|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Signed:** | | **Officer:** | **KH** | | | | **Date:** | | **03/04/25** | | **Manager:** | | **LH** | **Date:** | **8/4/25** |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Application Ref:** | | | | | 2024/0771 | | | | | | |  | | | |
| **Date Inspected:** | | | | | 10/10/24 | | | **Site Notice**  **expired:** | | 31/10/24 | |
| **Officer:** | | | | | Kathryn Hughes | | | | | | |
| **DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:** | | | | | | | | | | | | **REFUSAL** | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Development Description:** | | | | | | Outline planning permission for up to 9,290sq.m. of employment development (Use Class B2 – General Industrial and/or Use Class B8 – Storage and Distribution with access applied for off A59 Longsight Road (all other matters reserved). | | | | | | | | | |
| **Site Address/Location:** | | | | | | Land at Causeway Farm, Longsight Road, Balderstone BB2 &HZ | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | | | **Parish/Town Council** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Balderstone Parish Council:**  Would be grateful if their strong objection is noted. The Council was against the previous application which was refused and can see no persuasive or material change in this submission.  The proposals are strongly opposed by the vast majority of our local community. The main concerns are that the development would profoundly negatively change the character and amenity value of Mellor Brook and the surrounding area and so impoverish the quality of life of residents. There would be little, if any meaningful economic or social benefits when considered within the wider context of borough, county or regional level.  To reiterate the Council’s previous objections. The site is in open countryside outside the area’s settlement boundary. As such it is the Council’s understanding that any proposed development must be essential to the social and/or economic benefits of the area. Given the space allocated to business activities to the west of Mellor Brook along Myerscough Smithy Road and the land available at Samlesbury Enterprise Zone, the allocation of this site for industrial development is entirely superfluous to local or indeed Borough wide need.  Whilst the proposed buildings and layout of the site are outline at this stage it is clear that the buildings would be incongruous, overbearing and out of character with a semi rural residential area. The development would in effect sandwich Mellor Brook between industrial areas and degrade the amenity value of the village and those overlooking the site. There would inevitably be environmental degradation associated with both the buildings and likely associated activity, including habitat loss and disturbance, increased vehicle movements along with potential noise, air and light pollution.  Access would be significantly impoverished. The three footpaths crossing the site provide an important recreational link between Mellor Brook and Mellor giving walkers an opportunity to appreciate open countryside leading to spectacular vistas. The adjoining footpath running east along Whalley Road cycle path and A59 is used as a walking route to Osbaldeston Primary School, such a development would clearly present a further hazard along this route.  This proposal would truly blight our area and should be refused.  **Mellor Parish Council:**  Shares a direct boundary with the land at Causeway Farm and therefore has the following observations to raise with the Planning Officer on behalf of the residents of Mellor and part of Mellor Brook:- Noise The Noise Assessment dated December 2022 and carried out in October 2022 makes the admissions that: [4.3 Traffic data has been provided by Eddisons (the Transport Consultant) and assumes full B8 use for the purposes of the noise assessment. Over a 24hour period, there is predicted to be approximately 281 movements on the Site, including 84 HGV movements.] [4.4 In the absence of specific information, it has been assumed that up to 25% of HGV movements could take place over a single 1-hour period, which would equate to approximately 20 movements in a 1-hour, and 5 movements in a 15minute period, as a worst-case.]    It is further stated [4.20 It is important to note that the final impact and mitigation measures will be dependent on the final development layout, and this should be reviewed by an acoustic consultant at the detailed design stage, to ensure that the layout as designed can appropriately address noise factors.]    The final layout is not known and therefore the noise conclusion is based upon a hypothesis and the report contains many references to ‘should’ not will. In addition, [4.26 Once the detailed nature of such future uses is confirmed, noise from any fixed plant can be considered to ensure that the limits can be met.]    Furthermore, the actual application is vague, and the noise assessment comments [4.27 It should be noted that the derived rating level limits would be applicable to the total noise from the simultaneous operation of all external plant serving the Proposed Development. As such, noise emissions from individual items of plant will need to be lower than the given limit, although the exact limit for each individual item of plant will be dependent upon its type, noise characteristics, location etc.]    However, [5.4 Appropriate noise limits have been determined to be achieved by fixed plant items associated with the proposed development] cannot be relied upon as the specific details are not known.  RVBC has previously accepted the above detailed Noise Assessment but given what the report states, this causes further concern for residents. GC Newt Survey The presence of Great Crested Newts, has not been addressed and it can be seen from the previous application that the Applicant has merely sought to provide a Certificate.  Residents are concerned as the Certificate has lapsed and yet has still been submitted without consideration of a full assessment. The Applicant has not made any provision for this area of concern.   Employment Land Assessment June 2024 The Application is for land which falls outside of the settlement boundary referred to at  [2.4.3] in the Assessment. The report it seeks to rely on the upon factor at [2.4.4 Policy DMG2 (Strategic Considerations) states "Within the Tier 2 villages and outside the defined settlement areas development must meet at least one of the following considerations:" Six considerations are listed, the first is relevant to the proposals for the Application Site. "The development should be essential to the local economy or social wellbeing of the area."]    However, Residents are concerned that this criterion has not been met and refers the Planning Officer to table 7.1.11.  The above table and statements taken from the Assessment demonstrate the Application will not provide essential employment to the local economy and should not be considered.  The A59 Longsight Road can be approached from several directions but to travel to this location for the business use which is proposed B2 and B8 and the volume of movements being (281 estimated 84 HGV) consideration has not been made in relation to the nature of access through the villages of Mellor and Mellor Brook which fall within this Parish. A substantial amount of money was spent in providing traffic calming measures on Mellor Lane. Further measures were put in place on Branch Road to remove the burden of vehicles over 7.5T using it. Residents report the number of HGVs over 7.5T using Branch Road is increasing and the ability to ‘Police’ this is limited. A new section of road was created but drivers take the shortest route which is naturally through Mellor Brook along Branch Road. Traffic and safety concerns have not been addressed by the Applicant.    Furthermore, the other point of direct access would be to approach this site from Blackburn or the connecting motorway network from the M65 and M66 via Yew Tree Drive. This Parish Council is part of a Traffic Concern Group to highlight the issues of our B Roads being used as a cut through.    Of particular concern from Residents is the increased traffic from Whinney Lane which provides a shortcut up through Mellor down to the A59 using Abbott Brow which would provide access to the site only 200 yards away. Although both of these roads are shortcuts, they are unsuitable for HGVs and further present a safety hazard as there are no pathways. Equally, any travel to the site for commercial purposes would further exacerbate the current volume of traffic issues that the Council are trying to solve.    The visual impact upon those Residents who reside on Mellor Brow, Elswick Gardens and Abbott Brow will cause extreme distress.    Mellor Parish Council wish to assert that RVBC has identified that several of its Policies and Strategies do not align with this Application in particular direct conflict with Policies DMG1, DMG2 and EC1 et al. Local Economy This application would not benefit the Parish or Residents of Mellor/Mellor Brook but will have a direct detrimental effect on the lives and wellbeing of the Residents or Mellor Parish which encompasses parts of Mellor Brook as stated. The usage classes of B2 and B8 provide for several types of use on the site which causes grave concerns. The specific uses are not currently known and although RVBC could impose restrictions there is always the possibility of their unknown nature, to damage the established local economy within our Parish.   Public Footpath Right of Way The Public footpath is well used by Residents of all ages and abilities. To alter access would cause issues for those less abled and present a danger.    We reiterate our previous observations as follows: -     * The development is very large with a selection of industrial units not suitable for this area. The plans don’t state what industries would reside in the units, some could be 24/7 operations and may cause unnecessary noise, air or light pollution. * The area of the A59 houses a number of residential properties along with a petrol filling station and a car showroom, all these already cause lots of traffic movement. This development will cause additional traffic and congestion in an already busy road where in the past we have seen many accidents both minor and unfortunately fatalities. * There will be increased air pollution from this development, the report fails to take account of the local primary schools and churches and those using these facilities especially children. One school is under 500m from this proposed development. * No provision has been made with regards to pedestrians passing the site in a safe manner. * The land is currently rough glazing land with evidence of Badger sets and other wildlife habitat in the area, along with a stream and public footpath. * The development would be unsightly for many residents whose property currently overlooks farmland. * Other industrial units are available locally at BAE Systems and Fairfield Business Park is there a need for similar facilities.     **Osbaldeston Parish Council:**  Strongly objects to the proposed development of an industrial park at Causeway Farm on the following grounds:   * The development has previously been refused by RVBC and the small amendments to the application do not sufficiently address the reasons for refusal. The reapplications appears to be a justification for the original application and does nothing to address the concerns of the local community or most of the refusal points from RVBC. * The proposed development is in open countryside, outside of any defined settlement boundaries and will have a significant detrimental impact to wildlife – these issues are not sufficiently addressed. * The massing and scale of the proposed development is completely out of place and a visual eyesore at the gateway to the Ribble Valley. The additional hedgerow included within this resubmission will not obscure the buildings on rising land with a ridge height of 12.75m. * The improvements to site access which have allegedly satisfied LCC Highways does nothing to address the additional traffic in an area of the A59 with significant accident history. * The amenity value of the footpaths crossing the site will be destroyed. * There is a large, under-developed industrial site at Bae Samlesbury that has been designed to cater for the industrial nature of its remit. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | | | **Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies** | | | | | | | | | |
| **LCC Highways:** | | | | | |  | | | | | | | | | |
| The submitted documents and plans, including Eddisons Transport Assessment and Framework Travel Plan have been reviewed and the following comments are made.  History  3/2023/0148 was refused at Committee on 21st September 2023 with reason 4 being:-  The proposal fails to demonstrate that the proposed site access arrangements are safe and suitable to serve the development. These highway safety concerns mean the development is contrary to Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy 2008 - 2028 as well as the National Planning Policy Framework.    Ribble Valley Borough Councils committee report dated the 21st September 2023 records, 'further information was received from the agent today with regards to the outstanding highway issues and this has been sent to LCC highways for comments. LCC highways have responded that they are not able to get a response prior to the meeting due to the short time frame therefore it is recommended that members continue to consider the application at committee, where the highway refusal reason remains. Should the committee agree with the officer's recommendation to refuse the application then the agent may choose to continue their dialogue with LCC highways post decision, and should this matter be resolved then the council would then withdraw its highway reason as part of any appeals process.  Subsequently we did review the amended plans that were submitted on the 21st September 2023 at committee and concluded that the matters raised during the consultation period had been addressed satisfactorily.    Proposal  The application is a re-submission of 3/2023/0148 and seeks the same amount and type of development.    Sustainability  The site is located on the A59 within close walking distance of bus stops with limited bus services and a SPAR shop. Based upon the distance to the bus stops and destination of services, distance to train station and defined cycle routes, the site is expected to offer a (lowest range) medium level of accessibility.    A Framework Travel Plan is submitted with the application. A robust Travel Plan and mitigation measures to support sustainable travel modes are required to support this development.    LCC offer a Travel Plan support service which oversee the progression from the Framework Travel Plan to the Full Travel Plan in line with agreed timescales and targets. To offer this service we would request a contribution of £12,000 based upon the proposed floor area and use class within a S106 agreement.    The nearest bus stops are located on Longsight Road A59 and are approximately 200m from the site and are served by services 280 (Preston- Skipton, hourly Mon/Sat, limited Sun service) and 25A (Mellor Brook Blackburn, Mon-Sun 2 hourly daytime). These are services subsidised by LCC and the site would be isolated and remote if these services were to cease. We would therefore request a contribution towards services running past the site to ensure that there are sustainable transport options for staff. We would request a contribution circa £100,000 spread over 5 years.  The nearest bus stops need to be upgraded to quality bus stop standard and these works can be undertaken under the S278 agreement with Lancashire County Council.  The provision of high quality secure and covered cycle parking and electric vehicle charging provision is expected on the site with details to be presented when then the reserved matters application is submitted.    Traffic Impact  Traffic surveys were undertaken on Thursday 15th September 2022 at A59 Longsight Road/ Myerscough Smithy Road/Daniel Thwaites Road and A59 Longsight Road/B6245 Ribchester Road. The surveys were undertaken between 0730 and 0930 hours in the morning and between 1630 and 1830 hours in the evening.    The peak hours were identified as 0745 to 0845 hours and 1630 to 1730 hours, for the AM and PM peaks respectively.    The 2022 flows are growthed to 2027 using TEMPro. This is out of date with the application being submitted in 2024.    No committed development has been included.    The trips have been distributed using observed turning movements but no indication of where this is.    Using trip rates 0.442 arrivals and 0.165 departures AM peak (total 2-way 0.607) and 0.105 arrivals and 0.343 departures PM peak (total 2-way 0.448) the proposed development is forecast to generate approximately 56 two-way trips in the AM peak and around 42 two-way trips in the PM peak hour.    The following junctions have been modelled using future 'with development' flows and are considered to continue to operate within capacity and require no mitigation measures.    A59/Site Access- PICADY  A59/ Myerscough Smithy Road/ Daniel Thwaites Road- ARCADY  A59/ Ribchester Road- LINSIG    There are 2 collisions recorded in the previous 5 years on Longsight Road between A59/ Myerscough Smithy Road and Abbott Brow/Osbaldeston Lane. Measures to address speed compliance on Longsight Road are required and are likely to offer improvement to highway safety and the number/severity of collisions/injuries in the future.  Construction traffic  A new temporary access on the A59 for construction traffic would be acceptable to allow works on site to commence. The detailed design of the temporary access must be agreed at condition discharge stage and be implemented under an agreement with Lancashire County Council. The visibility splays, geometry and surface will be matters to agree and it will be necessary to limit HGV movements to the off-peak movements 9.30am 2.30pm with wheel washing and hard standing for operative parking and HGV turning to allow all vehicles to exit the site onto A59 in forward gear.  Site access  Drawings Eddisons '3839-F01 Rev J Proposed site access plan' and 3839-SP01 Rev B Swept path analysis' were submitted for the previous application, subsequently reviewed and considered acceptable.  These drawings are submitted for this application.    A new priority access junction is proposed on the A59 to serve the site. The carriageway width is 7.3m wide with 15m radii with a central pedestrian island to break the width of the opening. A 3m wide pedestrian/cycle route will be provided on the south side and a 2m wide footway on the north side.  The swept path analysis submitted for an 18.48m long articulated wagon demonstrates the suitability of the site access geometry.    A 7-day Automatic Traffic Counter (ATC) was installed on the A59 Longsight Road to capture existing traffic volumes and speeds between 9/9/22 15/9/22. The average 7-day 85%ile speeds for NW and SE bound traffic is 46.57mph and 46.3mph respectively.  Visibility splays of X2.4m by Y131m to both sides of the site access are shown on the 'Proposed site access plan' and lie within the adopted highway or the applicants land. This is considered acceptable in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges standard.    A surface water drainage strategy will be required at a later date and it must be noted that Lancashire County Council Highways will not allow a new connection onto the highway drainage system in Longsight Road. The water must be collected and drained to an alternative system/outfall.  Off-site highway works  To mitigate the impact of the development on the highway network the following offsite highway works are requested:   1. The upgrade of 2 quality bus stops to support all users to travel to/from site sustainably. 2. Provision of new footway along the south side of Longsight Road between the site and the existing footway approximately 100m long to link the site to the nearest southwest bound bus stop for pedestrian safety.   Review the extent of the 30mph speed limit and associated traffic regulation orders with enhanced gateway feature in the vicinity of the site access to promote speed compliance on Longsight Road for highway safety.   1. New site access arrangement with right turn ghost island and two new central pedestrian crossing refuges including any changes to the street lighting, surface water drainage.     The off-site highway works will be constructed under a S278 agreement with Lancashire County Council and shall be constructed prior to first trading.    Contributions  To mitigate the impact of the development on the highway network the following measures are requested:     1. Travel Plan support £12,000 2. Public Transport support £100,000 spread over 5 years   PROW  Public footpaths FP0304060, FP0304061, FP0304062, FP0304063, FP0304064 and FP0304065 pass through the proposed site. Comments made by LCC PROW Team under separate cover for requirements for diversions.  Internal layout and parking  The layout is a reserved matter to be considered at a later date. The internal estate roads will be privately maintained and a private management and maintenance company will need to be established to ensure the future maintenance is undertaken.    The roads will need to be designed to accommodate the largest road going heavy goods vehicle and to ensure adequate sized turning heads/areas are provided so all vehicles can enter and leave the A59 in forward gear.    The level of car parking should be provided in accordance with the standards for a medium accessibility site with a ratio of 1 space per 47sqm for B2 and 1 space per 210sqm for B8. Secure, secure and covered cycle parking, disabled car parking and electric vehicle charging at a ratio of 1 space per 10 car parking spaces and secure motorcycle parking at a ratio of 1 space per 25 car parking spaces.    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 conditions and contributions as detailed above.    Should the application be approved then conditions are requested relating to construction method statement, times for deliveries, wheel washing, construction of site access and off-site works for highway mitigation and Framework Travel Plan.  **LCC Footpaths:**  LCC Public Rights of Way Team is supportive of the plans subject to the following:  Comments/Objections  Footpath FP0304060, FP0304062, FP0304063, FP030464 and FP0304065 pass through the proposed site.  The retention of the rights of way access across the site within green corridors and open spaces is commended, although it will necessitate a Public Path Order under the provision of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 Section 257 (TCPA257) resulting from the obstruction of footpath FP0304061 from the proposed Unit B and carparking area. TCPA90 S257 orders are administered by the authority that is considering, or has granted the planning permission, in this instance RVBC.  The detail of the exact alignment of the new route, the construction specification and any associated works would need to be agreed with the Public Rights of Way Team before the necessary TCPA90 S257 Order is made. I can advise that the new route must have a minimum width of 2m, have a firm properly constructed surface with no gates or stiles crossing the new route.  It is important for the developer to note that the Public Path Order must be made and confirmed before the development (in so far as it affects the public right of way) is commenced. TCPA90 S257 procedure includes a statutory period for objections. If objections are received and not withdrawn, the Order would need to be referred to the Planning Inspectorate for decision. Therefore, the legal alignment of the right of way will not change until the appropriate legal Order has come into effect and there can be no guarantee of the success of any Public Path Order. Any obstruction of the existing public rights of way would be a criminal offence.  Any changes in ground level or installation drainage should ensure that surface water is not discharged onto a public right of way.  Any trees or bushes should be at least 3m away from a PROW.  An infringement or obstruction of existing public rights of way would be a criminal offence.  **Lead Local Flood Authority:**  No objection subject to conditions relating to final surface water sustainable drainage strategy, construction surface water management plan, sustainable drainage system operation and maintenance manual and verification report being submitted for approval prior to the commencement of development.  Under Section 23 of the Land Drainage Act 1991, as amended by the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, there is a legal requirement to obtain consent from LCC as Lead Local Flood Authority, prior to undertaking certain works on ordinary watercourses.  **United Utilities:**  Recommend appropriate drainage condition is attached to any approval. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | | | **Additional Representations.** | | | | | | | | | |
| LCC Historic Environment Team: The site does not warrant any further archaeological investigation. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **PUBLIC REPONSES:** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 response received supporting the proposal and over 150 responses from separate addresses received objecting to the application on the following grounds:     * The assessment of traffic density is an estimate with numbers of vehicular movements per day based on assumptions. * The size and scope of the proposal is of major significance and out of context with the surrounding villages. * Greenfield/open countryside near to primary schools. * Employment opportunities are a necessary part of our culture and economic development but this is entirely the wrong place and must be stopped. * Lots of wildlife with at least 57 different species and eight species of butterfly along with Woodcock, Mallard Duck and Heron. * The woodlands are important habitat for wildlife and the multiple footpaths around and through the site gives members of the public a chance to appreciate the countryside and amenity as part of their wellbeing. * This development is totally unrequited and unnecessary. * There is plenty of industrial land available near British aerospace. * Additional safety risk on the surrounding minor roads that feed into the A59. No detailed analysis regarding volume of traffic and flows. * Another loss of green belt land. * Safety and clean air issues. * The Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment indicates that the development would require offsetting certain habitat losses. Despite these proposed offsets, there remains the risk of irreparable damage to the local biodiversity hedgerows, and the habitat of commuting and foraging bats. * Asbestos and dust constitute health risks as well as activities involving industrial processes; * The proposal would be an eyesore in views from Mellor. * No evidence of any objectively assessed need and no assessment of alternative locations. * In very close proximity to the NCF and SEZ creating thousands of jobs just a km away. * The SEZ Masterplan has been developed with a thorough assessment of access points and traffic mitigation measures concerning the A59 and A677. This proposal raises significant concerns over road safety, traffic congestion and the overall capacity of the area’s road network to accommodate additional development. * A car dependent workforce is the reality increasing congestion, air pollution, noise pollution and greenhouse gas emissions with negative effect on climate change and net zero targets. * I note the numbers from the 2022 traffic survey. Significant development in the Whalley and Clitheroe areas have taken place over the following two years and add to those numbers. * As a local resident I can say that it is very difficult to cross or access the A59 from Osbaldeston Lane or Abbotts Brow. * The site is a valuable local amenity with 6 PROW and an importance area for wildlife. * The fields in which the development is proposed would result in the loss of feeding grounds for badgers – these fields offer an ideal wildlife corridor to access neighbouring fields without having to cross the A59- badgers are highly mobile, an updated site walkover prior to development to identify any new badger setts and if necessary a Natural England License would be required. * NPPF 135 all development should be of good design or refused NPPF 139. * No details of foul and surface water management. * Sufficient commercial land identified within local plans in particular the large BAE site. * Land purchase speculation like this should not be encouraged. * Proposal is too large, in wrong place and outside the settlement boundary. * The potential height of the buildings exceeds any existing and will be an eyesore. * Extra 3,000 vehicles pending with the introduction of GCHQ. * The land was not included in the 2020/21 study which focused on brownfield sites. This site is greenfield, there are other agreed developments and seems to be part of a bigger strategy to release a large swathe of industrial and residential land when all the applications are joined up. * There is considerable vagueness and inaccuracy in the proposal with unsubstantiated claims about visual amenity and impact on increased traffic. * The great crested newt survey says there are only 2 ponds. This is incorrect as there are two other ponds adjacent Bay Trees Farm and two others on Higher Commons Lane. These are not shown on Natural England’s map but they are historic ponds. This would make the application for a licence invalid. This asks the question was there a physical survey done? * Need to consider cumulative effect of this and all the proposals in the area. * Threat to the identifies of local villages is considerable with existing public footpaths run through and converge on an industrial estate. * Extremely difficult to cross the A59 near to Pennine garage with parents walking children to school already having great difficulties. * Houses at the Willows are in a high flood risk area. * The EIA Screening report identified asbestos in the ground. * The old quarry at Abbotts Brow is a monitored site due to methane build up with an exclusion zone on new builds. * Allowing this development would encourage further applications for similar development in the adjacent areas, leading to a widespread loss of open countryside. * The negative effects of this proposal on health of the wider community is a significant concern. * An outline application lacks specific details regarding operational aspects such as working hours, light pollution mitigation, noise levels and waste management. * The applicant overlooks the nearby Lancashire Enterprise Zone as a more suitable location with existing infrastructure. * The precedent sites referred to are less obtrusive and not as large as, or relatable in terms of size, height, heavy industry, pollution, flood, environmental loss. Most are set back from the A59 and well screened and not in close proximity to residential areas. * The introduction of industrial activities would negatively affect property values in the area. * From our property would look down onto a vast expanse of metal roofing, at a height of twice that of the canopy of the petrol station. * This proposal would create a precedent which could turn the entire A59 from Mellor Brook to Gisburn into a ‘linear industrial park’ which conflicts with one of the Ribble Valley’s ‘unique selling points’ as an area of outstanding natural beauty. * This development has nothing to recommend it to those who live in the area. It is a total blight on the surrounding villages. Promoting the site as an employment opportunity does not acknowledge the damage. * Development would cause great harm to the landscape and detrimental visual impact in this sensitive area at the foot of Mellor Hill/Moor. * Ecology – there is a woodland 20m to the southwest the development boundary which is part of the wildlife corridor that extends from Abbott Brow to Mellor Brook and on to Mammon Road. There are extensive signs of badger activity with some evidence of sett construction within the proposed site, with an historical badger sett within 300m of the development. * Applicants focus on housing and employment number rather than countryside and landscape. * The A59 is already becoming a visual mess due to recent decisions in Clayton le Dale. * The proposed development is located 240m from St Mary’s Osbaldeston Primary School and would significantly increase traffic, no provision has been made to consider the safety of pedestrians crossing the A59. In recent years there have been a number of fatal accidents close by the petrol station and outside the Bay Horse along with a number of no fatal accidents resulting in damage to school premises. * Traffic along the A59 is only set to increase due to the nearby Enterprise Zone at Samlesbury and the proposed development of Cuerdale Garden Village. * This plan does not appear to enhance the rural environment in any way. * There is finite parking space on the plans. Given that the intended use is as yet unspecified, it is impossible to claim that this would be adequate. * None of the concerns and objections raised by the previous application have been adequately addressed in this proposal. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Relevant Planning History:**  **3/2023/0148 -** Outline planning permission for up to 9,290sq.m. of employment development (Use Class B2 – General Industrial and/or Use Class B8 – Storage and Distribution with access applied for off A59 Longsight Road (all other matters reserved) – Refused. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Relevant Policies**  **Ribble Valley Core Strategy**    Key Statement DS1 – Development Strategy  Key Statement DS2 – Sustainable Development  Key Statement DMI2 – Transport Considerations  Key Statement EN3 – Sustainable Development  Key Statement EN4 – Biodiversity and Geodiversity  Key Statement EN5 – Heritage Assets  Key Statement EC1 – Business and Employment Development  Key Statement DMI2 – Transport Considerations    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 DME4 – Protecting Heritage Assets  Policy DME5 – Renewable Energy  Policy DME6 – Water Management  Policy DMB1 – Supporting Business Growth  Policy DMB5 – Footpaths and Bridleways    National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Site Description and Surrounding Area:**  The application relates to an area of land outside of the defined settlement limits of Balderstone. The site is bounded to the northwest by the A59 and agricultural fields to the east and south. There are existing residential and commercial properties to the north and south, with the settlement of Osbaldeston to the north, whilst the settlement of Mellor lies to the south. The area is predominantly agricultural in nature largely defined by open fields and limited commercial and domestic development along the A59.    A number of public rights of way cross the site at present namely FP030461, FP0304062, FP0304063 and FP0304064 and these are proposed to be rerouted within the site.  A mains water pipe crosses the site from the northeast corner to the south east which presents a 3m easement on either side as well as overhead electricity lines along the south east boundary of the site.  There are two ponds within the site as well as a watercourse which runs along the eastern boundary. A number of trees and shrubs are on the site together with a hedgerow to the A59 western boundary. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Proposed Development for which consent is sought:**  The application seeks consent for outline permission for the erection of up to 9, 290 sq.m. of industrial units for general industrial use and/or storage or distribution. With all matters except Access reserved. A new vehicular access would be created off the A59 Longsight Road. The proposed use of the units would be for general industry (Use Class B2) and/or storage and distribution (Use Class B8).  An illustrative masterplan has been submitted which proposes that four units would be erected with a maximum ridge height of 12.75m in three development zones each with parking, loading and turning areas, separated by the re-routed public rights of way which would cross the site. Although indicative, this carries some weight in demonstrating how the scale and type of development proposed could be accommodated on the site, and the level of impact it would have.  Details of materials proposed are timber cladding with aluminium roofs, however, this is only indicative as details of appearance have been reserved.  Existing trees and planting will be retained where possible with enhanced planting proposed. An 8m buffer along the northeast boundary is proposed as well as the retention of existing hedgerows within the site with internal access road proposed to utilise existing breaks in these hedgerows. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Principle of Development:**  Policy DMG2 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy seeks to restrict development within the open countryside and Tier 2 Village settlements except where they meet explicit criteria, Key Statement DS1 reaffirms these criteria and sets out the overall spatial aspirations for development within the Borough.  In respect of assessing the submitted proposal, Policy DMG2 remains fully engaged. 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 with principal and tier 1 settlements with the second part  of the policy DMG2(2) being engaged when a 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 location of the proposal.  The site is located outside of a defined settlement and within the designated open countryside. In this respect, when assessing the locational aspects of development, Policy DMG2(2) remains engaged 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.*   In order to be considered acceptable the proposal would need to meet the exception criterion above. One such criterion is where development is considered ‘essential to the local economy or social wellbeing of the area’.  Key Statement EC1 outlines that the spatial strategy for employment development during the current plan period is to be directed towards the main settlement of Clitheroe, Whalley and Longridge as well as locations well related to the A59 corridor.  It states that the Council aims to allocate an additional 8 hectares of land for employment purposes in line with the supporting evidence base. The actual need as determined by the Housing and Economic Development DPD was identified as a residual requirement for 2.41ha of employment land. The DPD allocates three sites to deliver this; and not all of them have come forward to date.  The applicant has submitted an Employment Land Assessment which considers that the current extent of available employment land provides very limited choice. However, with site allocations and extent planning permissions / committed developments there is sufficient land available to deliver the council’s employment needs for the remainder of the plan period until 2028. As such there is not considered to be a shortage of sites to meet the current local plan requirements and so this policy is not considered out-of-date. Furthermore it is noted that the application is for speculative employment development with no end users identified. The council considers that the proposal fails to be considered ‘essential to the local economy’.  I would consider that the other criterion listed do not readily apply. Therefore, it cannot be considered that the proposal would meet any of the exception criterion contained within Policy DMG2 in relation to new development outside of defined settlement limits, in which case there is no explicit policy support for new employment development in the location proposed.  Further to the above, Policy DMG2 also requires that *‘within the open countryside development will be required to be in keeping with the character of the landscape and acknowledge the special qualities of the area by virtue of its size, design, use of materials, landscaping and siting’.*  Taking account of the quantum, scale and nature of the proposed development, it cannot be argued that the proposalisin keepingwith the character of the area nor that of the character of designated open countryside. The site would introduce large scale commercial built form and activity within an open countryside location of a scale which could not be easily integrated into this location even with the introduction of extensive landscaping. This is expended on in the ‘Visual Amenity’ section of this report.  Policy DMB1 supports proposals intended to support business growth and the local economy in principle; although there is an expectation that proposals will be determined in accordance with the development plan. Where such over-riding conflict is identified, e.g. with Policy DMG2 in particular in this case, the general support afforded by Policy DMB1 is considered to be fully disengaged.  Policy DMG3 seeks to support development proposals which are well related to the primary road network and can be accessed by sustainable transport modes. This is in line with one of the overarching objectives of the NPPF to encourage sustainable development and in turn to reduce reliance on private motor vehicles.  It is acknowledged that LCC Highways identify that the site is located on the A59 within close walking distance of bus stops with limited bus services and a SPAR shop. Based upon the distance to the bus stops and destination of services, distance to train station and defined cycle routes, the highways authority consider that the site is expected to offer a (lowest range) medium level of accessibility. However, the A59 is a constraint to pedestrians and cyclists, particularly when crossing to the bus stop on the other side of the road, the train station is not within walking distance and the service and facilities within walking distance are extremely limited. Therefore the LPA is of the view that future users of the development will largely be reliant on private motor vehicle and the site is not considered a sustainable location for employment development. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Impact on Heritage Assets:**  Causeway Farm is Grade II Listed and sited across the to the west. An Historic Environment Assessment has been submitted with this application which states that as the proposed development is to be located on the south side of Longsight Road (A59) it would have no impact on the immediate setting of the listed farmhouse. This assessment is accepted and any impact would be limited which accords with Key Statement EN5 and Policy DME4 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Impact Upon Residential Amenity:**  The site is located on agricultural fields and is some distance from residential dwellings, however, it will be seen from residential viewpoints and as such consideration must be given in respect of the potential for the proposal to result in undue impacts upon existing or future residential amenities.  In this respect, regard must be given in respect of Causeway Farm (Grade II Listed) sited approximately 80m to the northwest, Calf House Farm approximately 175m to the East, Glengarth just over 90m to the southwest together with properties on Whalley Road 160m to the southwest. There are also a number of properties along Whalley Road in Mellor Brook and those properties rising up Mellor Brow to the southwest ranging from 132 to 64 and those at Elswick Gardens which are orientated in a manner whereby their rear elevations and rear garden areas face onto the proposed development. Albeit these properties are between 200m and 400m away they would have clear, open views of the proposed development from their raised vantage points.  Taking into account the above interface distances none of the properties would experience any direct impacts, however, the elevated properties would have unrestricted open views of the development that will affect their outlook and the sense of openness currently afforded from their private garden areas and rear elevations.  Taking account of the above matters, the proposal would accord Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy insofar that the proposed development would result in no significant harm to the residential amenities of adjacent properties due to the distances involved. Noise and air quality issues are addressed separately later in this report. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Visual Amenity/External Appearance:**  The submitted details propose the erection of up to 9,290 sqm. Indicitive plans suggest this could be delivered in three zones of development consisting of four units with a maximum ridge height of 12.75m. The submitted Design and Access Statement provides more details how the four units have been derived and that larger units would offer the most efficient use of space. In terms of the 3 development zones, Zone A would accommodate the 30,000sq.ft. unit (approx. 94m in length) and the relocated access, Zone B would accommodate the 25,000sq. ft unit and two of the rerouted public rights of way, whilst Zone C would accommodate two units totalling 45,000 sq. Ft (the largest being approx. 107m in length), a rerouted PROW and the water mains exclusion zone.  A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) has been submitted which updates the previous LVIA submitted with the original application. It identifies the existing baseline landscape and visual context of the site and then goes onto do an impact assessment. This methodology is accepted.  The updated LVIA does not affect the judgements and conclusions in the original LVIA but provides additional verification and analysis to support the assessment.  It considers that the loss of a small section of hedgerow along the site frontage as well as internal field boundary will result in some change in residential views as well as public views from the footpaths crossing the site. The report concludes that overall, the perception of the distinctiveness of the wider Landscape Character Area (LCA) and Landscape Character Type would not be compromised. In terms of the temporary construction phase this is rated as a Temporary Major Adverse effect on the site, but a Temporary Moderate Adverse Effect on the LCA. The operational phase would result in a complete change to the site itself and is considered would have a degree of consistency with the existing settlement edge of Mellor Brook to the west and the uses associated with the A59. It is considered that this would result in a Moderate Adverse effect on the site and a Moderate Minor adverse effects on the LCA as only a small proportion of the LCA will be changed and no fundamentally defining features will be lost (a small area of privately owned agricultural land, two ponds and short sections of boundary hedgerows only).    The LVIA accepts visual and landscape harm ranging from moderate-minor to major adverse. Having reviewed the updated LVIA it is still considered that the impacts for both construction and operational phases have been downplayed. The quantum of development proposed on a site which is currently open grassland and sits alongside areas of open grassland and sporadic small-scale residential and commercial development nearby, together with the loss of over 100m of hedgerows, would have a major detrimental impact on the site and this countryside location. Furthermore the LVIA is considered to downplay the impact on users of the public rights of way to be diverted through a large commercial/industrial site across roads and between car parks and commercial units as this would clearly result in a major detrimental impact on the experience of users who are currently able to access open fields within the countryside.  The A59 is an arterial route road between York and Liverpool which provides access to towns such as Harrogate, Skipton and Preston and not a destination in its own right. Locally it meets the M6 at junction 21 and the A677 for Blackburn serving BAE at Samlesbury and continuing on to Gisburn before heading across the Yorkshire Border. The A59 is not a destination in its own right.  Appearance has been reserved for later consideration therefore details of a suggested palette of materials have been submitted in the form of a Design Code. This includes timber cladding on the elevations would the applicant considers would aid in blending the building with their surroundings and promote renewable materials in the scheme. The roof of the built form is proposed to be aluminium with standing seam joints which the applicant considers is a take on agricultural architecture in the local context. Integrated roof lights and concealed drainage pipes where possible are also suggested with steel shutters to windows and doors.  The suggested materials do raise concerns. Their scale and function and layout means they would not resemble agricultural buildings - furthermore the inclusion of roller shutter doors is industrial - and so attempting to replicate something which they are not would result in the buildings appearing incongruous, particularly as there is little use of this material at this scale in the vicinity of the site and so it would not blend in with its surroundings as intended. Although appearance is not applied for, it is not considered that a material could be successfully chosen that would in any way address the concerns identified above  The proposed hard surfaces suggested are asphalt/tarmac to service yards, compacted gravel to PROW’s and car parking areas lined with recycled timber sleepers or natural stone setts to mark the spaces. Whilst this is accepted it does not in any way address the concerns identified above, and the amount of infrastructure would not reflect that of an agricultural use.  In this respect, the amount of built form proposed as well as the overall scale of the proposed development would fail to accord with Policies DMG1 and DMG2 in that the proposal fails to meet criterion (2) of Policy DMG1 which requires that development proposals be *‘sympathetic to existing and proposed land uses in terms of its size, intensity and nature as well as scale, massing, style, features and building materials’ as well as* Policy DMG2 which requires that *‘within the open countryside development will be required to be in keeping with the character of the landscape and acknowledge the special qualities of the area by virtue of its size, design, use of materials, landscaping and siting’.* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Highway Safety and Public Rights of Way:**  LCC Highways has stated that the previous concerns raised in respect of the proposed access to the development have been addressed and therefore they do not raise an objection and they 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 appropriate conditions regarding construction method statement, times for deliveries, wheel washing, construction of site access and off-site works for highway mitigation and Framework Travel Plan. Contributions of £12,000 have been requested towards monitoring this. Further contributions have been requested towards continuation of the bus services which pass the site along the A59 which will ensure a more sustainable form of development and provide sustainable travel alternatives for staff. A request has been made for £100,000 towards this over a five-year period.  .  Public Rights of Way (PROW) 60, 61, 62, 63, 64 and 65 cross or bound the site. It is proposed to retain 60 and 62, reroute 61 to a new PROW to the western side of the site and retain 63, 64 and 65. This would result in PROW’s 60 and 62 being routed over the proposed new access road between the parking area for unit A and unit B and unit B and unit D. This does not enhance the experience for these users as claimed in the applicant’s Design and Access Statement (DAS). The new PROW to replace 61 would be sited along the western boundary between the A59 and the back of unit C and then around the back of Unit D which would clearly result in a significant change of experience for the users and would deter walkers from using this PROW.  Whilst it is acknowledged that the PROW Team raise no objection, they require the new routes to have a minimum width of 2m, have a firm properly constructed surface with no gates or stiles crossing the new route. Trees and bushes should be at least 3m away. This highlights the urbanised environment that users would experience.  The DAS states that this would be more desirable than walking on the access road this is clearly not the case and the proposal would conflict with Ribble Valley Core Strategy Policy DMG1 which requires proposals to consider the protection and enhancement of public rights of way and access. Moreover, policy DMB5 seeks to retain, maintain and improve public rights of way particularly given the character of this rural area and the contribution these make to leisure, health and tourism.  Therefore, the quantum of development proposed would significantly undermine the level of openness experienced by users of the public rights of way to an unacceptable degree and the scheme fails to accord with policies DMG1 and DMB5 in this regard. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Drainage/Flooding Issues:**  The site is located within flood zone 1 (lowest risk of flooding). The principle of the drainage strategy is accepted subject to appropriate conditions.  In this respect the proposal accords with Policy DME6 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy which requires that all development proposals provide adequate drainage strategies to avoid flooding on the site or to nearby land. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Noise/Contamination/Air Quality Issues:**  A Noise Assessment has been submitted which concludes that the effects of operational noise would result in low impact and therefore mitigation measures are not considered necessary subject to the eventual site layout. This is sufficient to conclude that impact of noise is not a reason to refuse this outline permission. In the event of outline permission being granted a condition could be imposed requiring an updated noise assessment to accompany a reserved matters application once full details are known to ensure that the development would not result in an unacceptable noise impact.  A Phase 1 Site Investigation Report has been submitted which concludes that further investigations are required to determine whether pollutants are present on the site and appropriate remediation measures if this is proven to be the case. An appropriate condition requiring this can be attached to any grant of permission.  An Air Quality Assessment has been submitted which concludes that a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) to minimise emissions during construction would be required and that the proposed development trip generation did not exceed the relevant screening criteria outside of an Air Quality Management Area therefore detailed dispersion modelling was not required. An appropriate condition requiring submission of a CEMP can be attached to any grant of permission. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Trees/Ecology:**  The application has been accompanied by an Arboricultural Impact Assessment which identifies that trees within and adjacent to the site are protected by Tree Preservation Order 7/19/3/224 (Whalley Road, Mellor Brook)  There are a total of 21 trees within or adjacent to the site of various categories including category A and B trees, as well as seven groups and three hedgerows.  The survey identified three hedgerows all of which meet the description of the Habitat of Principal Importance as well as tree groups G2 and G6 are linear boundary features that also meet this description.  The assessment states that tree removal and retention is a reserved matter and would not be determined by this application except for the tree removal that is necessary to facilitate detailed parts of the layout i.e., the access. These are known effects and anticipated effects.  For this proposal the known effects would be the loss of one category U Ash tree (T21) and part of one hedgerow equating to 103m in order to facilitate the access together with a 40m retained length reduced in height to 1.5m together with the removal of 4 trees located within the hedgerow. Retained parts of the hedgerow would require pruning to reduce its height in order to accommodate the required visibility splays for the proposed access.  Further tree and hedgerow removal is anticipated to accommodate the amount of built form proposed. Most of the trees scheduled for removal are Ash and have symptoms of ash die-back or are poor quality category U trees and therefore their removal is accepted. The amount of hedgerow to be removed which is Habitat of Principle Importance is a concern at over 100m and this would have a significant impact on the visual impact on the site. Even if this was replaced the impact would not be immediately mitigated and therefore this would be contrary to Policies DME1 and DME2. From an ecology perspective however it is acceptable that hedgerow mitigation could be possible with suitable conditions.  Any tree work would need to be undertaken outside the bird nesting season or after a detailed inspection by a qualified ecologist to confirm the absence of nesting birds prior to works.  The woodland located to the southwest of the site is part of a wildlife corridor which extends from Abbotts Brow to Mellor Brook and then Mammon Wood. This would need to be considered as part of a habitat buffer with any potential lighting schemes taking into account this route in terms of protecting potential wildlife habitat.  A landscaping masterplan has been provided in respect of proposed detailed landscaping, with the landscaping shown on the proposed site plan being considered as being indicative with details of species mix and density being provided. In this respect the authority cannot ascertain whether the proposal would align with the requirements of Key Statement EN4 which requires a ‘net enhancement in biodiversity’. However, it is accepted that a suitable condition would be able to achieve this.  An ecology report, bat survey and Great Crested Newts (GCN) report have been submitted in support of the application. Whilst the conclusions of the ecology and bat survey are agreed in principle the report relating to great created newts is scant in detail and states that further surveys should be carried out. Whilst specific details of the Great Crested Newts including numbers, type, etc have not been obtained by the carrying out of further surveys, the LPA acknowledges that since the original application was submitted a provisional district level licence (DLL) from Natural England has been obtained and the planning application includes an IACPC signed for and on behalf of Natural England. In which case the LPA acknowledges that it would not be reasonable to require further surveys.  As a competent authority the Habitats Directive places a duty on local planning authorities to consider the three tests. As the development has a provisional DLL it is considered to meet the ‘favourable conservation status’ (FCS) test in the Habitats Regulations 2019 and so the LPA is required to consider the:-  ‘no satisfactory alternative’ test  ‘imperative reasons of overriding public interest’ (IROPI) test  There is not considered to be a satisfactory alternative in terms of developing the site. And in terms of the overriding public interest test, there would be benefits in the provision of jobs during the construction of the units as well as resulting from the end uses of the units. This would be considered an imperative reason of overriding public interest.  Under DLL, developers still need to survey and assess the impact of a proposed development on other protected and priority species and habitats; and follow avoidance, mitigation or compensation measures for these species.  The Preliminary Ecological Appraisal states that there are no records of badgers within the 2km search area. However, due to the presence of a sett less than 300m away from the site it would be appropriate to require a further walkover as well as reasonable avoidance measures to ensure that any setts or presence of badgers is addressed prior to any development. This can be controlled by an appropriate condition attached to any grant of permission.  Any external lighting and landscaping should be sensitive to the use of the site by bats and other wildlife and details of suitable compensation and enhancement features would need to be provided and agreed in accordance with appropriate conditions.  Based on the above the proposal would accord with policies Key Statement EN5 and policies DMG1, and DME3 in this regard subject to appropriate conditions attached.  Since the original application the development is subject to a statutory requirement to achieve at least 10% overall gain in Biodiversity.  The development will result in losses to habitats, hedgerows and watercourse units. The submitted Biodiversity Metric identifies that there will be gains in each of these based on the Indicative Landscape Plan. However given the limited space available within the application site when factoring in routed PROW (which LCC has indicated should be 2m with 3m clearance on either side) and infrastructure, it seems likely that the extent of hedge and tree planting required will be dependent on off-site habitat creation and/or enhancement will be required to compensate for habitat losses, and to achieve an overall net gain in Biodiversity. No details of any off-site tree planting or habitat provision have been proposed as part of the application. Likewise the Landscape Plan is unclear how the gains in watercourse units will be achieved on on-site and no details of off-site provision has been proposed.    Therefore the Council has concerns that the development will be unable to achieve the statutory BNG requirement on-site, and limited details of an off-site strategy have been provided. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Contributions:**    To mitigate the impact of the development on the highway network the following contributions are required:     * Travel Plan support £12,000; and * Public Transport support £100,000 over a 5-year period.   This could be controlled by a s.106 Agreement attached to any grant of permission.  NB a s.106 Agreement would also need to secure monitoring for BNG (even if on-site as this would be considered ‘significant’) and/or off-site provision. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Observations/Consideration of Matters Raised/Conclusion:**  For the reasons outlined above the proposed development is considered to be in significant direct conflict with Policy DMG1, DMG2 and EC1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy insofar that approval would result in a form of development that will significantly undermine and compromise this open countryside location outside of a defined settlement.  It is further considered that the proposed development would result in the introduction of an incongruous and discordant form of development that fails to respond positively to the inherent character of the area particularly when viewed from Public Footpaths which cross the site, being in direct conflict with Policy DMG1, DMG2 and DMB5 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.  The removal of over 100m of hedgerow Habitat of Principle Importance along a prominent frontage would result in an unacceptable visual impact contrary to Policies DME1 and DME2.  For the above reasons the principle of development is not supported by the development plan and would be in conflict with the development strategy for the Borough. This carries significant weight. Whilst it is acknowledged there would be economic benefits from the development, given the availability of existing employment sites to meet current needs, there are no material considerations in this case that would outweigh the harm identified and justify a deviation from the development plan.  As such, for the above reasons and having regard to all material considerations and matters raised that the application is recommended for refusal. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **RECOMMENDATION**: | | | |  | | | | | | | | | | | |
| That planning consent be refused for the following reasons: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **01** | The proposed development would result in large scale commercial development outside of a defined settlement which fails to meet any of the exception criteria for allowing development in such locations. Furthermore the rural location of the application site means that future users would be reliant on a private motor. The harm that would arise would be contrary to Policy DMG1, DMG2, DMG3 and EC1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy 2008 -2028 as well as the National Planning Policy Framework which supports sustainable patterns of development and seeks to promote sustainable transport. There are no material considerations which justify deviating from the Development Plan in this case. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **02** | The proposed development, by virtue of its overall scale and footprint, would result in the introduction of an incongruous, unsympathetic, and discordant form of development, of an overtly suburban appearance, particularly when viewed from the A59 approaching the site and Public Footpaths FP0304060, FP0304061, FP0304062, FP0304063 and FP0304064. The loss of over 100m of hedgerow (classed as Habitat of Principle Importance) adjacent to the prominent road frontage together with a further 40m of hedgerow being reduced to 1.5m in order to accommodate the site access and sightlines would result in further environmental harm. The resultant impact fails to protect key landscape features or respond positively to the inherent visual and landscape character of the area contrary to Policies DMG1, DMG2, DME1, DME2 and DMB5 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy 2008 – 2028. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **03** | The proposed development would result in the loss of existing habitat, hedgerow and watercourse units, with insufficient details being submitted to demonstrate an appropriate strategy for achieving the statutory requirement for Biodiversity Net Gain contrary to Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (inserted by the Environment Act 2021). | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |