

Supplemental planning statement to that presented re initial delegated and refused application (reference 3/2012/1087 – decision notice dated January 29th 2013)

The applicants, their agent and the proposed occupants are most disappointed with the refusal to date, as we dispute the reasons for the decision which we believe to be flawed. We substantiate this by outlining the following:-

1. The site is indeed in a rural area as is the majority of the Ribble Valley; but, contrary to the refusal, is not isolated nor in an open location, nor is it agricultural.
 - It is immediately bounded by domestic buildings to the North and South, an urban speed restricted busy road to the East, and is hedged off from an adjacent agricultural field.
 - The proposed property would in fact be infill to the existing ribbon development at Osbaldeston Green, and thereby does not extend the ribbon. Given it is now curtilage to no 4 The Green, it follows this would be designated no 5 The Green.
 - It has been in domestic use by the owners of 1, 2 & latterly number 4 The Green for a minimum of 70 years and possibly as long as 207 years! This has accommodated stone buildings, green houses, an orchard, kitchen garden, car park and other storage, and therefore could be considered a brown field site.
2. The refusal also, cites the pre-application report which was conducted without any discussion with the applicants, thereby missing some of the salient points perhaps reversing some of the negative issues raised. It does however state that “...the principle of residential development for one unit in this location is accepted....”!
 - The report also refers to local need and affordable housing. As per the original planning statement, the applicant was approached by a local family in expensive rented very local accommodation, to build on the land in question. The savings made by the self build will make their permanent stay in the parish possible. i.e. by local standards, this is affordable housing, and it is not envisaged that it will go “open market”.
 - There is also reference to new builds being located “where they will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities”. Osbaldeston has relatively very few children and an also relatively aged population. The intended occupants are a young family, with young children who attend the parish school. Furthermore one of the parents is a governor at the school. They must surely satisfy this criteria.
 - The only reduction in hedgerow, is envisaged to be enough to form an entrance. It is also envisaged that an additional +/-40 yards of hedgerow would be planted to the North and South boundaries. Contrary to the report, perhaps excepting a couple of fruit trees, there are no trees with the curtilage that could be lost.
 - The report concedes that the site is “not overly isolated” in direct contradiction to the only reason for refusal by the officers.

In conclusion, once analysed the pre-application report seems to be more supportive than not.

3. Some time prior to refusal the agent discussed the progress of the application and was told that “they had no objections in principle to the development subject to a site visit which will determine if they consider the application site to be within the settlement of Osbaldeston Green, which is a key issue regarding this proposal and the only outstanding matter in advance of the delegated decision”. Post site visit there was no further contact with the Agent as promised and the opportunity to respond to the apparent issues raised was lost. This therefore is our main grievance and the primary reason for our resubmission.

Finally, Osbaldeston has had only one new build none tied house over the last c. 48 years, which in line with this application was also infill. The last local plan makes provision for the building of 15,000 new homes, most of which are not wanted by the majority of neighbours in the locations proposed. There has been little or no objection to date re this application, including the Parish council local highways etc. Given the positive factors in the proposal's favour, which limit its replication elsewhere, can it not be deemed Osbaldeston's contribution to the local plan?