


Late Items – Planning & Development Committee				 Ribble Valley Borough Council www.ribblevalley.gov.uk
Meeting Date: 13 MARCH 2025				
Briefing version		Issue Date:		
Committee Version	•	Issue Date:	13/03/2025	
Application Ref:	3/2023/0706	HIGHER COLLEGE FARM, LOWER ROAD, LONGRIDGE PR3 2YY	REC:	APPROVAL

Since the publication of the Committee Agenda the Committee are asked to note the following updates on this application:

Hothersall Parish Council have submitted an updated response as follows:

Hothersall Parish Council wish to object to the planning application being considered at the meeting on 13th March 2025 on the following grounds:

1. *The visual impact and massing of the development with the two blocks fronting onto Ribchester Road. We don't believe that the test for a higher standard of development on open and hitherto undeveloped land in a rural area in what is a transition from the settlement of Longridge into Hothersall has been met by this proposal. The previously approved application did meet this test and received the support of Hothersall Parish Council.*

This is the third very slight variation of the original application and we feel that a different design approach is required in order to create a high quality development at a crucial transition point from a settlement into a rural area and vice versa.

We would seek Placeshaping principles, often applied to housing developments to be applied to this commercial development to help soften the transition which sits opposite a residential area. It is important to recognize that this site already has an approved planning application.

2. *We also have concerns about surface water run-off from the hard surfaces if this is not drained, since there would be considerable impact on the adjacent farmland during periods of wet weather. The underlying sub soil is clay, which already causes issues for local farmers accessing fields during wet weather. We wish to minimize this impact in our rural community.*

We therefore object to this application as it is currently designed, but we would offer to work with the applicant to help achieve an acceptable design solution. We do support the need for employment space and we applaud the applicant for the incorporation of photovoltaic panels and battery storage, together with the enhanced bio-diversity in the proposals.

An additional representation has been received raising concerns about parking, both for contractors during construction and once the units are operating.

Application Ref:	3/2024/0858	BACKCASTLE WORKS, PENDLE COURT, LITTLE LANE, LONGRIDGE, PR3 3WY	REC:	REFUSAL
-------------------------	--------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------	----------------

Since the publication of the Committee Agenda the Committee are asked to note the following updates on this application:

1. Two representations have been received in support of the application, noting that the application supports small businesses which benefits the community. They note that small cost effective spaces are difficult to find. The representations note that parking is not an issue due to on-street parking and that users walk to the units. Comments have also been raised that the area is well maintained.
2. The main Committee report (page 46) identifies one objection having been received based on parking being shown incorrectly - to clarify this objection also raises concerns regarding the difficulty of finding a parking space for residents and gym users.

Application Ref:	3/2024/1016	1 TO 7 THE PICTURE HOUSE, GEORGE STREET, WHALLEY BB7 9TH	REC:	REFUSAL
-------------------------	--------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------	-------------	----------------

Since the publication of the Committee Agenda the Committee are asked to note the following updates on this application:

Supplementary information has been submitted by the applicant in response to concerns raised by the Planning Officer about the lighting scheme. No changes to the scheme as implemented are proposed but the applicant has undertaken a lighting assessment and details of this have been submitted to the officer on the 11th March, together with light meter readings.

The officer's observations are as follows:

No details of the person who has undertaken the assessment including details of their expertise (the person has been referred to as an expert by the planning agent), qualifications or company name have been provided.

The information has been reviewed by the Council's Environmental Health and their comments are as follows:

- *The issues for this site relate to the amenity perspective of residents and therefore the assessment should be made from the local resident's premises;*
- *The planning agent cites light guidance to argue their case Recommended Outdoor Lighting Levels: A Comprehensive Guide which is not the relevant guidance for assessing lights on existing residents and links to an American website whilst reference is made to the British Standard for outdoor lighting levels but this, in isolation, does not consider if the lighting installed would result in any unacceptable impacts to nearby residential receptors. There has been no consideration of the directionality of the lights, angling of the lights to illuminate downwards or consideration of any beam width. Having seen the lights installed they are of a wide beam angle, with no directionality or angling/shielding of the lights, the lights have been installed vertically, shining down towards the properties at the rear (Church Lane) which inevitably leads to overspill onto the existing properties and this is the issue that has not be satisfactorily addressed.*
- *The correct guidance for the installation and assessment of lights from an amenity perspective is the Institute of Lighting Professionals Guidance Note 1 for the reduction of obtrusive light 2021 for amenity protection of residents. Any measurements taken using this guidance must be in the vertical plane, from the existing resident's premises. It would appear from the photos submitted with the assessment that the light meter was used on the horizontal plane within the development site. Used in the wrong position this would measure the reflected light from the boundary wall and not provide accurate results.*

- *No details of the calibration of the device in terms of certificates or lab used to calibrate the device have been provided.*

Furthermore, amended plans of the rear elevation (plan ref: 2232-301) and rear boundary wall (2232-410) have been submitted on the 11th March.

The officer's observations are as follows:

The amended plans show a number of vertical aluminium slats proposed to be erected over more than half of the exposed rear gable with gaps of less than 100mm in an attempt to address the concerns of overlooking and loss of privacy from the external staircase used to access apartment G. It is not clear how effective this would be in terms of mitigation and there is concern about the introduction of a heavy screening with an industrial appearance that would be visually prominent on a building of townscape merit within the conservation area as well as the impact on the nearby listed buildings. In this regard the harm to the heritage assets would outweigh the benefit in terms of reducing overlooking, and it is considered that a more appropriate effective and sympathetic screen is required.

A supporting email confirms that the rear boundary wall has been constructed on the original foundations, however, the heights indicated on the amended plan (although slightly higher than previously submitted at 0.9m plus capping stone 0.55m) from the access road/public footpath does not seem to correspond with the built height and the height internally within the site is not clearly indicated. Further information in the form of a dimensioned elevational plan with section indicated have been requested.

In relation to the dark grey cladding described in the report i.e. on the rear gable and front dormer this has been confirmed as Anthracite coloured aluminium with standing seam detail, however the officer's views on this have not changed from those stated within the main report.

An image showing the proposed artificial box hedge to the top of the planter on the rear terrace has also been submitted. This image shows the proposal from the terrace and not from the rear public viewpoints nor has it been accurately reflected on the amended elevation plan (2232-301). The officer's views on this have not changed from those stated within the main report.