

RECOMMENDATION FOR PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

REFUSAL

DATE: 13 NOVEMBER 2014

REF: CS/EL/CMS

CHECKED BY:

APPLICATION NO: 3/2014/0687/P (GRID REF: SD 370556 434580)
PROPOSED OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION FOR UP TO 132 RESIDENTIAL DWELLINGS AND ASSOCIATED ACCESS, LANDSCAPING AND OTHER NECESSARY WORKS ON LAND OFF LONGSIGHT ROAD, LANGHO

PARISH COUNCIL: Billington and Langho Parish objects to this application for the following reasons:

The proposed development is contrary to Policies G1, G5, ENV 6 and H2 of the Ribble Valley District Wide Plan.

1. Policy G1 - Concerns re access to the site

The A59 is a major East-West traffic link and is classed as a Road of Regional Significance in LCCs Functional Road Hierarchy. In the Functional Road Hierarchy, roads and paths are categorised in terms of function and actual use. The safe, effective and efficient movement of motor vehicles is balanced against the needs of other transport and non-transport users. The hierarchy is seen as the foundation of a coherent, consistent and auditable approach to managing the road network. The hierarchy recommends that development should be limited on these roads. There is no highway justification to permit the proposed development.

This development should be refused in the interests of road safety, good highway design and the free flow of traffic along this road of regional significance for the following reasons,

- The proposed development will lead to an increase in turning traffic along the A59 which will increase the risk of further accidents and adversely affect the free flow of traffic. In addition to the vehicular traffic generate by the proposed housing, the developers compound the problem by adding 20 additional parking places for Langho railway station within the curtilage of the development.
- a previous application opposite the propose development was refused due to these reasons:

- The egress from the proposed development onto the A59 will mirror the adjacent Northcote Road junction (no right turn across the traffic flow), This forces all traffic heading to the main village of Langho and beyond in a southerly direction (Blackburn, Manchester) and easterly direction (East Lancashire and all points east of this development) will be forced to use Whitehalgh Lane or Chapel Lane as the next element of their route. Both these roads are effectively single track in places and contain several sharp and blind bends. The junction of the A59 and Whitehalgh Lane/Chapel Lane is a dangerous high-speed junction with some limited sight lines.

Policy G1 of Ribble Valley District Wide Plan states - all development proposals will be expected to provide a high standard of building design and landscape quality. Development which does so will be permitted, unless it adversely affects the amenities of the surrounding area. In determining planning applications the following criteria will be applied:

- (a) Development should be sympathetic to existing and proposed land uses in terms of its size, intensity and nature.
- (b) The likely scale and type of traffic generation will be assessed in relationship to the highway infrastructure and the proposed and existing public transport network. This will include safety, operational efficiency, amenity and environmental considerations.
- (d) A safe access should be provided which is suitable to accommodate the scale and type of traffic likely to be generated.
- (e) The density, layout and relationship between buildings is of major importance. Particular emphasis will be placed on visual appearance and the relationship to surroundings as well as the effects of development on existing amenities.

2. Policy G5

States that outside the main settlement boundaries and the village boundaries planning consent will only be granted for small-scale developments which are:

- i) essential to the local economy or the social well-being of the area; or
- ii) needed for the purposes of agriculture or forestry; or
- iii) sites developed for local needs housing (subject to Policy H20 of this plan); or

- iv) small scale tourism developments and small scale recreational developments appropriate to a rural area subject to Policy RTI; or
- v) other small-scale uses appropriate to a rural area which conform to the policies of this plan.

3.2.18 This policy recognises the need to protect the countryside from inappropriate development. In doing so, it must be accepted that the countryside is a working area and a source of many Ribble Valley residents' livelihoods. As such it is subject to change and to development pressures. If properly managed, these can be accommodated without harming the basic character of the area.

This application fails to meet these criteria.

3. Policy ENV 6 - The land is described as lowland fringe farmland.

Positive landscape elements in the lowland fringe farmland are:

- The unspoilt settlements and their characteristics vernacular with only limited new development, well related to existing buildings;
- The open spaces in villages;
- Absence of urbanisation;
- Strong field pattern and well managed hedgerows, walls and fences;
- Trees, woodlands, hedgerows and hedgerow trees, particularly semi natural vegetation and trees native to the area;
- Open land which allows views of open water, rivers, becks and waterfalls;
- Herds of dairy cattle.

Existing or potential landscape detractors include:

- Intrusive, inappropriate and insensitive siting and design of new development,
- Telegraph and electricity poles and overhead wires;
- Road improvements including widening and straightening;

The Borough Council will safeguard the best and most versatile

- agricultural land (as classified by the Ministry of Agriculture) unless it can be shown that the need for development overrides agricultural considerations:
- any agricultural land taken should be the minimum required to meet
- essential needs; ENV 6

4. Policy H2 – Dwellings in the open countryside – Outside the settlement boundaries residential development will be limited too.

- Development essential for the purposes of agricultural or forestry or other uses wholly appropriate to the rural area.
- Residential development specifically intended to meet a proven local need
- The protection of attractive open countryside is an important element of both national and county planning policy – to achieve this development in the countryside must be strictly controlled.

The proposed development does not meet the criteria within Policy H2.

In addition to the contravention of these policies the Parish Council objects because,

- The proposed development is an over development of the area and is further erosion of land around a village. The railway line has traditionally been the natural boundary of the village and this development will cause an unnecessary spread leading to a ribbon development. It will have a detrimental impact upon residential amenities and the visual impact will also be detrimental. This includes the impact on the character of the area, the effect on the local infrastructure, density and over development.
- The effect on public services such as drainage and water supply. There is local knowledge of limited sewer capacity and the sewers have overflowed in the past.
- The development is also contrary to Key Statement DS1 and policies' DMG2 and DMH3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy Proposed Main Modifications (May 2014) in that the approval would lead to the creation of new dwellings in the open countryside without sufficient justification which would cause harm to the development strategy for the borough as set out in the emerging core strategy leading to unsustainable development.
- The proposed development would set a precedent for the acceptance of other unjustified proposals which would have an adverse impact on the implementation of the emerging 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 National Planning Policy Framework.

PARISH COUNCIL:

Wilpshire Parish Council has commented that a permission for

this application would lead to more pressure on the infrastructure and more traffic onto the A666 and A59; and would also result in ribbon development.

ENVIRONMENT
DIRECTORATE
(COUNTY SURVEYOR):

The County Surveyor has no objections to the application in principle subject to a number of matters being addressed through the imposition of appropriate conditions and advisory notes on any planning permission that might be granted. The County Surveyor explains the considerations that led to this conclusion as follows:

Site access will be via a newly constructed vehicular access on to Longsight Road (A59) to the west of Northcote Road. Pedestrian access will be via the proposed new entrance and also through a pedestrian subway at Langho rail station. The proposal was the subject of pre-application discussions with an agreed scoping study.

Vehicular Access

The principle of the vehicular access onto the Longsight Road is acceptable and I would suggest certain similarities between the junction layout proposed and the site at Rydings which is situated further west along Longsight Road. I would consider the latter development being similar to the proposed development in terms of composition and traffic generation. A review of the recorded injury accidents at the Rydings/Longsight Road junction reveals that there have been none in the past 5 years. In view of this, the proposed junction layout is considered to be acceptable for the size of development proposed but the precise details will necessarily be subject to a detailed design and safety audit.

Pedestrian Access

Due to the lack of a site frontage onto Northcote Road pedestrian access into the development is restricted to the proposed access onto Longsight Road and the pedestrian subway at Langho Station. A pedestrian footway is proposed along the site frontage to Longsight Road with a pedestrian refuge at the western end and also connections to Northcote Road. To the south, access to Whalley Road A666 Langho and its amenities is through a pedestrian subway at the rail station. The subway is illuminated but appears to suffer from poor drainage and has a low ceiling. The other drawback is the number of steps which have to be negotiated. Unfortunately due to the involvement of third party land, alterations to improve the access is limited, nevertheless I would expect the developer to use his best endeavours to secure improvements to the accessibility and fund lighting /drainage improvements. Unfortunately in its present form, the subway is inaccessible to pedestrians with mobility issues and due to the barrier presented by the rail line the alternative route would have to be via Northcote Road. This is a lightly trafficked cul-de-sac with street lighting and some footway provision.

Cycle Access

Longsight Road has a shared pedestrian /cycle facility on its north side which connects to Northcote Road with a route towards Whalley. As part of the proposal I would require that the footway proposed on the south side be a shared cycle facility (minimum width 3m) allowing users to access both the proposed site and Northcote Road.

Unfortunately cycle links to Whalley Road are restricted by the subway nevertheless, the route may benefit some cyclists who would be prepared to carry their cycles up the steps and the internal estate links to the subway should allow for cycle access.

Traffic Generation

The traffic generation figures used in the Assessment are acceptable and were agreed in the pre-application scoping study.

Future Growth Year

The Transport Assessment uses a base year of 2015 and a future assessment year of 2020 which, assuming a 2015 start year, represents a build out of 26 dwellings per year which is achievable

Traffic Distribution

The consultant has assumed that site for the Whalley Road (A666) and routes to Blackburn will turn right out of the site and use the roundabout. Whilst I would disagree with this assumption and suggest that Whitehalgh Lane to the west would be an attractive alternative, the consultant has provided an alternative routeing scenario to allow Whitehalgh Lane to be used in the form of a sensitivity test.

Junction Analyses.

In the agreed scoping study the following 4 junctions were identified as requiring analysis to assess the impact of the development on their capacities.

1) A59 Roundabout

The Arcady results for the A59 roundabout show that whilst 3 of the 4 arms will operate within capacity in both 2015 and 2020, the A59 (east) arm is operating at or above 87%capacity in the am peak in 2015 and 75% capacity in the pm peak. In light of the 2020 forecast (with development) the situation will worsen with the arm approaching 94%capacity. This would not be acceptable and a highway scheme will be required to increase the capacity of this arm.

2) Whitehalgh Lane Whalley Road (mini roundabouts)

As mentioned previously , I have raised concerns regarding the assumption that all A666 (Blackburn) traffic from the development will use the A59 Roundabout. The transport Assessment provides an analysis of the junctions using the alternative routeing of vehicles using Whitehalgh Lane which indicates that the mini-roundabouts will operate within capacity in 2020 (with development). The junction is therefore acceptable.

3) Site Access Longsight Road

Although the analysis for the junction does not account for left turns out of the site (towards Whitehalgh Lane) the 2020 analysis for the junction does not suggest that this omission will affect the operation of the junction. The junction is therefore acceptable subject to detailed design and safety audit.

4) Whitehalgh Lane / Longsight Road

Using the sensitivity test scenario with all A666 traffic turning left out of the site, the junction will operate well within capacity in 2020. The junction is therefore acceptable in capacity terms, however it was noted during my sight visit that the property on the corner has recently planted some shrubs along the boundary wall. Whilst these are outside the remit of the highway authority the relocation of a highway sign and the pruning / removal of vegetation in the verge would benefit visibility to the west.

Comments on Travel Plan

This development is in excess of our Travel Plan submission threshold. An Interim Travel Plan for the site has been developed that meets LCC Highway's criteria. It is, however, important that the Interim Travel Plan is adhered to and that a Full Travel Plan is developed and implemented in line with agreed timescales. The Full Travel Plan when developed would need to include the following as a minimum:

- Contact details of a named Travel Plan Co-ordinator
- Results from residents travel survey
- Details of cycling, pedestrian and/or public transport links to and through the site
- Details of the provision of cycle parking for any properties where suitable storage is not available.
- Objectives
- SMART Targets for non-car modes of travel, taking into account the baseline data from the survey
- Action plan of measures to be introduced, and appropriate funding
- Details of arrangements for monitoring and review of the Travel Plan for a period of at least 5 years

Subject to the above concerns being addressed satisfactorily there would be no objection to the proposal on highway grounds subject to the imposition of conditions to cover the following matters:

1. The new estate road/access between the site and Longsight Road to be constructed in accordance with the Lancashire County Council Specification for Construction of Estate Roads to at least base course level before any development takes place within the site.

2. The Rail Station car park to be surfaced or paved in accordance with a scheme to be approved by the Local Planning Authority and to provide for the safe and secure parking of cycles and motorcycles.

3. No part of the development to be commenced until all the highway works have been constructed in accordance with a scheme that shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority For the avoidance of doubt these works shall include the A59 westbound approach to the Petre Roundabout, carriageway widening and ghost island at the site entrance

4. No part of the development to be commenced until a scheme for the construction of the site access and the off-site works of highway improvement has been submitted to, and approved by, the Local Planning Authority.

5. No part of the development to be occupied until the approved scheme referred to in Condition 4 has been constructed and completed in accordance with the scheme details.

6. No development to be commenced until a Framework Travel Plan has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The provisions of the approved Framework Travel Plan to then be implemented and operated in accordance with the timetable contained therein unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

7. The Framework Travel Plan must include a schedule for the submission of a Full Travel Plan within a suitable timeframe of first occupation, the development being brought into use or other identifiable stage of development.

8. Where the Local Planning Authority agrees a timetable for implementation of a Framework or Full Travel Plan, the elements are to be implemented in accordance with the approved timetable unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. All elements shall continue to be implemented at all times thereafter for as long as any part of the development is occupied or used/for a minimum of at least 5 years.

9. No development to take place until a Construction Method Statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority

10. The developer is to provide a S106 contribution not exceeding £70,000 to fund various off site works improvement works and to include improvements to the subway at the rail station, signing and lining improvements on Whitehalgh Lane and junction improvements at the Longsight Road / Whitehalgh Lane junction.

Notes relating to the following matters will also be required on any planning permission that is granted:

1. The grant of planning permission will require the applicant to enter into an appropriate Legal Agreement, with the County Council as Highway Authority.

2. This permission does not give approval to a connection being made to the County Council's highway drainage system.

3. For a contribution of £6,000 Lancashire County Council's Travel Planning Team can provide a range of services relating to the required Travel Plan

4. The grant of planning permission does not entitle a developer to obstruct a right of way and any proposed stopping-up or diversion of a right of way should be the subject of an Order under the appropriate Act. Public Right of Way 3-6-fp6a runs close/adjacent to the site.

LANCASHIRE COUNTY
COUNCIL (PLANNING
CONTRIBUTIONS):

Following an assessment made on 15 August 2014, the County Council initially made a request for a financial contribution towards the provision of 50 primary school places, but with no contribution required in respect of secondary school places.

Following a more recent assessment, however, in which other proposed developments have been taken into account, the County Council confirmed on 28 October 2014 that this reassessment has resulted in there now being no requirement for any education contribution in respect of either primary or secondary school places.

The County Council also stated, however, that there may be a request for a contribution from the Highways and Sustainable Transport Teams in relation to the application. That matter is covered in the separate consultation response from the County Surveyor as stated above.

LANCASHIRE COUNTY
COUNCIL (ARCHAEOLOGY):

Have checked their records and confirmed that there are no significant archaeological implications.

ENVIRONMENT AGENCY:

The Environment Agency has no objection in principle to the proposed development subject to the inclusion of appropriate conditions.

In relation to flood risk, the application site is greater than 1 hectare in size and lies within Flood Zone 1, which is defined as having a low probability of flooding in the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). In accordance with the NPPF, the application is accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA). A Preliminary Drainage Strategy has also been submitted with the application.

EA has reviewed the FRA (ref: 45444P1R4 dated June 2014) and the Drainage Strategy (ref: 45444P2R2 dated June 2014) in relation to the risk of flooding on and off site and they are satisfied that the proposed development would not be at an unacceptable risk of flooding or exacerbate flood risk elsewhere, provided that any subsequent development proceeds in accordance with the recommendations outlined in the approved FRA and Drainage Strategy. This should be ensured by an appropriate condition.

A condition to ensure a satisfactory means of surface water drainage is also recommended.

In relation to the aquatic environment, EA has given advice in relation to a watercourse that is adjacent to the application site. It is recommended that a clear, unobstructed buffer between the edge of the watercourse and the proposed development is incorporated into the layout of the proposed development. The buffer zone is to be free from built development, including lighting, domestic gardens and formal landscaping.

UNITED UTILITIES:

United utilities draw attention to a number of matters in order to

facilitate sustainable development within the region, as follows.

In accordance with NPPF and the Building Regulations, the site should be drained on a separate system with foul drainage to the public sewer and surface water draining in the most sustainable way. Building Regulation H3 clearly outlines the hierarchy to be investigated by the developer when considering a surface water drainage strategy. The developer is asked to consider the drainage options in the following order of priority:

- a) An adequate soakaway or some adequate infiltration system or, where that is not reasonably practicable –
- b) a watercourse or, where that is not reasonably practicable –
- c) a sewer.

To reduce the volume of surface water draining from the site, United Utilities would promote the use of permeable paving on all driveways and other hard standing areas including footpaths and parking areas.

Overall, United Utilities would have no objection to the proposed development subject to appropriate conditions and advisory notes being included on any planning permission.

ELECTRICITY NORTH WEST:

Electricity North West do not express any objections to the application but point out that the development could have an impact upon their infrastructure. They therefore advise that the applicant should be informed that, should there be any requirement to divert any apparatus because of the proposed works, the cost of such a diversion would usually be borne by the applicant. ENW also advise that the applicant should be aware of their requirements for access to inspect, and maintain, adjust, repair, or alter any of their distribution equipment.

NATURAL ENGLAND:

Natural England has made a number of comments in relation to this application as summarised below:

1. Based on the information provided, Natural England advises the Council that the proposal is unlikely to affect any statutorily protected sites or landscapes.
2. Natural England has not assessed the application and associated documents for impacts on protected species. Natural England has however, published standing advice in relation to protected species.
3. The application may provide opportunities to incorporate

features into the design which are beneficial for wildlife, such as the incorporation of roosting opportunities for bats or the installation of bird nest boxes. The authority should consider securing measures to enhance the biodiversity of the site from the applicant if it is minded to grant permission for the development. This is in accordance with paragraph 118 of NPPF.

4. This application may provide opportunities to enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the surrounding natural and built environment; used natural resources more sustainably; and bring benefits to the local community, eg through green space provision and access to and contact with nature. Landscape characterisation and townscape assessments, and associated sensitivity and capacity assessments provide tools for planners and developers for considering new developments and ensure that it makes a positive contribution in terms of design, form and location, to the character and functions of the landscape and avoids any unacceptable impacts.

NETWORK RAIL:

Network Rail has made a number of comments relating to the Langho level crossing. Network Rail assesses this level crossing every 3 years and the crossing currently has an estimated use of 0 users per day. Network Rail considers however that there would be a considerable increase in usage if this application was approved. This would also increase the likelihood of injuries or fatalities.

Network Rail seeks to reduce risk as far as reasonably practicable at all level crossings and would like to work with the developer and the Council to completely remove this likely increase in risk at the Langho level crossing whilst keeping the walking route in place either by:

- (a) diversion of the footpath and closure of the level crossing, or
- (b) closure of the level crossing and replacement with a footbridge, which could be funded by a developer contribution.

Network Rail considers this to be in line with any developer contribution towards any highway works in the area or any enhancements to local facilities. They also request that, as part of any planning permission, only a set percentage of dwellings are constructed prior to the closure of the level crossing. They would also seek approval in principle from the Council for either the diversion of the footpath and closure of the level crossing or the closure of the crossing and replacement with a footbridge. Whilst Network Rail is also

supportive in principle of development promoting new housing and economic growth, they examine all proposals on an individual basis and determine if the proposal has the potential to impact the railway infrastructure. Therefore they object to this proposal. They recommend that the developer contacts the Network Rail Level Crossings Manager for the area to discuss this issue.

Network Rail also requests that, although no detailed drainage drawings are submitted at this stage, all surface water should be directed away from the railway and any storing of water should be away from the railway.

Network Rail also advises that if there are to be any construction of buildings or works within 10m of the railway boundary they request that the developer submit a risk assessment and method statement for their approval once the proposal has reached the construction phase.

LANCASHIRE
CONSTABULARY:

The Architectural Liaison Officer has commented that a development of this scale provides a great opportunity to shape the future and help to ensure that the community goes on to live in safe and secure environment; and that there is no better opportunity to do so than to build to a Secure by Design standard. Therefore, in order to reduce the risk of crime and antisocial behaviour affecting the future development, the Architectural Liaison Officer makes a number of recommendations that should be incorporated into the design and layout.

These are all suggestions that would be addressed at reserved matters stage in the event that outline permission is granted.

LANCASHIRE BADGER
GROUP:

The Lancashire Badger Group have stated that they have anecdotal evidence of badgers present in the immediate area (badger sightings) and they are slightly concerned that a full survey of the woodland adjacent to the site does not appear to have been carried out. The Badger Group is aware that 30m around the boundary has been surveyed, but comment that the field itself would be more important for foraging. They say that it would therefore seem sensible to be aware of any badger sett within the field as the development would have direct impacts on badgers in terms of foraging and disturbance.

ADDITIONAL
REPRESENTATIONS:

A 62 page document entitled "Summary of Objections" has been received from the Langho Residents' Action Group; and a total of 408 letters have been received from 353 local households. The document and the letters are on the file and are available for inspection by Members, but a summary of the objections that they contain is as follows:

1. The proposed development is contrary to the emerging Core Strategy which identifies a figure of 18 residential units for Langho based on the limited amenities and infrastructure (especially highways) of the village. The proposal is for 7.5 times that number.
2. The proposal would be detrimental to highway safety as all car journeys from the proposed development would have to access the A59, as would all construction traffic for a period of approximately 6 years. The A59 is not suitable for this development for the following reasons:
 - There are accident hotspots in the vicinity at Petre Roundabout, Northcote Road junction with the A59 and Whitehalgh Lane junction with the A59.
 - Northcote Road was blocked off adjacent to the application site in order to keep the number of junctions onto the A59 down and to reduce conflict.
 - Traffic turns right out of Northcote Road from Brockhall even though it is a left turn only.
 - The compound effect of the additional traffic resulting from new developments at Clitheroe, Whalley and Barrow.
 - Flooding at the bottom of Northcote Road over recent years which could be made worse due increased volume of rainwater being directed into the stream on the eastern boundary of the application site.
 - The junction at the bottom of Whitehalgh Lane is extremely dangerous with poor visibility and where drivers take risks on a daily basis. Increasing the traffic flow would simply endanger lives.
3. Applications have been refused in the past for the reason that the creation of a new access on to the A59 was considered to be unacceptable due to detrimental effects upon road safety.
4. A good proportion of the traffic associated with the proposed development, after negotiating the A59 would use the highways of Whitehalgh Lane, York Lane, Whinney Lane and Snodworth Road. These are narrow country lanes that are single track in places and are already used as rat runs; any increased traffic on these lanes would be detrimental to highway safety including detriment to the safety of pedestrians.

5. The development would be detrimental to the local environment as it would result in the loss of green fields and habitat to many animals, insects and plants. The endangered Bee Orchid has been sighted on the site close to the back of the station. The field is used by migrating birds such as Curlew, Oyster Catchers, Woodpecker and Snipe and should be protected. There are also bats which frequent the area, especially the trees around the stream on the eastern boundary. Badgers have also been sighted adjacent to Northcote Road.
6. The site is classed as Grade 3 agricultural land and an independent Agricultural Land Classification Survey should be carried out rather than relying on the developer's submission. The land has not been farmed effectively in recent years and this will have had a detrimental effect on its grading. A permission for the application could set a precedent whereby landowners would let good quality land remain unmanaged so that it gets a lower classification and can then be used for development.
7. Lack of local amenities. The local amenities are the railway station (which is inaccessible other than to the able-bodied) a post office, a convenience store, a pharmacy which operates 4.5 days per week and a doctors surgery which opens two afternoons, an Indian restaurant and three hairdressers. There are no banks or ATM machines, no dentists, no cafes, no butchers, or bakers or other fresh food outlets. There are no florists or pubs in the village centre and no public parking.
8. The proposed development would put pressure on the already overstretched infrastructure of doctors, dentists and schools.
9. Public transport is limited as only one bus route immediately passes the application site and this has, at best, an hourly service during daytime hours and the bus stops are a considerable distance away from the site in both directions. A bus service serving the village centre is at best every half hour and is a single decker and is therefore often full at peak times and would only be accessible from the site via the subway and the 19 steps or via Northcote Road. The train service is hourly.
10. It is stated in the application that pedestrian access to transport and the village amenities is of a high quality. This is not the case as in reality it is a poorly lit, damp

and often under water subway that leads to three flights of stairs totalling 19 steps. It is totally inaccessible to people with disabilities, people in wheelchairs, young families with prams, buggies and the elderly who walk with the aid of sticks etc. The subway is also known as a site for antisocial behaviour. It is also inaccessible to cyclists. The alternative route using Northcote Road is approximately half a mile longer and incorporates two hill climbs which will also therefore affect those groups who would have difficulty using the subway route.

11. There are concerns about drainage problems as flooding has occurred in the past on both Whitehalgh Lane and Northcote Road; and the application site also often floods under heavy rainfall. The foul water sewers on Whitehalgh Lane and Moorland Road often surcharge leaving raw sewage on the carriageway. This raises the concern that the proposed development would exacerbate the existing unsatisfactory situation.
12. There would be disruption for a construction period of approximately 6 years. The A59 and surrounding roads would be under considerable strain from the constant comings and goings of heavy goods vehicles and plant associated with a development of this size. There would also be considerable disruption on the A666 as many of the utilities would be coming from this area.
13. There is fear in the locality that this application is just the first phase of a development that could be for up to 900 houses. These fears are given substance by the fact that the submitted site plan shows the main service road for the development stopping in the middle of the boundary to the next field, and the submitted soil survey highlights that three fields have been surveyed and not just the one that is the subject of the current application.
14. Detriment, due to increased noise and activity, to the amenities provided by the St Michael's Lodge rehabilitation facility that adjoins the site.
15. Detrimental effects upon local property values.

Proposal

The application seeks outline permission for a development of up to 132 residential dwellings. All matters except access are reserved for consideration at reserved matters application stage.

An illustrative master plan has been submitted which shows the general layout of the development and the position to the single point of vehicular access. The proposed vehicular access is onto the A59 relatively close to the eastern boundary of the site. The access takes

the form of a priority control right turn lane junction from the A59/Longsight Road into the site. Whilst the access is indicated on the illustrative master plan, detailed drawings for this access arrangement are provided in the supporting Transport Assessment.

The internal layout of the site as shown on the illustrative master plan shows 132 dwellings across the site and also includes public open space areas, including a children's play area, within the site. The illustrative master plan also shows the provision of a shared parking area with associated landscaping at the south western corner of the site adjoining the railway line.

It is stated in the submitted documents that the applicant agrees to the provision of 30% affordable dwellings in accordance with the Council's current policy. This would equate to approximately 40 units.

Site Location

The site comprises 5.3 hectares of agricultural land within an area designated as open countryside in the Local Plan. The southern boundary of the land is adjoined by a railway line immediately to the south of which is the settlement of Langho. There is a pedestrian underpass beneath the railway line at the south western corner of the site linking the site to the main centre of Langho to the south. There is a public footpath running in a north westerly direction through the adjacent field.

The northern boundary of the site is adjoined by Longsight Road (A59) and a residential property known as 'Langholme', with its associated gardens and woodland. To the west, the site is adjoined by other agricultural land; and the eastern boundary comprises a row of trees, a brook and the rear gardens of several residential properties fronting Northcote Road.

The submitted site location plan shows (outlined in blue) a larger parcel of greenfield land extending from the western site boundary up to the boundary with Whitehalgh Lane that is also within the applicant's ownership.

Relevant History

There have been no applications relating to proposed developments on this site that are relevant to the consideration of this current application. The only recent planning history for the site is the following application.

3/2014/0322/P – Screening opinion application under the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011 relating to residential development on this 5.3 hectare application site. The Local Planning Authority adopted the screening opinion that the proposal was not EIA development.

Relevant Policies

Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan

Policy G1 - Development Control.

Policy G5 - Settlement Strategy.

Policy G11 - Crime Prevention.

Policy ENV3 - Development in Open Countryside.

Policy ENV6 - Development Involving Agricultural Land.

Policy ENV7 - Species Protection.

Policy ENV10 - Development Affecting Nature Conservation.
Policy ENV13 - Landscape Protection.
Policy H2 - Dwellings in the Open Countryside.
Policy H20 - Affordable Housing - Villages and Countryside.
Policy H21 - Affordable Housing - Information Needed.
Policy RT8 - Open Space Provision.
Policy T1 - Development Proposals - Transport Implications.
Policy T7 - Parking Provision.

The Core Strategy Submission version as proposed to be modified

Key Statement DS1 – Development Strategy.
Key Statement EN2 – Landscape.
Key Statement EN3 – Sustainable Development and Climate Change.
Key Statement EN4 – Biodiversity and Geodiversity.
Policy DMG1 – General Considerations.
Policy DMG2 – Strategic Considerations.
Policy DMG3 – Transport and Mobility.
Policy DME1 – Protecting Trees and Woodland.
Policy DME2 – Landscape and Townscape Protection.
Policy DME3 – Site and Species Protection and Conservation.
Policy DMH3 – Dwellings in the Open Countryside and AONB.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG).

Environmental, AONB, Human Rights and Other Issues

The matters for consideration in the determination of this application relate to the principle of the development, highway safety/traffic issues, infrastructure provision, ecology/tree considerations, effects upon visual amenity, effects upon residential amenity, affordable housing provision and public open space provision.

For ease of reference these are broken down into appropriate sub-headings for discussion.

Principle of Development

The site is located outside but adjacent to the settlement boundary for Langho and is therefore located within the Open Countryside. As such Policy ENV3 within the saved Districtwide Local Plan (DWLP) is relevant. Development schemes in the open countryside will be required to be in keeping with the character of the landscape area and should reflect local vernacular style, features and building materials. Proposals to conserve, renew and enhance landscape features will be permitted, providing regard has been given to the characteristic landscape features of the area.

Policy G5 of the DWLP is also applicable to the application. The policy is intended to recognise the need to protect the countryside from inappropriate development but in doing so accepts that the countryside is a working area and a source of many Ribble Valley residents' livelihoods. The policy states that, outside the main settlement and village boundaries (as this site is) planning consent will only be granted for small scale developments which are essential to the local economy, developed for local needs housing (subject to Policy H20 of the DWLP) or are for other small scale uses appropriate to a rural area which conform to the policies of the plan.

Whilst the DWLP policies outlined above remain relevant, the 'Core Strategy 2008-2028: A Local Plan for Ribble Valley' continues to progress through the Examination in Public (EiP) and has now progressed through the formal hearing stages. Public consultation has recently taken place on a series of main modifications to the Core Strategy following these hearing sessions (consultation ended on 5th September 2014). This consultation follows on from Members of Ribble Valley's Planning and Development Committee ratifying these modifications (on 8th May 2014). The policies set out in the Core Strategy Submission Version, as proposed to be modified therefore represents the Council's proposed policy position. It is considered that the plan is at an advanced stage in the plan making process and the policies within the Core Strategy must therefore be afforded significant weight in the decision making process.

This view was supported in a recent Appeal decision by the Planning Inspectorate (APP/T2350/A/14/2213808), where the Inspector stated, "*I note that the Ribble Valley Borough Council Core Strategy 2008-2028: A Local Plan for Ribble Valley Regulation 22 Submission Draft 2012 is at an advanced stage of examination. Even though it is yet to be adopted and has no statutory force it nevertheless carries substantial weight.*"

When assessing the proposals against the Core Strategy policies at this stage, a central issue for consideration is whether the proposals would cause harm to the Development Strategy. Main Modification 54 of the Core Strategy Proposed Main Modifications (May 2014) outlines the proposed modifications to Policy DMG2: Strategic Considerations. This policy states that *development should be in accordance with the Core Strategy Development Strategy and should support the spatial vision. Development in the principal settlements of Clitheroe, Longridge and Whalley and the more sustainable defined settlements (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.*

In assessing the impact on the Development Strategy however, main modification 21 and 25 of the Core Strategy Proposed Main Modifications (May 2014) outlines the proposed modifications to Key Statement DS1: Development Strategy. This policy states that, "*the majority of new housing development will be concentrated within an identified strategic site located to the south of Clitheroe towards the A59; and the principal settlements of Clitheroe, Longridge and Whalley...In addition to the identified strategic site at Standen and the borough's principal settlements, development will be focused towards the Tier 1 villages, which are the more sustainable of the 32 defined settlements.*

Langho is one of the nine Tier 1 villages; and the site lies outside but adjacent to its settlement boundary, and is therefore designated as open countryside. Policy DMH3 'Dwellings in the open countryside' of the Core Strategy is therefore relevant. This policy states that *within areas defined as open countryside or AONB on the proposals map, residential development will be limited to development which is essential for the purposes of agriculture or residential development which meets and identified local need.* Proposals for residential development within the open countryside will therefore only be acceptable where proposals meet an identified local need. However, as the site is directly adjacent to the settlement boundary of Langho, a tier 1 settlement, the residual housing requirement in this location should be considered.

As set out under Main Modification 21 and 25 of the Core Strategy Proposed Main Modifications (May 2014), the residual number of residential units to be provided in Langho as at 31st March 2014 is 18. A more recent round of housing monitoring (30th June 2014 – that represents the most up to date data at the time of preparation of this report) has shown that there have been

no further commitments in Langho and therefore the requirement remains at 18 units. More information on how this requirement figure has been calculated is set out below.

Within the Core Strategy as proposed to be modified, Langho is classified as a tier 1 settlement, however in calculating supply, it also falls within the category of 'other settlements' (i.e. those settlements that are not Clitheroe, Longridge and Whalley). As the table at paragraph 4.11 of the Core Strategy as proposed to be modified shows, there is an overall requirement over the plan period (2008-2028) of 1600 dwellings in 'other settlements'.

In the Planning Statement submitted with the application, the applicant states that "*Langho is only afforded 21 dwellings over the plan period which is just 1.3% of the 1,600 dwellings that the Council is seeking to deliver in the 32 'other settlements' and just 0.37% of the Borough's overall housing requirement for the plan period*". However, as the table at paragraph 4.11 of the submitted Core Strategy as proposed to be modified illustrates, 1655 dwellings have already been committed (so 55 more than that required) through permissions and completions as at 31st March 2014 and therefore there has been an oversupply of housing for the village settlements. However, the approach taken is that 200 units from the Longridge adjustment are reapportioned across the tier 1 settlements, as the most sustainable locations outside of the principal settlements, and therefore there remains a requirement of 145 units to provide in the other settlements at this point in time. These 145 units are then proportioned across the nine tier 1 settlements in accordance with the assessment of sustainability undertaken in the 'Development Strategy: Defining the more sustainable settlements and patterns of housing development' evidence base document that was consulted upon between 23rd May and 7th July 2014. The requirement for Langho, illustrated to be one of the more sustainable settlements in the borough is 18 units. The proposal is therefore for a substantially higher level of housing in this location, over 7 times the requirement for Langho.

In addition to the Core Strategy, the NPPF also needs to be considered. Paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that to promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. This site is not considered to be overly isolated and is not remote from other built form. The site is close to a variety of services within Langho and, in that regard, could be considered to be a sustainable location in principle for development. The sustainability of Langho is therefore not disputed, However, the amount of housing to be provided must be proportionate to the objectively assessed housing need and in accordance with the Development Strategy. As stated above, the housing requirements for the settlements in the borough have been developed upon evidence. As the residual requirement in Langho is 18 units, this scheme for up to 132 units, is not acceptable in principle and it conflicts with Development Strategy (Policy DS1) and the strategic considerations of the strategy (Policy DMG2).

It is also noted that the applicants have undertaken their own assessment of housing land and have concluded that the Council cannot demonstrate a five year supply. The Council's latest position at 30th June 2014 is that there is a 5.10 years supply of land based on a requirement of 280 dwellings per year.

Highway Safety/Traffic Issues

Highway safety and traffic issues form a part of many of the letters of objection to this application. The comments of the County Highway Authority on the application are given in some detail earlier in this report. From these comments it can be seen that the application was

the subject of pre-application discussions with an agreed scoping study. The County Highway Authority has therefore been involved in the consideration of this proposal since before the application was submitted. The traffic generation figures used in the submitted Transport Assessment were agreed in the pre-application scoping study and are considered to be acceptable by the Highway Authority. The principle of vehicle access on to the A59 is also considered to be acceptable by the Highway Authority. Overall, subject to conditions and financial contributions towards highway improvements, the County Highway Authority has no objections to the proposed development. There does not therefore appear to be any reasons for refusal of this application relating to highway safety/traffic issues.

Infrastructure Provision

Concerns have been raised by persons objecting to the application about the ability of local schools to cope with the additional demands generated by this development. Following a recent assessment, however, the County Council has confirmed that this development will not contribute to a shortfall in either primary or secondary school places such that no developer financial contribution is sought towards the provision of school places.

Subject to appropriate conditions, both the Environment Agency and United Utilities have not expressed any objections to the application. Doctors and dentists tend to be demand led and in this pleasant location, this should not be problematic.

Overall, for these reasons there do not appear to be any issues relating to infrastructure provision that would represent reasons to refuse this application.

Ecology/Tree Considerations

A Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Bat Survey Report has been submitted with the application. The site is not within any protected ecological designation and it is not considered that the development would result in any adverse impacts to statutory or non-statutory natural designations. As part of the Ecological Appraisal, local trees were examined for bat roost potential in order to identify and evaluate the site's ecological value, identifying any protected habitats, assess the general potential roost site to support protected species, highlight any potential ecological constraints and advise on any further ecological survey, mitigation or licensing requirements.

The results of the assessment were that the variety of habitat types at the site mean that it has a low to medium ecological value. The improved grass and field has limited biodiversity and has been damaged by grazing livestock. The woodland beyond the north west boundary of the site and northern hedgerows do offer higher value in both the Flora and Fauna they support. The stream valleys and drainage ditches to the eastern and western boundaries support elements of badly degraded but formally biodiverse habitats. It is recommended in the report that the mix of habitat types should be retained and enhanced where possible in line with planning guidance and this is shown in the proposed master plan through the retention of the woodland, the majority of the northern hedgerows and watercourses which are to be enhanced as part of the SUDs proposals for the site. The assessment concludes in relation to Great Crested Newts that there are no waterbodies within the survey area and desktop surveys found no record of this species within 1km of the site and therefore no further survey licensing or mitigation is considered, by the applicants, to be necessary. It is also stated that no bats were found within the site but two trees were confirmed as having potential to support roosting bats and further

surveys have been commissioned. If any bats were found to be roosting whilst the site was being developed, then appropriate mitigation measures would need to be put in place.

The assessment found no evidence of otter, badger, water vole or reptiles and the opinion is expressed that the site does not offer potential habitat for breeding birds within the areas of scrub, hedgerows and trees. To prevent the damage or destruction of active bird nests, tree felling and vegetation clearance between the months of March and September would be avoided. Nest boxes targeting red-list species would be provided in trees and buildings to provide additional nesting sites.

The Council's Countryside Officer was involved in pre-application discussions about the proposal and he considers that the applicant has adhered to what was agreed at that stage. The Countryside Officer therefore only has a number of relatively minor comments to make concerning matters which he considers could be easily resolved, as follows:

- During the LVIA process it was agreed between both parties that a significant tree buffer would be required in the south eastern corner of the site. This does not appear to have been indicated on the illustrative plan, so a change to the plan in this area is required.
- The inclusion of a children's play area in the north eastern corner of the site appears to be inappropriate. The southern end of the site would be more appropriate and this could be adjacent to the tree buffer referred to in the point above.
- There is an opportunity for SUDs on this site. The Countryside Officer would like to see SUDs used as much as possible and this could therefore significantly impact on any landscaping scheme.
- It is stated that the outline application includes landscaping but only includes landscaping in very broad terms. It would however be more appropriate, in any event, to deal with landscaping in its entirety at reserved matters stage, using the master plan as an overall context but with the detail to be agreed.
- More landscaping will be required adjacent to the access from the train station. Currently this is an open view, but from the master plan it would be completely blocked by a house with no landscape buffer. A change to this arrangement is necessary.
- More information on ecology would be required. The biodiversity unit loss/gain from the development needs to be quantified in order to determine whether or not biodiversity offsetting is required. As a preliminary ecology report has already been provided, there should not be too much of an issue putting together the required additional information.
- Consideration should be given to the inclusion of provision for improvements to Primrose Lodge, or to the woodland area adjacent to Rogersfield, as a requirement of a Section 106 Agreement.

Overall, therefore the Countryside Officer does not have any objections to the proposal with regards to ecology considerations. If outline planning permission was to be granted, it is considered that through the imposition of appropriate conditions, the development could result in a net gain in biodiversity through the enhancement of the site for bird and bat species and through the use of native plant species in the landscaping scheme.

A Tree Survey Report has also been submitted with the application. This includes a detailed assessment of trees and hedgerows affecting the site. The majority of the trees are either on or just outside the site boundaries with branches overhanging the site. Only two trees lie within the body of the site as opposed to the boundary, and the opinion is expressed in the Report that these would provide major consideration with any proposed housing layout. It is stated in the

Report that all boundary trees, including Green Nook Wood, could be accommodated by the creation of a suitable buffer zone for the protection of trees and ecology; and that the presence of the stream to the eastern boundary will significantly restrict root spread from trees growing to the east of the stream.

Three specific arboricultural recommendations are made in the report as follows:

1. An arboricultural method statement and tree protection plan will need to be formulated under condition and agreed with the Local Planning Authority to protect trees and hedgerows that are to be retained.
2. There is a veteran Alder in the south west corner of the site that is of conservation value. This should be retained where possible for the benefit of the site ecology. Limited surgery or the use of supporting structures should be considered in this instance.
3. Permission should be sought to access private land and further investigate the structural stability of the trees along the eastern boundary. Where there is danger of collapse, agreement should be reached with the relevant landowner to take appropriate actions. Some ground stabilisation maybe required where trees are being undermined, to extend the life of the trees and prevent collapse.

The Council's Countryside Officer has not raised any issues in relation to the tree report. Therefore, in the event that outline permission is to be granted, the use of appropriate conditions would ensure that the development would not be detrimental to the trees and hedges within the site and on or close to its boundaries.

Effects upon the Character, Appearance and Landscape of the Countryside Area

The site is not located in any protected landscape areas such as national park, Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, greenbelt or any other locally protected area. Nevertheless, a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment has been submitted with the application. The assessment confirms that the loss of the existing field and alterations to the topography will have some impact on the rural landscape character of the area. However, the opinion is expressed in the Assessment that such impacts will be minimised through the retention of existing landscaping features such as hedgerows, trees and a brook, additional planting to provide screening and by working with the existing site levels. It is also concluded in the Assessment that the proposals will reinforce local townscape character and will also have beneficial impact on public footpaths and recreation routes. In terms of visual impact, the Assessment concludes that whilst some views will suffer adverse impacts at certain times of the year, these impacts will be minimised through the retention of the existing landscape features and additional planting. It also notes that these impacts significantly reduce when the trees are in leaf and will reduce further as the landscape matures.

The Council's Countryside Officer was involved in the formulation of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment at pre-application stage. Other than a requirement for a significant tree buffer in the south eastern corner of the site, the Countryside Officer does not express any objections to the application in respect of its impacts upon visual amenity. I concur with this opinion and conclude that there would be no sustainable reason for refusal of the application relating to its effects upon the visual amenities of the locality.

Effects upon Residential Amenity

The only existing dwellings that could be affected by the proposed development are a number of dwellings on Northcote Road whose rear gardens adjoin the eastern boundary of the site and a relatively large detached dwelling, Langholme, on Longsight Road, that has two boundaries with the application site. The submitted illustrative layout shows existing tree screening between all of these properties and the application site; and it is stated in the submitted Planning Statement that a minimum separation distance of 30m will be provided between any proposed dwellings and the neighbouring existing dwellings.

I consider that with appropriate consideration at reserved matters application stage, the proposed dwellings can be sited and orientated in such a way that they would not have any seriously detrimental effects upon the privacy or other residential amenities of any existing neighbouring residents.

Affordable Housing

It is stated in the submitted application documents that the development would include the provision of 30% affordable dwellings in accordance with the Council's current policy. A draft Section 106 Agreement submitted with the application also contains a covenant by the owners with the Council 'not to commence the development until an Affordable Housing Scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Council'. In the event that outline planning permission was granted, the precise content of that particular element of the required Section 106 Agreement would be finalised between the applicants and the Council with the involvement, as appropriate, of the Council's Strategic Housing Officer.

There is therefore no objection to the proposed development in relation to the provision of affordable housing.

Public Open Space and Recreational Facilities

The submitted illustrative layout shows the provision of public open space areas in central locations within the site, plus an equipped children's play area close to the north eastern corner of the site. Whilst the precise details of on-site open space provision would be covered at reserved matters application stage, the areas shown on the illustrative layout appear to be broadly appropriate for a development of this size (although the location of the equipped children's playground might require further consideration). In the event that outline permission was granted, conditions would be required to ensure the provision of appropriate public open spaces as broadly illustrated on the master plan and also to ensure their future management and maintenance (that would be by the applicants and not by the Council).

Notwithstanding this proposed on-site provision, the Council is currently in the process of undertaking an assessment of need in respect of the open space and sports facilities in the borough. Whilst this is currently in draft form, the assessment is at an advanced stage of production and would be presented to both the Planning and Development Committee and the Community Committee once finalised. In respect of Whalley (the applicable settlement for this site in Langho) the assessment identifies specific areas for improvement in respect of the quality of the facilities available for use by residents and a tribute accost to those improvements based on information provided by Sport England. The improvements of facilities would include the following:

Swimming pool modernisation scheme at Ribblesdale Pool (13% shared with Clitheroe)

Artificial Pitch (13% shared with Clitheroe)
QEII Playing fields or Oakhill pitch
Oakhill Academy
Contribution to play facility provision

The financial contribution would be £914 per unit. This would amount to a maximum contribution of approximately £120,648 in the event that any reserved matters application was for 132 dwellings. This requested financial contribution would be included in a Section 106 Agreement in the event that outline permission is to be granted.

Section 106 Agreement Content

In the event that outline planning permission is to be granted, a prior appropriate Section 106 Agreement would be required. This would need to cover the provision of affordable housing in accordance with the Council's policy; the payment to Lancashire County Council of a financial contribution not exceeding £70,000 to fund various off-site highway improvement works and to include improvements to the subway at the railway station, signing and lining improvement on Whitehalgh Lane and junction improvements at the Longsight Road/Whitehalgh Lane junction; and the payment to Ribble Valley Borough Council of a sum in the region of £120,000 towards off-site recreational facilities. In relation to this particular application, no financial contribution towards education provision will be required.

Further consideration would also need to be given as to whether a financial contribution towards a footbridge over the railway line to replace the level crossing (as requested by North West Rail) would be justified. Similarly, further consideration would also need to be given as to whether a Section 106 requirement for improvements to Primrose Lodge, or to the woodland area adjacent to Rogersfield, would be justified.

Conclusion /Planning Balance

In previous sections of this report, the conclusions have been reached that the proposed development is considered to be unacceptable in principle as it does not comply with the Council's emerging Core Strategy; but that, in relation to all other relevant considerations, there are no sustainable reasons for refusal of the application.

In making the planning balance, regard must be paid to the benefits of the development such as job creation; financial investment into the local area through the construction process; financial benefits through the new homes bonus; additional spending in the locality by the future occupiers of the proposed development; the provision of a range of affordable and open market housing; the provision of areas of public open space; the provision of public footpaths through parts of the site; and the provision of a shared parking area with associated landscaping adjacent to the railway station.

To be weighed against these benefits is the harm to the Council's Development Strategy as defined by Key Statement DS1 of the Core Strategy. As described earlier in this report, the Council's Core Strategy is now considered to be at such an advanced stage in the plan making process that its policies must be afforded significant weight in the decision making process. This view has been supported by Inspectors in a number of recent appeal decisions.

Having regard to the stage to which the Council's Core Strategy has now reached, I would refer to paragraph 12 of NPPF which states that the Framework does not change the statutory status

of the Development Plan as the starting point for decision making. It states that any proposed development that accords with an up to date Local Plan should be approved, and proposed development that conflicts should be refused unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The underlying basis of the Core Strategy is that the Development Strategy as defined in Key Statement DS1 that seeks to concentrate the majority of new housing development within an identified strategic site (Standen) located to the south of Clitheroe towards the A59 and to the principal settlements of Clitheroe, Longridge and Whalley. In addition to the strategic site and the principal settlements, developments are then allocated to a number of defined settlements (ie the nine, more sustainable, Tier 1 Villages, including Langho). Although the site is outside the settlement boundary of Langho and in the open countryside, it does immediately adjoin that boundary. For this reason it is considered appropriate to consider the application in relation to the residual housing requirement for Langho rather than against policy DMH3 that relates to dwellings in the open countryside. The current residual figure for Langho, and the fact that the application proposal far exceeds that number, has previously been described in the report.

The Council obviously considers it important that the Core Strategy is not undermined; and also considers that the granting of planning permission that is not in accordance with the Core Strategy could create a harmful precedent for the acceptance of other similar unjustified proposals which would have accumulative adverse impact on the implementation of the emerging planning policies of the Council.

Overall, on balance, it is considered that the harm to the development strategy that would be caused by a permission in relation to this application (and by the precedent that such a permission would create) would outweigh the economic and social benefits associated with the proposed development as listed above in this section of the report.

It is accordingly recommended that outline planning permission be refused for the two reasons stated in the recommendation below.

RECOMMENDATION: That permission be REFUSED for the following reasons:

1. The proposal is considered to be contrary to Policies G5 and H2 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan and Key Statement DS1 and Policies DMG2 and DMH3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy Submission Version as proposed to be modified in that a permission would lead to the creation of new dwellings in the open countryside outside the boundaries of a Tier 1 settlement considerably in excess of the identified residual number of dwellings for that settlement. The proposal is therefore without sufficient justification and would cause harm to the development strategy for the borough as set out in the emerging Core Strategy leading to unsustainable development.
2. The proposed development would create a harmful precedent for the acceptance of other similar unjustified proposals which would have an adverse impact on the implementation of the emerging planning policies of the Council contrary to the interests of the proper planning of the area in accordance with the core principles and policies of NPPF.