

Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.

Application Ref:	3/2021/0374	 Ribble Valley Borough Council www.ribblevalley.gov.uk
Date Inspected:	~	
Officer:	AB	
DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:		REFUSED

Development Description:	Permission in Principle for a 4 bedroom detached house.
Site Address/Location:	Land Adjacent to 56 Knowsley Road West Wilpshire BB1 9PW

CONSULTATIONS:	Parish/Town Council
None received.	

CONSULTATIONS:	Additional Representations.
A total of 9 objections have been received and raise the following concerns:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The land is Green Belt land;• Would provide opportunity for future encroachment;• Not clear why this house needs to be so far from existing farmhouse;• Poor access;• House would obscure views from neighbouring properties;• Additional traffic;• Foul sewer may run through the site;• Concerns regarding public consultation process;	

RELEVANT POLICIES:

Ribble Valley Core Strategy:

Key Statement DS1 – Development Strategy
Key Statement DS2 – Sustainable Development
Key Statement DMI2 – Transport Considerations
Key Statement EN1 – Green Belt
Key Statement EN2 – Landscape
Key Statement EN3 – Sustainable Development and Climate Change
Key Statement EN4 – Biodiversity and Geodiversity
Key Statement H1 – Housing Provision
Policy DMG1 – General Considerations
Policy DMG2 – Strategic Considerations
Policy DMG3 – Transport and Mobility
Policy DME3 – Site and Species Protection and Conservation

National Planning Policy Framework

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:

Site Description and Surrounding Area:

This application relates to a plot of land located beyond the north-western end of Knowsley Road, Wilpshire. The site lies outside the defined settlement area of Wilpshire and is located in the Green Belt.

Proposed Development for which consent is sought:

Permission in Principle is sought for the erection of a new dwelling.

The permission in principle (PiP) consent route is an alternative way of obtaining planning permission for housing-led development which separates the consideration of matters of principle for proposed development from the technical detail of the development. The permission in principle consent route has 2 stages: the first stage (or permission in principle stage) establishes whether a site is suitable in principle and the second ('technical details consent') stage is when the detailed development proposals are assessed.

The scope of permission in principle is limited to location, land use and amount of development. Issues relevant to these 'in principle' matters should be considered at the permission in principle stage. Other matters should be considered at the technical details consent stage. In addition, local authorities cannot list the information they require for applications for permission in principle in the same way they can for applications for planning permission. It is not possible for conditions to be attached to a grant of permission in principle nor can planning obligations be secured and its terms may only include the site location, the type of development and amount of development.

The technical detail stage will provide the opportunity to assess the detailed design of the scheme to ensure that any impacts are appropriately mitigated and that the contributions to essential infrastructure, for example, are secured. If the technical details are not acceptable, the local authority can refuse the application.

Principle of Development:

Having regard firstly to the matters of land use and amount of development, it appears reasonable to suggest that the site could accommodate one dwelling with associated private amenity space and parking.

Detailed plans of the site layout and house types are not provided at this stage of the PiP application process and therefore any impact on adjacent land uses cannot be fully considered. However, the site is located next to existing residential development and bounds open agricultural land. There are no obvious concerns at this stage in terms of the compatibility of the proposed use with neighbouring land uses.

The latest published position in relation to housing land supply is contained in the Council's Five-Year Supply Statement (Published May 2020) which demonstrates a deliverable 13.9-year housing land supply from the base date of 31st March 2020 against a Local Housing Need Requirement figure of 143 dwellings per year calculated using the 'Standard Method' (as per para. 3. of PPG Guidance 'Housing supply and delivery'). Therefore, the Council is able to comfortably demonstrate a deliverable 5-year supply of housing land. The relevant policies for the supply of housing contained in the adopted Core Strategy can be afforded full weight and the presumption in favour of sustainable development is not engaged.

Taken from the Housing Land Availability Schedule (HLAS) March 2020, housing completion rates in the borough have significantly exceeded the Core Strategy housing requirement figure of 280 dwellings per year since 2014. The Government's objective to significantly boost the supply of homes is being met in the Ribble Valley.

Key Statement DS1 sets out the Borough's housing strategy and provides the overarching vision aimed at achieving a sustainable pattern of development. The majority of new housing development will be concentrated within the strategic site at Standen and the Borough's principal settlements of Clitheroe, Whalley and Longridge. In addition, development will be focused towards the Tier 1 Villages, which are the more sustainable of the 32 defined settlements. Wilpshire is identified as a Tier 1 Village by Key Statement DS1. 5.28 hectares of land is allocated for housing development by Policy HAL2 of the

adopted Housing and Economic Development DPD and this is sufficient to meet the housing requirements for the settlement.

Notwithstanding the above, the site lies in an area defined as Green Belt, outside of the Wiltshire settlement boundary. Core Strategy Policy DMG2 (1) states 'development proposals in the principal settlements of Clitheroe, Longridge and Whalley and the Tier 1 Villages should consolidate, expand or round-off development so that it is closely related to the main built-up areas, ensuring this is appropriate to the scale of, and in keeping with, the existing settlement.' The appeal proposal does not comply with the above part of Policy DMG2 (1) as the appeal site is not located in the principal settlements of Clitheroe, Longridge and Whalley or a Tier 1 Village.

The second part of Policy DMG2 therefore applies to the appeal site given its location in the Green Belt and outside of defined settlements areas. The provision of one new open market residential dwelling in this location fails to meet any of the considerations listed in Policy DMG2 (2).

The application sites lies within Green Belt and therefore Key Statement EN1 is engaged. Key Statement EN1 is in line with national policy providing the local interpretation of these national policies. Key Statement EN1 states that the overall extent of the green belt will be maintained to safeguard the surrounding countryside from inappropriate encroachment. The development of new buildings will be limited to the purposes of agriculture, forestry, essential outdoor sport and recreation, cemeteries and for other uses of land which preserve the openness of the green belt and which do not conflict with the purposes of the designation.

Chapter 13 of the NPPF refers to development proposals within the Green Belt and under paragraph 134, the five purposes of the Green Belt are outlined as:

- *To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas,*
- *To prevent neighbouring town merging into one another,*
- *To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment,*
- *To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns, and*
- *To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.*

Paragraph 143 of the Framework then goes on to say that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances (VSCs). Furthermore, under paragraph 144 it is established that substantial weight should be given to any harm to the Green Belt and 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

It must be recognised that not all development in the Green Belt is inappropriate, and these exceptions are established in paragraph 145 of the NPPF as:

a) buildings for agriculture and forestry;

b) the provision of appropriate facilities (in connection with the existing use of land or a change of use) for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation, cemeteries and burial grounds and allotments; as long as the facilities preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it;

c) the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building;

d) the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces;

e) limited infilling in villages;

f) limited affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in the development plan (including policies for rural exception sites); and

g) limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land, whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would:

- not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development; or*
- not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt, where the development would re-use previously developed land and contribute to meeting an identified affordable housing need within the area of the local planning authority.*

Certain other forms of development are also not inappropriate in the Green Belt provided they preserve its openness and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it.

The provision of a new dwellinghouse does not meet any of the exceptions and would therefore constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

Conclusion:

Taking the above into account, the proposals are contrary to Key Statement EN1 and Policy DMG2 of the Core Strategy and Section 13 ‘Protecting Green Belt Land’ of the NPPF.

As such, it is recommended that the application be refused.

RECOMMENDATION:

That planning permission be refused for the following reason(s):

- | | |
|-----------|---|
| 01 | The proposal is considered contrary to Policy DMG2 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy in that approval would lead to the creation of a new residential dwelling in the defined Green Belt, located outside of a defined settlement boundary, without sufficient justification and would create a harmful precedent for the acceptance of other similar unjustified proposals which would have an adverse impact on the implementation of the planning policies of the Council contrary to the interests of the proper planning of the area in accordance with core principles and policies of the NPPF. |
| 02 | The proposed development is contrary to the provisions of Key Statement EN1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and Section 13 of the National Planning Policy Framework in that the proposal does not fit within one of the exception categories for development in the Green Belt and thus the proposal is considered to represent inappropriate development within the Green Belt. No Very Special circumstances have been put forward which would outweigh the harm by reason of inappropriateness or any other harm caused to the openness of the Green Belt. |