



Our reference JDTPPL 316

Your reference 3/2021/0287

1st April 2021

Ribble Valley Borough Council
Planning Department
Council Offices
Church Walk
Clitheroe
Lancs
BB7 2RA

FAO Adam Birkett,

Dear Adam,

3/2021/0287 The Old Barn, Bowfields Lane, Baldestone BB2 7LW
Application for permission in principle - Proposed new dwelling within the garden boundary of existing dwelling.

I am writing on behalf of [REDACTED]
who wish to object to the above planning application.

The application has been submitted seeking permission in principle for 1 dwelling. The ability to make an application for permission in principle was introduced on the 1st June 2018 through The Town and Country Planning (Permission in Principle) (Amendment) Order 2017. The National Planning Practice Guidance – permission in principle (paragraph 011) states the application must be made in accordance with the development plan unless there are material considerations such as those in the National Planning Policy Framework. The scope of permission in principle is limited to location, land use and amount of development only these matters can be taken into account in reaching a decision on the application (paragraph 012).

Proposed development

The accompanying Design Statement states that the application seeks permission for one dwelling within the garden of The Old Barn

Location and land use

The site lies outside any defined settlement boundary in a predominantly open and rural location in an area designated as open countryside in the adopted Ribble Valley Housing and Economic Development DPD proposals map sheet 3. Whilst the property is within a group of dwellings it is in a relatively isolated location 0.8 miles to the west of the defined settlement boundary of Osbaldeston. Commons Lane is a rural lane with no footways or street lighting. There are no bus services along Commons Lane so that it cannot be considered to be a sustainable location so the occupants of the proposed dwelling, and visitors would be reliant on using cars to access the site.

The proposal is contrary to Key Statements and Policies in the Core Strategy including:

Key Statement DS1: Development Strategy which focuses new housing development to principle and tier 1 settlements.

Policy DMG2: Strategic consideration which resists development in the open countryside unless it is essential to the social well-being of the area or is for local needs housing which meets an identified need and is secured as such amongst other exceptions.

Policy DMH3: Dwellings in the open countryside and the AONB. Which limits residential development to meeting a specific need.

The application for permission in principle is for an open market dwelling not one that meets a specific local need such as an agricultural worker's dwelling. As the site is in the open countryside the proposal is clearly contrary to Key Statement DS1 and policies DMG2 and DMH3 and the National Planning Policy Framework. In granting permission, the Local Planning Authority would set a precedent for similar unsustainable patterns of development remote from local services contrary to the policies of the Core strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

The Design Statement refers to a number of historical planning applications near to the site. The majority of the developments are listed as "conversions". The creation of a dwelling through the conversion of an existing building such as a barn conversion is a well-established exception to the policy of not granting permission for new housing in the open countryside. This has no bearing on the suitability of the site for the construction of a wholly new built dwelling.

The proposed development will introduce a new dwelling into an area of open countryside and will have the effect of urbanising the landscape. This is contrary to Key Statement EN2: Landscape and Policy DME2: Landscape and Townscape Protection. Key Statement EN2: Landscape applies to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the open countryside.

The Design Statement which accompanies the application has several factual inaccuracies. The site is on land designated as open countryside not Green Belt. The site being part of the residential curtilage of the host dwelling does not exclude the site from designation as open countryside. The site is not within the designated Green Belt so the references to the National Planning Policy Framework in relation to the Green Belt are therefore irrelevant.

 also wish to make you aware of their concerns as follows:

1. The proposed building work would cause noise and inconvenience and danger for our grand children for approximately 2 years . All the builder's vehicles would have to come up Bowfields Lane and over our driveway which is very narrow and there is a high risk of

damage to our property. We have already had to put up with 5 years of building work at Balderstone Grange which has been renovated.

2. We cannot understand the statement that the access will be designed to accommodate fire vehicles because our driveway is very narrow and is bordered by stone walls.
3. The 5 houses in our cluster share a Klargestor sewage system which is already overloaded and could not serve another house .
4. The farm buildings which were demolished and buried had an asbestos roof.
5. Is that asbestos buried beneath the present lawn ?
6. We cannot understand how the existing trees could be preserved when a house is built with parking for 3 vehicles.

Conclusion

The application for permission in principle proposes a development which is contrary to the policies contained within the adopted Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework. It would result in the creation of a dwelling in the open countryside that fails to meet proven local need or deliver regeneration benefits. The proposal is in direct conflict with the aims and objectives of the development plan in that the granting of permission in principle would lead to the creation of a dwelling within the defined open countryside without sufficient justification. In addition, it would lead to development in an unsustainable location that does not benefit from adequate or suitable walkable access to services and facilities. Residents and visitors would be reliant on the car to gain access to the site as the site has no access to public transport. I trust that you will take these comments into account in reaching your decision.

Yours sincerely,

Judith Douglas