are of the opinion that the proposed development will not have a significant impact on highway safety, capacity or amenity in the immediate vicinity of the site subject to the above matters being considered as part of any future planning applications.

Landscape/Ecology:

No implication evident at this stage given the remit of the application relates solely to that of matters of principle. As such, should consent be granted, there will be the requirement for appropriate surveys to be undertaken (bats/nesting birds) and submitted in support of any subsequent 'Technical Matters' submission(s), to ascertain as to whether the proposal is likely to result in adverse impacts upon protected species or species of conservation concern.

Other Material Matters:

Appeals.

The applicant has referenced appeal decision PINS 6006097 as being of relevance to the application decision given the inspector gives weight to the provision of housing in appropriate locations despite a modest contribution in housing units. The appeal relates to the contribution of 2 dwellings, as opposed to 1 dwelling as per this application. The council does not dispute that the contribution of housing in Ribble Valley, in light of a lack of housing supply, should be given weight. However, it is not considered the appeal site in this instance is directly comparable to the application site in terms of proximity to exiting residential development and patterns of development.

Whilst applications are assessed on individual merits, comparisons can be drawn. In appeal PINS 6009990, which was of the provision of 1 self-build dwelling outside of the settlement boundary, the inspector concludes that 'there would be benefits to the proposals, but these would be limited by the scope and scale of the scheme. Including the contribution to the supply of homes for the Council which would be very limited in the grand scheme. I would give them, collectively, limited weight'. Much like the application scheme, the benefits identified in this appeal are the contribution of 1 self-build housing unit. However, this was given limited weight in light of the unsuitable location and harm to the open countryside identified. This is relevant to the application.

Similarly, under appeal PINS 6009691, which was for the provision of 3 self building bungalows 1 of which for over 55s, the inspector concluded that whilst the 'scheme would add housing to the Council's supply but by a very limited number. Other associated economic and social benefits arising would be equally limited by the scale of the proposals. With this and the above in mind, I give the benefits of the proposals limited weight'. Despite this being for a greater number of units than the application scheme, the benefits of both self-build and housing provision were given limited weight, despite the lack of a 5-year housing land supply, due to the harm identified. Again, this is relevant to the application.

Self-build.

The submitted information and development description identify the proposed dwelling as self-build. Importantly, the applicant has not submitted a signed unilateral undertaking to secure the dwelling as such. Were an appropriate legal mechanism to be submitted, with a shortfall of self-build housing within the Borough, despite the proposal only relating to the provision of one dwelling, some weight could be given to the fact that this would be a self-build dwelling. However, development in this location would unacceptably harm the character of the area by virtue of it being a discordant pattern of development and encroachment into the countryside. Therefore, the matter of whether the dwelling will be 'self-build' in nature for the purposes of the Self-build and Custom housebuilding Act 2015 is not afforded weight in favour of the proposal which outweighs the harm identified.

Observations/Consideration of Matters Raised/Conclusion:

As such, for the above reasons and having regard to all material considerations and matters raised that the application for permission in Principle is recommended for refusal.

RECOMMENDATION:

That permission in principle consent be refused for the following reason:

01:

The proposal is considered to be in direct conflict with Policies DMG2 and DMH3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy insofar that approval would lead to the creation of a new residential dwelling, located outside of defined settlement limits, within the defined open countryside without sufficient justification. The development would result in a discordant pattern of development and encroachment into the countryside, and the harm identified would not be outweighed by the benefits to development in this case.

02:	The proposed development if approved would lead to the creation of a new residential dwelling in an unsustainable location outside of the defined settlement limits. As a consequence, future occupiers would be heavily reliant upon private motor vehicles to access employment, education, healthcare, shops and other essential services. The proposal would therefore fail to promote sustainable patterns of development and travel and would be contrary to Key Statement DM12 and Policy DMG3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy, as well as Policy TR3 and S5 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
------------	--