



pwa
planning

WOOD TOP FARM, CHIPPING ROAD, CHAIGLEY, PR3 2TS

Appeal under Section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (Planning Application Ref. 3/2025/0569).

Prepared for:
Mr & Mrs Moon

March 2026

Prepared by:
Catherine Johns



PWA Planning Ltd (trading as PWA Planning)
Registered office: Agriculture House, Stoneleigh Park, Kenilworth CV8 2TZ
Registered in England No. 8605706



REPORT CONTROL

Document type	Statement of Case
Project	Wood Top Farm, Chipping Road
Client	Mr & Mrs Moon
Job Number	24-1716

Document Checking

Primary Author	Catherine Johns
Contributor	
Reviewer	Daniel Hughes

Revision Status

Issue	Date

Contents

1. Introduction	3
2. Site and Proposed Development	6
3. Planning History	8
4. Relevant Planning Policy.....	10
5. Case for the Appellant	13
6. Conclusion	23

Appendix A: Officer's Report

Appendix B: Email to the LPA with drawing no. 2299-P06A

Appendix C: Appeal Ref. APP/T2350/W/25/3372635

1. Introduction

1.1.1 PWA Planning has been retained by Mr & Mrs Moon ('the Appellant') to progress an appeal against the decision of Ribble Valley Borough Council ('the Local Planning Authority') to refuse planning permission for the demolition of redundant barn and erection of farm worker's (self-build) dwelling to include new vehicular track at Wood Top Farm, Chipping Road, Chaigley, PR3 2TS ('the site').

1.1.2 The original application (LPA ref. 3/2025/0569) was refused on 5 September 2025. The Decision Notice specifies 2 reasons for refusal as follows:

- 1) *The proposal, by way of the provision of a two-storey residential dwelling and associated domestic curtilage which is sited separately from the existing pattern of development, would comprise an unacceptable intrusion into the Forest of Bowland National Landscape, in a prominent position that detracts from the visual and landscape character of the area. As such it would fail to comply with Ribble Valley Core Strategy Key Statement EN2 and Policies DME2, DMH3, DMG2 and DMG1, together with the National Planning Policy Framework (in particular paragraphs 135, 187 and 189).*
- 2) *Insufficient information has been provided with the application submission to demonstrate a suitable visibility splay can be achieved. As such the application fails to demonstrate that the development would have a safe access and so fails to comply with Ribble Valley Core Strategy Policies DMG1 (Highways) and DMG3.*

1.1.3 This Statement of Case (SoC) has been prepared in response to the refusal and will provide an overview of the appeal context before going on to demonstrate why the LPA were unjustified in their decision. The SoC should be considered alongside the original application supporting documents, which include:

- PWA Planning Statement (July 2025);
- Bat Survey;
- Agricultural Appraisal;

- Structural Condition Survey;
- Highway Report; and
- Drawn Information
 - Location Plan
 - Existing Site Plan drawing no. 2299-P02
 - Existing Building drawing no. 2299-P04
 - Proposed Site Plan drawing no. 2299-P03
 - Proposed Elevations and floor plans drawing no. 2299-P01
 - Plan showing extent of holding

1.1.4 The following plan is also submitted in support of this appeal:

- Visibility Splays drawing no. 2299-P06

1.1.5 This plan, along with an explanatory email as contained at **Appendix A**, was submitted to the LPA on 31 October 2025 prior to the determination of the application. However, the plan was not uploaded to the LPA's online register and the Local Highway Authority ('LHA') were not re-consulted in relation to the plan. We provide further detail in this regard at Section 5 of this Statement.

1.1.6 Additionally, a Landscape Appraisal has been undertaken as part of this Appeal submission. This is a direct response to Reason for Refusal 1. Following the undertaking of the assessment, minor tweaks have been made to the plans proposed as part of the application. They make the following changes:

1. Substituting a native hedge for the close board fence, reducing the domestic appearance of the boundary, directly responding to one of the concerns of the LPA.

2. The provision of an arched lintel above the patio window which reflect a detail found on many barn conversions in the locality which utilise former barn door openings. Again a response to comments within the LPA's officer report (contained in **Appendix B**).

1.1.7 The drawings are numbered as follows:



- 2299-P01A Proposed Plans and Elevations
- 2299-P03C Proposed Site Plan
- 2299-P05A Existing and Proposed Site Sections
- 2299-P06A Visibility Splays

1.1.8 It is understood that it's the Inspector's discretion as to whether they should be accepted or not.

2. Site and Proposed Development

- 2.1.1. A full description of the site and proposed development are provided in Section 2 and 4 of the Planning Statement submitted with the application.
- 2.1.2. In brief, the site comprises land opposite Wood Top Farm, which is situated off Chipping Road, Chaigley. Access to the site is obtained via a gate immediately off Chipping Road with a dilapidated barn located on the north east of the site.
- 2.1.3. The site is located within the Forest of Bowland Natural Landscape within a rural area located approximately 1.9 miles east of Chipping.
- 2.1.4. The Agricultural Appraisal submitted with the application provides full details of the farming operations at Wood Top Farm, with a summary provided in the Planning Statement. In brief, Wood Top Farm is a long-established and family-run dairy enterprise operated by Mr and Mrs Moon, alongside Mr Moon's two uncles. The holding comprises approximately 146.6 hectares of agricultural land. Labour demand on the farm equates to between 4.3 and 4.7 full-time equivalent workers based on industry-standard labour requirement models (Nix Farm Management Pocket Book and SAC Handbook). The business relies on the full-time involvement of Mr and Mrs Moon, with additional input from their uncles and occasional external contractors. The nature and intensity of the farm operations, particularly the year-round calving, twice-daily milking, and continuous care requirements for young stock, necessitate the presence of key workers on-site at all times to ensure animal welfare, security, and the smooth running of the enterprise.
- 2.1.5. The proposal is for the erection of a permanent agricultural worker's dwelling which would be occupied by the Appellant's and their children. The proposed dwelling is a two-storey, three-bedroom property designed in a traditional rural style, using materials and proportions that reflect the local vernacular. The proposed dwelling is set within a defined residential curtilage and accessed via an existing gravel track that connects to the wider farm complex. The proposal includes a permeable resin-bound driveway, EV charging point, paving around the dwelling,

and a timber cycle shed to meet highway requirements. A proprietary septic tank system is proposed for foul drainage.

3. Planning History

3.1.1. There are several planning applications of relevance to the wider Wood Top Farm site, these are set out at Section 3 of the Planning Statement.

3.1.2. In terms of the application site, the most pertinent planning application is ref: 3/2023/0620 for the proposed demolition of redundant barn and erection of farm worker's dwelling which was refused on 10th November 2023. The application demonstrates that the Appellants have been trying for several years to obtain consent for an agricultural worker's dwelling on the site due to the necessity for them to be on-site at all times to ensure animal welfare and the smooth running of the farm.

3.1.3. Although this previous application was refused, it is important to note that there have been changes in circumstance since the refusal, including:

- The Appellant is now a partner in the business, with one of the other partners unable to take on as much work as he is of ill health. On the basis of this changing situation, along with other evidence submitted with the application, primarily the submitted Agricultural Appraisal, the LPA are now of the view that the principle of a farm worker's dwelling at this location is acceptable, as set out in the Delegated Report.
- A Highway Report was submitted with the planning application subject to this appeal to provide further evidence in relation to the suitability of the proposed access arrangements. On the basis of this additional information, when consulted on the application, the Local Highway Authority ('LHA') acknowledged that improvements had been made to the access, parking provision and sustainable transport measures. However, a request was made for the submission of an amended visibility splay drawing. In response to the LHA's request, a Visibility Splay drawing (ref: 2299-P06) and explanatory email were submitted to the LPA during the determination process, but the LHA were not re-consulted on this drawing. Accordingly, the drawing is submitted in support of this appeal to address the LHA's comments; and

- The design of the proposed development has been amended since the previous refusal to reflect the comments received. The LPA are of the view, as set out in their delegated report, that the design of the appeal scheme is an improvement to the previously refused scheme by virtue of the introduction of traditional stonework to all elevations and a more simplistic fenestration pattern with simple glazing and stone surrounds. However, it is noted that the LPA maintain concerns in relation to the overall size and scale of the dwelling.

3.1.4. Since the 2023 decision, and indeed since the determination of the application subject to this appeal, there have been significant changes in the planning policy landscape. Since the determination of the previous application, the NPPF 2024 has been published which introduced several revisions. Of particular note to this appeal is the revision to paragraph 11d including the amendment to paragraph 11d(i) via the exchange of the word 'clear' to 'strong' reason for refusing development. This means that the significance of any conflict with the policies of the NPPF that protect areas of particular importance would need to be greater than was the case under the previous NPPF and when the previous application was determined.

3.1.5. In addition, and importantly, as will be discussed in further detail in the following chapters, the Council can no longer demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites. This fact means that in the determination of the appeal, paragraph 11d of the NPPF is engaged. On this basis, a case is made that the appeal should be allowed as the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance, which include the Forest of Bowland National Landscape in this case, do not provide a strong reason for refusing the development and that the benefits of the scheme outweigh any adverse impacts perceived by the LPA. Furthermore, there is also a case to be made that an approval could be granted without an agricultural tie restriction associated with it.

4. Relevant Planning Policy

- 4.1.1 Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires planning applications to be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The Development Plan for the appeal site comprises the Ribble Valley Core Strategy 2008 to 2028. Key policy documents that comprise 'material considerations' include the National Planning Policy Framework (2024), National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG), and any local supplementary planning guidance documents and decisions considered relevant to the proposal.
- 4.1.2 Within the Decision Notice and reason for refusal, the LPA refers to the following Development Plan policies:
- 4.1.3 **EN2 Landscape** states that the landscape and character of the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (now National Landscape) will be protected, conserved and enhanced with any development needing to contribute to the conservation and natural beauty of the area. The landscape and character of those areas that contribute to the setting and character of the Forest of Bowland Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty will be protected and conserved and wherever possible enhanced. As a principle the Council will expect development to be in keeping with the character of the landscape, reflecting local distinctiveness, vernacular style, scale, style, features and building materials.
- 4.1.4 **DME2 Landscape and Townscape Protection** outlines that developments should not harm important landscape or landscape features including traditional stone walls, ponds, characteristic herb rich meadows and pastures, woodlands and copses.
- 4.1.5 **DMH3 Dwellings in the Open Countryside and AONB** states that development in open countryside areas will be limited to agricultural or residential development that meets an identified local need, or an appropriate conversion of buildings to dwellings that is in keeping with their surroundings, and finally, for the rebuilding or replacement of existing dwellings.
- 4.1.6 **DMG1 General Considerations** assists in ensuring that development proposals are in line with overarching considerations regarding the quality of developments. The policy covers Design, Access, Amenity, Environment, Infrastructure and Others.

- 4.1.7 **DMG2 Strategic Considerations** assists in the interpretation of the Development Strategy and underpins the settlement hierarchy for the purposes of delivering sustainable development. 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.
- 4.1.8 **DMG3 Transport and Mobility** outlines that in making decisions on proposals, the Council will attach considerable weight to the availability and adequacy of public transport and associated infrastructure to serve those moving to and from the development.
- 4.1.9 The LPA also refer, in the decision notice, to the provisions of the paragraph 135, 187 and 189 of the NPPF.
- 4.1.10 **Paragraph 135** relates to achieving well-designed places. The paragraph sets out six design criteria which developments should adhere to including that developments should function well, be visually attractive, be sympathetic to local character, establish a strong sense of place, optimise the potential of the site and create safe, inclusive and accessible places.
- 4.1.11 **Paragraph 187** seeks to conserve and enhance the natural environment by amongst other measures protecting and enhancing valued landscapes.
- 4.1.12 **Paragraph 189** states that great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Landscapes which have the highest status of protection in relation to these issues. It is set out that the scale and extent of development within these designated areas should be limited.

Housing Land Supply Position

- 4.1.13 Appeal Decision ref: APP/T2350/W/25/3372635 (see **Appendix C**) dated 7th January 2026 confirms that the Council has a housing land supply equivalent to 3.45 years' supply of deliverable sites. Accordingly, the Council is unable to demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply.
- 4.1.14 This is a highly significant material consideration which fundamentally alters the planning policy context for this appeal. As set out in footnote 8 of the NPPF, where a local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites, its housing policies are

considered out-of-date. This engages paragraph 11d of the NPPF where planning permission should be granted unless the application of policies that protect areas of particular importance provides a strong reason for refusing the development or any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework as a whole.

5. Case for the Appellant

Principle of Development

5.1.1. As set out within the delegated report for the application, the LPA are in agreement with the Appellant that the proposals accord with Policy DMH3 and DMG2 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and paragraph 84 of the NPPF as there is a justified need for an additional agricultural worker dwelling at Wood Top Farm to accommodate 2 no full time workers, subject to an occupancy condition being attached to any consent. The Appellant would be agreeable to such a condition should the appeal be allowed. Given both parties agree that the principle of the development is acceptable, we provide limited commentary in this regard as part of this Statement. Paragraphs 6.1 – 6.19 of the Planning Statement and the Agricultural Assessment provide detailed information in relation to need for the development, we summarise the key points below:

- The agricultural worker's dwelling is needed to allow the Appellant's to properly run the farm and deal with issues that arise out of typical operating hours.
- The Agricultural Assessment provides clear evidence of a need for two agricultural workers to reside on the site to ensure the business is run safely and effectively.
- While the Appellant's uncles live on the farm, they are in their advancing years and can no longer undertake certain tasks on the farm or attend emergencies in the night.
- It has been demonstrated that Wood Top Farm is a long standing and established business which is financially viable, and it proposed to continue operating for years to come.
- A search of alternative accommodation found no suitable and available dwellings in the surrounding area.

5.1.2. In accordance with Policy DMH3 and DMG2 of the Core Strategy, the application submission demonstrates that there is an identified local need for the development with the functional and financial test having been applied, and that the development is necessary for the purposes of

agriculture. As set out in the delegated report, the LPA are in agreement that the proposal accords with these local plan policies.

Reason for Refusal 1

- 5.1.3. It is the LPA's view, as set out in the delegated report for the application, that the proposal would result in a harmful intrusion into the Forest of Bowland National Landscape that would detract from the visual and landscape character of the area. The Appellant does not agree with this stance. The existing barn on the site is dilapidated and constitutes an eyesore within the National Landscape. The poor state of repair of the existing barn is demonstrated by the photographs contained within the Structural Report. There is substantial damage to the stonework and timbers, broken windows and the use of cement/asbestos sheets to the roof which overall creates a rundown appearance which detracts from the landscape and scenic beauty of the Forest of Bowland National Landscape. Conversely, it is considered that the proposal represents an opportunity for the derelict barn to be replaced with an agricultural worker's dwelling which is of a high quality design which is sympathetic to its surroundings, which would bring significant benefits to the succession planning of the farm.
- 5.1.4. It is appreciated that the site is on the opposite side of the road to the main buildings associated with Wood Top Farm. However, the built development to the north of Chipping Road is flush with the roadside, and accordingly, the farm worker's dwelling would be clearly associated with, and viewed in the context of, the wider farm. The design of the proposed dwelling incorporates locally appropriate materials including natural stonework and slate tiles to reflect the local vernacular including the adjacent farmhouse. The dwelling will integrate well with its surroundings with the simple and traditional, yet high quality design, acting to improve the appearance of the site when compared to the existing run-down barn. It is considered that the dwelling will sit logically within the landscape given the cluster of agricultural buildings at this location, with the development forming a more attractive structure within the backdrop of Longridge Fell, as opposed to the existing derelict barn.
- 5.1.5. It is accepted that the proposed agricultural worker's dwelling is of a greater scale than the building it will replace. However, the scale needs to be considered in the context of the overall

improvements which will be delivered. The proportions of the dwelling are necessary to ensure that suitable living accommodation can be provided to meet the needs of Mr and Mrs Moon and their two children with an open-plan living space to meet modern needs provided on the ground floor, along with a utility/mud room and shower room which is an essential requirement following work on the farm. The first floor accommodation comprises 3-bedrooms along with bathroom facilities. It would not be possible to deliver a dwelling which would meet the needs of the Appellants within a building of the scale of the existing barn. The Appellant has sought to respond to the LPA's concerns raised during the refusal of application ref: 3/2023/0620 through the removal of the gable roof projections and vertical glazing which were previously proposed, however, it is considered that any further compromises in terms of the scale of the building would negatively impact on the quality of living space to be provided. The scale of the building is considered to be suitable in terms of the surrounding context, with the other comparable sized dwellings present in the local area.

5.1.6. The LPA have suggested that they may deem the scheme to be acceptable if the agricultural worker's dwelling were to be delivered on the opposite side of Chipping Road. However, this is not an option for the Appellant. As set out above, it is the Appellant's view that the site of the existing dilapidated building forms the most logical location for the agricultural worker's dwelling and the location which would have the least visual and landscape impact, given the existing barn at this location. In addition, the proposed site comprises a lesser farmed area of the wider farmstead and the positioning of the dwelling at this location would ensure the farm buildings are visible from the house which is beneficial from a security perspective. A new cow shed is likely to be required to the east of the main cluster of agricultural buildings in the near future, which forms a further reason that this area of land is not suitable. It would also not be possible for a dwelling to be situated between the two existing dwellings on the farmstead as a slurry pipe which carries slurry from the main pit to the reception wells throughout the farm passes between the two houses. It would not be possible to dig or build at this location given the presence of the pipe. Notwithstanding the commercial reasons why the dwelling could not be placed on the opposite side of Chipping Road, it is considered that the proposed site is the most appropriate location and would have the least impact on the landscape as the proposals will not result in a new built structure at this location, but will replace a poor quality barn which

detracts from the beauty of the surrounding area with a high quality building which has been designed to integrate well with and complement its surroundings.

- 5.1.7. As set out in the intro to this statement, a Landscape Appraisal has been undertaken as part of this Appeal submission, in response to Reason for Refusal 1. The assessment concludes with the following:
- 5.1.8. *The 1847 OS map shows several buildings on the north side of Chipping Road which appear to represent the existing farmhouse and adjoining brick building at Wood Top Farm. A building is also indicated on the south side of Chipping Road in the location of the existing barn. This structure is larger than the existing barn which suggests there was a building on the Application Site prior to the barn. During this period the farmstead was relatively small and clustered around the road corridor. Chipping Road would have been a minor country lane, routed through the farm. The farmstead was gradually expanded in the later part of the C19th and throughout the C20th. The structure shown on the south side of Chipping Road on the 1908 OS map and on later maps represents the existing barn. For a period, there was a holding pen located to the east of the barn.*
- 5.1.9. *The review of historic OS maps also confirms that the existing field pattern immediately around the existing barn and to the west is not historic but has been altered through changes in farm management. This has resulted in the loss of a holding pen to the east of the barn and the creation of a larger field to the west, where two fields have been combined. It is also noticeable that the historic route of Chipping Road has been previously altered by a realignment to remove two distinct bends between Brook Wood and Cherry Tree House. The property at Brook Wood is now set well back from the highway.*
- 5.1.10. *It is clear from a review of mapping, aerial photography and field work, that the existing barn is well related to the wider farmstead at Wood Top Farm and is and always has been part of the extended farmstead. Therefore, the only settlement pattern which is of relevance to the application site (in this rural, agricultural landscape) is that of the wider farmstead at Wood Top Farm. Fieldwork confirms there is no local viewpoint where the barn and other parts of the farm are not viewed in close proximity. Indeed, the barn is always perceived as part of the wider farmstead*

located on either side of Chipping Road. Gated access between the two sites reinforces this relationship.

- 5.1.11. *The proposed dwelling would be slightly set back from the existing barn but occupy a larger footprint than the existing structure. The rear elevation of the barn and the front elevation of the dwelling would broadly align and the small front door porch would project out towards the main farmstead. The proposed building would not extend beyond the farmstead limits when viewed from Chipping Road and the dwelling would utilise an existing field gate for access with a short drive screened by an existing hedge. New hedging would extend around the garden and provide substantial screening to the grounds.*
- 5.1.12. *The proposed building would be slightly more visible in the local landscape than the existing barn due to the increased scale but it would have no greater invisibility in the wider landscape than the existing structure due to screening elements such as vegetation and the farm buildings. There are likely to be no significant views of the proposed dwelling beyond 250m from Chipping Road or in any other public view. The extent of visibility is similar to the existing barn. Where views occur, the dwelling would be closely related to the existing farmstead and would not appear incongruous in the landscape where new or refurbished farmhouse properties are clearly visible in the locality forming part of farm conversions or diversification, which are common. There would be no loss of local landscape features which contribute to local distinctiveness accepting the eventual loss of the existing barn which is in such poor condition that it has no viable future use and will eventually become an unidentifiable ruin. A short section of existing hedge would be lost due to the development. The affected field boundary would be realigned with a new native hedge.*
- 5.1.13. *There would be no effect on a historic landscape pattern as surrounding fields have been previously altered by changes in farming practice. Any changes to the pattern of development across the established farmstead would be barely discernible in the wider landscape. Any potential visible change would only be perceived within 250m of Wood Top Farm. This analysis clearly indicates that the proposed property does not occupy a prominent position in the wider landscape and does not affect features which have special historic or landscape importance. The development does not affect the setting of a heritage asset and does not feature prominently in key views across the wider landscape.*

- 5.1.14. *There is no potential for a single residential dwelling in this location, designed in the local modern/traditional vernacular and closely related to a large established farmstead, to generate significant landscape effects on the character areas/types defined in this part of the Bowland Forest National Landscape or indeed, across the wider AONB.'*
- 5.1.15. The appraisal confirms there are no strong reasons to refuse the application on landscape grounds. The minor amendments to the drawings only strengthen this position further. It would not impact on the pattern of development, it would not represent an unacceptable intrusion in to the National landscape and it is not located in a prominent position.
- 5.1.16. In summary, in accordance with Policy EN2, DME2, DMG1 and DMG2 of the Core Strategy, the proposal will protect and conserve the Forest of Bowland National Landscape, and there will be no significant harm as part of the proposal.
- 5.1.17. Specifically, in terms of EN2, the proposal will protect and conserve the National Landscape, and the build reflects both the character of the landscape and local distinctiveness. In relation to DME2, the landscape will not be significantly harmed. Turning to DMG1, it is not clear where the LPA consider a policy conflict to lie in relation to Reason for Refusal 1, however, the proposal, as commended by the Landscape Appraisal will not lead to significant landscape effects on the character areas/types defined by the Bowland Forest National Landscape. Finally, in relation to DMG2 the proposal, as previously iterated will protect and conserve the National Landscape.

Reason for Refusal 2

- 5.1.18. The LPA's second reason for refusal states that insufficient information has been provided with the application submission to demonstrate a suitable visibility splay can be achieved and therefore that the applicant has failed to demonstrate that the development would have a safe access to comply with Core Strategy Policies DMG1 (Highways) and DMG3.
- 5.1.19. As set out at Section 3, during the determination period, the Appellant was made aware of the LHA's request for additional information to be submitted in the form of an amended visibility

splay drawing in order that the LHA would be in a position to further assess the highway implications of the proposal. In response to this request, a Visibility Splay Plan (ref: 2299-P06), along with an explanatory email, were submitted to the LPA on the 31 October 2025, prior to the determination of the application. This email is contained at **Appendix A** of this Statement. The LPA did not re-consult the LHA in relation to the additional information but proceeded to determine the planning application later the same day. Accordingly the Visibility Splay Plan and explanatory note are submitted with this appeal. The Plan shows a visibility splay of 41m to the left based on the application of Manual for Streets guidance and the design speed of 28.8mph south-eastbound recorded at this location. A visibility splay of 90m is shown to the right based on Design Manual for Roads and Bridges guidance Table 2.10 and the recorded design speed of 37.5mph. Indeed, the application of MfS guidance at this location would require a visibility splay of only 59m, therefore, it is considered that the 90m splay is more than sufficient.

- 5.1.20. It should be noted that the LHA have not objected to the proposals and merely asked for additional information to be submitted by the applicant in the form of an amended visibility splay drawing in order that the LHA would be in a position to further assess the highway implications of the proposal. Indeed, the LHA set out in their consultation response that they had *'reviewed the proposed development and acknowledges the improvements made to the access, parking provision and sustainable transport measures such as cycle storage and EV charging.'*
- 5.1.21. It is considered that the submitted Visibility Splay Plan fully responds to the LHA request for further information in this regard and demonstrates that a suitable and safe access can be achieved at the site. It is therefore concluded that the development accords with Policy DMG1 (Highways) and DMG3 as a safe access can be provided which is suitable to accommodate the scale and type of traffic likely to be generated, which in this case will be minimal given the proposal is for a single dwelling. Indeed, the forecast traffic generation from the dwelling is fewer than one vehicle movement per hour in peak periods. As the proposal will allow the Appellant's to live at their place of work, this will reduce vehicle movements compared to the existing trips which they need to take between their home and the farm. Paragraph 116 of the NPPF is clear that development should only be prevented or refused on highway grounds if

there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network, following mitigation, would be severe, taking into account all reasonable future scenarios. As the submitted Visibility Splays and accompanying email clearly show that a safe and suitable access can be provided, with no further concerns having been raised by the LHA, the proposal should be deemed acceptable in highway terms.

Planning Balance

- 5.1.22. As has been explained in detail above, it is agreed by both parties that the principle of an agricultural worker's dwelling at this location is acceptable in principle. In addition, the Appellant deems the scheme to accord with development plan policies relating to landscape and visual impact, including Policies EN2, DME2, DMH3, DMG1 and DMG2, as the proposal will conserve the landscape and scenic beauty of the Forest of Bowland National Landscape, with an opportunity for enhancement via the removal of a dilapidated building and the introduction of well design, yet simple and traditional, farm worker's dwelling. The Visibility Splay Drawing and accompanying email demonstrate that a safe and suitable access to the site can be delivered in accordance with Policies DMG1 and DMG3.
- 5.1.23. Notwithstanding the Appellant's view that the proposals accord with the development plan, as we have set out at Section 4, as the Council cannot currently demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply, paragraph 11d) of the NPPF is engaged. Accordingly, planning permission should be granted unless: the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance, such as the Forest of Bowland National Landscape, provides a strong reason for refusing the development proposed; or any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.
- 5.1.24. Further to this, it's worth identifying the weight that should be attached to the need for the proposal, given it will provide an agricultural workers dwelling, the need of which has been affirmed by the LPA. This aside, it could be argued that the case presented would be acceptable to a typical market dwelling in this location (given the Landscape Appraisal presented as part of the appeal) in light of the LPA's current lack of 5 year housing land supply. The LPA currently

has an acute need for housing, in this respect it could be argued that an agricultural tie to make the scheme acceptable in planning terms is not necessarily needed. However, the fact it is for an agricultural need, and this is agreed between both parties, only adds to the weight in favour of the proposal, in even a tilted or flat balance scenario. In this respect, the below sets out the matters in favour of the proposal.

- 5.1.25. Firstly, it is not considered that the policies which seek to protect the Forest of Bowland National Landscape provide a **strong** reason for refusing the proposal. Paragraph 189 of the NPPF states that great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Landscapes. As we have set out in detail above, there is no potential for a single residential dwelling in this location, designed in the local modern/traditional vernacular and closely related to a large established farmstead, to generate significant landscape effects on the character areas/types defined in this part of the Bowland Forest National Landscape or indeed, across the wider AONB. Paragraph 189 goes on to state that the scale and extent of development with National Landscapes should be limited. The proposal is for a single agricultural worker's dwelling which will replace an existing barn, accordingly, the extent of the development is deemed to be limited. Even if the Inspector were to consider that the proposed development would result in some harm to the National Landscape, given the small scale nature of the development, any such harm would be limited, particularly in the wider context of the National Landscape, and therefore would not constitute a strong reason for refusal.
- 5.1.26. In applying the tilted balance set out at paragraph 11d of the NPPF, the proposal will deliver a range of economic, social and environmental benefits in accordance with the objectives of sustainable development. Clear economic and social benefits will be realised through the delivery of the agricultural worker's dwelling as it will allow the Appellants to reside at the farmstead thus ensuring a high standard of animal welfare and supervision to assist the farming business in operating effectively financially and in terms of health and safety. The provision of the dwelling will support the long term viability of the farm which will have wider economic benefits through the provision dairy production. The NPPF clearly sets out that significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth and productivity, and accordingly, significant weight should be afforded to the economic benefits of the scheme in

supporting the continuation of the farming activities at this location. As a small site, the proposal can be built out quickly, providing a swift boost and contributing to the Council's current lack of housing land supply. The benefit of delivering a dwelling at a time when the Council cannot demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply should carry substantial weight. Further economic gains will be realised during the construction process both directly through the employment of local people and companies and indirectly through the supply chain, which should be afforded moderate weight.

- 5.1.27. In terms of social benefits, the proposed development would result in the creation of a high-quality environment for the Appellants, allowing them to live on site and ensure the business is kept safe and overcome issues that they are currently having with the management of the business affecting their ability to enjoy their personal lives from travel and long hours, which cannot continue indefinitely.
- 5.1.28. Environmentally, the proposal makes effective use of land through the demolition of the existing redundant barn and the creation of a high quality agricultural worker's dwelling, with the proposals including EV charging points and cycling parking in support of mitigating and adapting to climate change. The application submission and the submitted Bat Survey also demonstrate that the demolition of the barn will not harm bats or result in the loss of any high-value habitat.
- 5.1.29. Whilst the site is not located within a defined settlement, the location is sustainable as it will allow the key workers at the farm to reside at that place of work. This will eliminate the substantial movements which currently need to take place from the Appellant's existing property to and from the farm every day.
- 5.1.30. Any perceived harm raised by the LPA relating to the visual and landscape impacts of the scheme is considered to be limited and would not override the clear and substantial benefits of the proposal set out above.

6. Conclusion

- 6.1.1. It is the Appellant's stance that the proposals for the demolition of the redundant barn and erection of a farm worker's dwelling represents a sustainable and appropriate form of development that, overall, aligns with the Development Plan and national planning objectives.
- 6.1.2. It is agreed by the Appellant and the LPA that the principle of development is acceptable.
- 6.1.3. The outstanding highway matter relating to the scheme, specifically the request of the LHA for an amended visibility splay drawing to be submitted, has been addressed through the submission of drawing ref: 2299-P06 and the accompanying note. It has been demonstrated that a safe and suitable access to the development can be created, and accordingly, the appeal should not be dismissed on highway grounds.
- 6.1.4. It is the Appellant's view that the proposals will conserve and enhance the Forest of Bowland National Landscape with the small scale proposal for a single farm worker's dwelling to replace the existing dilapidated barn on the site resulting in the removal of the derelict building at this location which detracts from the beauty of the landscape and its replacement with a well designed, yet simple structure, which integrates well with the local vernacular. Accordingly, the Appellant's consider the scheme accords with the development plan and the appeal allow on this basis.
- 6.1.5. Notwithstanding this, as the Council cannot currently demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply, paragraph 11d of the NPPF is engaged. There are no strong reasons, when applying the policies of the NPPF relating to National Landscapes, that the development proposed should be refused. In addition, the significant benefits of the scheme, the most substantial of which include the provision of a farm worker's dwelling to ensure the continued operation of the farm business which provides a valuable contribution to the economy and the dwelling providing an invaluable contribution to the local authority's housing supply at a time when a 5-year supply cannot be demonstrated. Any impacts of the scheme, as perceived by the LPA, in terms of the visual and landscape impacts of the development would be minor in nature, indeed, it is the Appellant's view that the proposal would form a more sympathetic structure within the National

Landscape when compared to the existing dilapidated barn. As such any adverse impact would not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the clear and substantial benefits of the scheme and the scheme should be allowed.



pwa
planning

Lockside Office Park
Lockside Road
Preston
PR2 2YS

01772 369669
info@pwaplanning.co.uk
pwaplanning.co.uk

DISCLAIMER

This report is for the sole use of the named client. While it may be shown to other professionals acting for them, the contents are not to be disclosed to, nor made use by, any third party without our express prior written consent. Without such consent we can accept no responsibility to any third party.



PWA Planning Ltd (trading as PWA Planning)
Registered office: Agriculture House, Stoneleigh Park, Kenilworth CV8 2TZ
Registered in England No. 8605706

