Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.								
Signed:	**Officer:**	**LW**	**Date:**	**17/11/26**	**Manager:**	**LH**	**Date:**	**17/11/26**

Application Ref:	3/2026/0810			Ribble Valley Borough Council www.ribblevalley.gov.uk
Date Inspected:	30/10/26	**Site Notice:**	30/10/26	
Officer:	LW			
By virtue of the Council's approved Scheme of Delegation, the application must be dealt with under delegated powers.				**REFUSAL**

Development Description:	Permission in Principle for up to nine dwellings and associated development.
Site Address/Location:	Land as Vicarage Lane, Wilpshire.

CONSULTATIONS:	**Parish/Town Council**

A consultation response from Wilpshire Parish Council was received on 30 October 2026 raising an objection to the proposed development for the following reasons:

- The adverse effects of the development would substantially outweigh the benefits;
- Negative impact on two Public Rights of Way;
- Impact on Tree Preservation Orders;
- Increase in vehicular traffic;
- Right of access issues;
- Unsuitable access arrangements.

CONSULTATIONS:	**Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies**
LCC Highways:	The Local Highway Authority is of the opinion that the principle of development raises significant highway and access concerns. Based on the information currently available, it is not clear that the constraints associated with Vicarage Lane, including its limited width, adjacent drainage ditches, visibility limitations, land ownership uncertainties and safe movement of vulnerable users of the Bridleway can be satisfactorily mitigated to provide a safe and suitable means of access for the proposed development.
Lancashire Fire and Rescue Service:	The Fire Authority has provided advice in respect of access for fire appliances and water supplies for firefighting purposes to the site.

CONSULTATIONS:	**Additional Representations.**

Approximately 45 letters of objection from separate addresses have been received. The concerns raised can be summarised as below:

- Inadequate access along Vicarage Lane/ impact on highway safety;
- Damage to the unadopted access track which would result in additional expense to existing residents;
- Increase in traffic;
- Pedestrian safety/ impact on public footpaths and bridleways;
- Increase in parking demand;

- Construction disturbance;
- Loss of open, rural character and green space;
- Impact on Green Belt openness;
- Erosion of the settlement boundary buffer;
- Impact on residential amenity; through overlooking, loss of privacy, overbearing impact;
- Noise and air pollution;
- Increase in local crime;
- Reduction in property value;
- Proposed density not comparable with adjacent residential development;
- Impact on existing infrastructure;
- Impact on trees;
- Loss of biodiversity including impact on Great Crested Newts;
- Drainage issues;
- Right of access concerns;
- Application should be assessed against Policy S5 of the NPPF not Policy S4;
- Misleading information in Planning Statement;
- The red edge does not connect to a public highway.

RELEVANT POLICIES AND SITE PLANNING HISTORY:

Ribble Valley Core Strategy:

Key Statement DS1: Development Strategy
Key Statement DS2: Sustainable Development
Key Statement EN4: Biodiversity and Geodiversity
Key Statement DMI2: Transport Considerations

Policy DMG1: General Considerations
Policy DMG2: Strategic Considerations
Policy DMG3: Transport & Mobility
Policy DME1: Protecting Trees & Woodland
Policy DME2: Landscape & Townscape Protection
Policy DME3: Site and Species Protection and Conservation
Policy DMB5: Footpaths and Bridleways

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Relevant Planning History:

3/2000/0506: Erection of 7 dwellings, upgrade/ creation of access (resubmission) (Withdrawn).

3/1999/0315: Development of 7no. dwellings (Withdrawn).

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:

Site Description and Surrounding Area:

The application relates to an area of undeveloped greenfield land situated to the east of Vicarage Lane, Wilpshire. The site lies wholly within the defined settlement limits of Wilpshire and is bounded by existing residential development to the east, south and west. Directly to the north of the site is additional undeveloped land which benefits from a Green Belt designation; however, the site itself is not part of this designation.

A bridleway follows the western boundary of the site, along Vicarage Lane, whist a public footpath runs along the northern boundary. The site is also bordered by mature trees, some of which are protected under a Tree Preservation Order.

Proposed Development for which consent is sought:

The application seeks 'Permission in Principle' for the construction of up to nine new residential dwellings. Given the application seeks consent solely for matters pertaining to the principle of development, no details in respect of the proposed layout, configuration, nor external appearance of the dwelling are required to be submitted for consideration at this stage.

Principle of Development:

Permission in Principle applications may only deal with the principle of development and are not applications for planning permission. Any other details relating to other material planning considerations are to be dealt with during any future Technical Details application. Planning Practice Guidance confirms the scope of Permission in Principle as being limited to matters of location, land use and amount of development. As such, these matters have been assessed as follows:

Location

The application seeks Permission in Principle for the construction of up to nine residential dwellings. As such, it is necessary to consider whether the location of the proposed new dwellings would be compatible with the overall spatial strategy for housing growth within the Borough, as identified within the currently adopted development strategy.

When considering the principle of new residential development, Key Statement DS1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy outlines a spatial strategy for new housing developments which are to be directed to the strategic sites and Principal and Tier 1 settlements.

Policy DMG2 of the Core Strategy also states that '*development proposals in the principal settlements of Clitheroe, Longridge and Whalley and the 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 this instance, the proposed development relates to the provision of up to nine new residential dwellings within the defined settlement area of Wilpshire, which is identified as a Tier 1 settlement in the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.

In addition, whilst the site is bordered to the north by open land which benefits from a Green Belt designation, the site surroundings are predominantly residential in character, with established dwellings situated immediately to the east, south and west of the site. As such, the proposed introduction of new residential development at the proposal site is considered to be broadly compatible with the immediate surroundings of the site, insofar that it would be closely related to the main built-up residential area of Wilpshire.

With the above in mind, it is not considered that the residential development of the site would result in any significant adverse conflict with Key Statement DS1 or Policy DMG2 of the Core Strategy in relation to the locational and spatial aspirations for new housing growth within the plan area.

The accessibility and sustainability of the site's location must also be assessed. Key Statement DMI2 and Policy DMG3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy require development to be located so as to minimise the need to travel, maximise opportunities for walking and cycling, and provide convenient access to public

transport. Significant weight is to be attached to the availability and adequacy of public transport provision.

These objectives align with the sustainability principles of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (August 2026). Policy TR3 of the NPPF seeks to ensure that development is located where it can support sustainable patterns of movement, enable good accessibility for different users and make the most of existing and proposed transport infrastructure. The Policy further states that '*development proposals which could generate a significant amount of movement, in the context of the area within which they would be situated, should be in locations that are sustainable (or which can be made so, taking into account planning improvements, including any provided for as part of the development itself). This means the location should limit the need to travel, particularly by private car, and offer a genuine choice of transport modes for residents and users, unless the nature of the development would make this impractical.'*

As noted above, the site lies within the defined settlement limits of Wilpshire, which the Core Strategy identifies as one of the Borough's more sustainable settlements. The village provides a relatively modest range of services and facilities, including a convenience store, primary school, public house and village hall, all within reasonable walking distance of the site. Bus stops on Ribchester Road also serve both directions, providing connections to Blackburn and Preston, with an hourly service from Monday to Saturday and a two-hourly service on Sundays.

Pedestrian access to these services and facilities would involve walking along Vicarage Lane. The initial section, extending approximately 140m from its junction with Ribchester Road, benefits from street lighting. However, there is no dedicated footway along the route, meaning pedestrians must share the carriageway with vehicular traffic. This includes a shorter, more constrained section where opportunities to step clear of passing vehicles are limited. Even along the wider section, nearest Ribchester Road, there is no dedicated pedestrian infrastructure, and its provision would be likely to require third-party land.

Nevertheless, most of the route between the application site and Ribchester Road follows the wider section of Vicarage Lane, where verges on either side of the carriageway provide opportunities for pedestrians to step clear of approaching vehicles. Whilst this does not provide the same level of separation of accessibility as a dedicated footway, it does offer some mitigation.

On balance, future occupiers would have access to some alternative modes of transport for everyday journeys and would not be wholly reliant on the private car. However, the absence of a continuous dedicated footway, together with the constraints along the narrow section of Vicarage Lane, is likely to limit the attractiveness and accessibility of walking as an alternative for some vulnerable road users. The shortcomings in pedestrian connectivity therefore weigh against the proposal.

Third-party representations have also suggested that the principle of the proposal should be assessed against the Green Belt and Open Space policies of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and NPPF. However, the application site is neither within the Green Belt nor designed as Open Space. The policies relating to specifically to those designations are therefore not directly applicable to the determination of this application.

<u>Land Use</u>

Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy requires development proposals to be sympathetic to existing and proposed surrounding land uses in terms of their size, intensity, nature, scale, massing, design, appearance and use of materials.

Similarly, Policy DP3 of the NPPF seeks to ensure that development proposals respond to their context (the history, character and features of their site and its setting), so that they integrate with and enhance their surroundings.

In principle, the proposed residential use of the site would not be incompatible with the pattern of surrounding land uses. Whilst the application site currently comprises undeveloped land, it is bordered directly to the east, south and west by existing residential properties. Consequently, the development would be viewed in the context of the existing residential development in immediate locality and would appear as a relatively modest extension of this established built form.

Amount of Development

Policy DMG1 also emphasises the importance of density, layout and the relationship between buildings, with particular regard to visual appearance, the character of the surrounding area, and impacts on landscape character.

Whilst matters relating to layout, scale, appearance and landscaping are not for consideration at the Permission in Principle stage and would instead be assessed through any subsequent Technical Details application, it is nevertheless necessary to consider whether the amount of development proposed is acceptable in principle.

No indicative layout has been submitted. Nevertheless, having regard to the size of the plot, it is considered that the site could physically accommodate up to nine dwellings, together with associated parking and private amenity space, subject to an acceptable detailed design.

Third-party concerns regarding density are acknowledged. Desktop analysis indicates that nine dwellings would equate to approximately 18 dwellings per hectare. Although the submitted information indicates that this would be higher than the density of neighbouring residential development, it is not considered excessive in itself or sufficient to demonstrate that the proposed amount of development would be unacceptable. The application also seeks permission for 'up to nine' dwellings, rather than a fixed number. The precise number and arrangement would therefore require further consideration at the Technical Details stage, and a lower number may be necessary if an acceptable layout cannot be achieved.

However, concerns are raised about the ability of the surrounding access network to safely serve the residential development of the site. In this respect, the Local Highway Authority (LHA) has raised significant concerns regarding the suitability of Vicarage Lane to accommodate the additional traffic associated with up to nine dwellings.

The initial section of Vicarage Lane, extending approximately 140m from Ribchester Road, has a carriageway width of approximately 5.5m and can accommodate two-way vehicular movements. Beyond this point, the lane narrows substantially to a single-track width of between approximately 2.5m and 3.5m alongside the western boundary of the application site. The LHA considers this section insufficient to accommodate the anticipated increase in traffic without substantial widening or formal passing places. No evidence has been submitted to demonstrate that such improvements are deliverable, particularly having regard to land ownership and the physical constraints alongside the route.

Along this section, the western edge of Vicarage Lane is bordered by a drainage ditch, with the ground falling away immediately beyond the carriageway to create an unprotected drop. The LHA is concerned that vehicles using a potential access on the western side of the site would need to manoeuvre close to this hazard. The restricted width would also require opposing vehicles to reverse to a suitable passing point, increasing the risk of vehicles inadvertently entering the ditch. These risks would be exacerbated during periods of snow or ice, particularly as the lane is privately maintained and does not form part of a winter maintenance route.

The eastern side of the lane is also constrained by drainage features, vegetation (including trees protected by a Tree Preservation Order), and land outside the application boundary. Although the drainage features on this side are less pronounced, they present further potential obstacles to widening.

The LHA also note that the ditches perform an important drainage function by conveying surface water away from the lane and helping to limit deterioration of its surface. Any alterations to facilitate widening would therefore need to maintain adequate drainage provision and could require replacement or additional drainage infrastructure. Neither the feasibility of such works nor the availability of necessary land has been demonstrated.

The single-track section currently serves approximately ten properties alongside and beyond the application site. Whilst this establishes an existing residential use of the route, it does not demonstrate that the lane could safely accommodate the additional traffic generated by up to nine further dwellings accessed from the western side of the site.

This section of Vicarage Lane also carries Bridleway BW0346027. The combination of the narrow carriageway and adjacent drainage ditch limits opportunities for pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians to move clear of passing vehicles. Additional traffic would therefore increase the potential for conflict between vehicles and vulnerable users along this shared route.

The submitted Planning Statement also identifies a potential alternative access along the route extending eastward from No.14 Vicarage Lane, adjacent to the southern boundary of the application site, which serves Nos. 16-28. However, the LHA advises that this route is similarly constrained by its width and land ownership.

This route is approximately 3.5m wide in places and currently serves seven dwellings to the south. A private parking area serving nearby properties also lies immediately to the north of the track. Traffic associated with up to nine additional dwellings would increase the potential for conflicting vehicle movement and would be likely to necessitate widening on land outside the application boundary.

Visibility to the north at the junction of this route with the main section of Vicarage Lane is also restricted by existing vegetation. No information has been submitted to demonstrate that adequate visibility could be achieved and maintained, or that the application controls the land necessary to secure any improvements. This raises further concerns regarding potential conflict with vehicles serving the existing dwellings beyond this junction and with users of Bridleway BW0346027.

To provide safe and suitable access, the LHA considers that the route serving the development would need either to accommodate two-way vehicular movement throughout its length or to incorporate an appropriate network of passing places supported by adequate forward visibility.

Whilst widening, passing places and dedicated pedestrian provision could potentially address some the identified concerns, their delivery has not been demonstrated. The restricted carriageway widths, adjacent drainage features, vegetation and uncertainty regarding control of the necessary land raise significant doubts as to whether an acceptable scheme of access improvements could be secured.

These concerns are not confined to the detailed design of an access junction. They relate to the suitability of the routes serving the site and their ability to accommodate the residential development of the site. They therefore bear directly on whether residential development of the scale sought is acceptable in principle and cannot simply be deferred to the Technical Details stage without sufficient evidence that a safe and deliverable solution exists.

In the absence of deliverable access improvements or suitable mitigation, the proposal would increase vehicular movements along constrained shared routes and heighten the potential for conflict with pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians. On the evidence submitted, and having regard to the LHA's advice, it has not been demonstrated that a safe and suitable access can be secured for the development proposed.

Accordingly, the suitability of the site access network to serve the development safely has not been established. The proposal therefore conflicts with Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy insofar

as it requires safe access appropriate to the scale and type of traffic generated and consideration of the protection and enhancement of public rights of way and access, as well as Policy DMG3 which attaches considerable weight to the availability and adequacy of infrastructure to serve those moving to from development, including the relationship of the site to the primary route network and the strategic road network. The development also raises conflict with the aims and objectives of Policy TR6 of the NPPF which states that '*development proposals should be refused if they would have a severe adverse impact on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion, including cumulative impacts), or an unacceptable impact on highway safety'.*

Impact Upon Residential Amenity:

Third-party representations have raised concerns regarding potential effects on neighbouring residential amenity, particularly overlooking, loss of privacy and overbearing impacts.

These concerns are acknowledged. However, the application seeks Permission in Principle only. Accordingly, detailed matters affecting neighbouring living conditions—including overlooking, overshadowing, interrelationships between buildings and the siting of the dwellings—fall outside the scope of this application. These matters would be fully assessed at the Technical Details Consent stage.

Concerns have also been raised regarding potential increases in noise and air pollution associated with the proposed residential use. However, given the predominantly residential character of the surrounding area and the scale of the proposal, the introduction of up to nine dwellings is not expected to result in a significant increase in noise or air pollution once completed, above that of the existing locality.

Furthermore, some degree of disruption arising from construction activity is an inevitable and temporary consequence of the development process and would cease upon completion of the works. However, should Technical Details Consent be granted, a planning condition could be imposed requiring the submission and approval of a Construction Management Plan. This would provide appropriate controls over construction traffic, vehicle routing, delivery times and contractor parking, thereby minimising potential impacts on the highway network and the amenity of surrounding occupiers during the construction period.

Visual Amenity/External Appearance:

Third-party representations have also raised concerns regarding the potential visual impact of the development on the site's open, rural character.

The introduction of built development on this undeveloped greenfield site would inevitably result in some loss of openness. However, the site is bordered to the east, south and west by existing residential properties. The development would therefore be viewed within the context of the established residential development in the immediate locality. As such, the visual impact of the proposal would largely depend on the detailed design and layout of the scheme.

As this application seeks Permission in Principle only, detailed matters, including design, layout, scale, appearance and landscaping, fall outside the scope of the current assessment. The development's detailed visual impacts and external appearance would therefore be comprehensively assessed through any subsequent Technical Details application.

Highways and Footpaths:

Third-party representations have raised concerns regarding highway and pedestrian safety. Lancashire County Council, as the Local Highway Authority (LHA), has also identified significant concerns regarding the suitability of the access network, as discussed elsewhere in this report.

Notwithstanding these concerns, the LHA has provided advice on the internal layout and servicing arrangements that would need to be addressed through any subsequent Technical Details application.

The LHA advises that the development should accord with Lancashire County Council's Estate Road Specification and Creating Civilised Streets guidance, irrespective of whether the internal roads would be adopted. As the site has no direct connection to the adopted highway, the LHA considers that the internal roads would not be eligible for adoption and would therefore be likely to remain privately maintained. The LHA recommends an internal carriageway width of 5.5m throughout, with 2m wide footways on both sides. Swept-path analysis would also be required to demonstrate that an 11.2m refuse vehicle could safely negotiate the internal roads and turning area, ensuring that the layout accommodates the largest vehicle expected to visit regularly.

Representations have also raised concerns regarding increased parking demand. Whilst detailed parking arrangements would be considered at the Technical Details stage, the LHA advises that provision should comply with its parking guidance, as set out in the Joint Lancashire Structure Plan. Private drives accommodating both vehicular and pedestrian access should have a minimum width of 3.2m, and standard off-street parking bays should measure at least 2.4m wide by 5m long. Where bays adjoin walls, fences or similar obstructions, the LHA recommends an additional clearance of 0.6m to allow vehicle doors to open. Single garages should have minimum internal dimensions of 6m by 3m.

The LHA also recommends covered, secure cycle storage to encourage cycling as an alternative to the private car, together with at least one electric vehicle charging point per dwelling. These matters would require consideration through any subsequent Technical Details application.

Concerns have also been raised regarding the effect of the development on nearby public rights of way. Footpath FP0346018 lies to the north of the site, whilst Bridleway BW0346027 runs to the west. However, no direct alteration to either route is proposed, and both routes would need to remain unobstructed during construction.

Finally, representations have raised concerns that additional use of the unadopted track could cause damage and increase maintenance costs for existing residents. Whilst this is acknowledged, questions of private maintenance liability and the sharing of costs are separate from the planning merits of the proposal.

Landscape/Ecology:

Appropriate surveys would be required to be undertaken (Preliminary Ecological Appraisal) and submitted in support of any subsequent Technical Details submission to determine whether the proposal is likely to result in adverse impacts upon protected species or species of conservation concern.

A Tree Survey/ Arboricultural Impact Assessment would also need to be submitted so that the impact upon trees, including those protected under a Tree Preservation Order, could be fully assessed at the Technical Details stage.

In addition, at the Technical Details stage, the applicant would be required to demonstrate how the proposal would achieve the mandatory 10% Biodiversity Net-Gain or provide an appropriate reason for exemption.

Other Matters:

<u>Flood Risk and Drainage</u>

Concerns have been raised by third-party representations regarding drainage infrastructure and the management of surface water/ increased risk of localised flooding. However, the proposal site is located within Flood Zone 1 and is not identified as being as risk of surface water flooding either now or in the future.

Notwithstanding this, drainage is a matter that falls to be considered in detail at the Technical Details stage rather than through the assessment of Permission in Principle.

Impact on Infrastructure

Concerns have also been raised that the proposed development would place additional pressure on local infrastructure, including education and healthcare services. However, the scale of the proposed development falls to be considered minor residential and would not be required to make financial contributions towards educations, healthcare or other community infrastructure.

Right of Access

Third-party representations have questioned whether the applicant has the necessary rights of access, as sections of Vicarage Lane are owned by adjoining residential properties. The existence and extent of private access rights are legal matters separate from the determination of this application, and a grant of Permission in Principle would not grant any additional rights over third-party land.

Property Value

Any effect on the value of neighbouring residential properties is not a material planning consideration and therefore carries no weight in the determination of this application.

Local Crime

Having regard to the scale and residential nature of the proposal, there is no evidence to indicate that the development would give rise to an increased risk of crime sufficient to justify refusal. Detailed matters relating to layout, lighting and natural surveillance could be considered through any subsequent Technical Details application.

Inaccurate/ Misleading information in Planning Statement

Third-party representations have questioned the accuracy of the information presented in the submitted Planning Statement, particularly Figure 1, which they consider potentially misleading.

These concerns are acknowledged. However, Figure 1 comprises two separate screenshots, rather than a single continuous map, and is intended to illustrate the density of the highlighted residential development near the application site. When viewed in this context, the Council does not consider that the presentation of Figure 1 gives rise to significant concerns.

Observations/Consideration of Matters Raised/Conclusion:

Policy S4 of the NPPF states that development proposals within settlements should be approved unless the benefits of doing so would be substantially outweighed by any adverse effects, when assessed against the national-decision making policies in the Framework. The Policy goes on to state that the circumstances in which the benefits of approving development are likely to be substantially outweighed by adverse effects include situations where the development proposal would fail to comply with one of the national decision-making policies which state that development proposals should be refused in specific circumstances.

In favour of the proposal, weight is afforded to the delivery of additional housing, particularly in the context of the Council's housing land supply position. The most recently published five-year housing land supply figure (base date of 31st March 2026) indicated that Ribble Valley Borough Council has a housing land supply of 2.24 years. The Council is therefore currently unable to demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing land. However, the development's contribution would be limited to up to nine dwellings. Other benefits include temporary economic activity associated with the construction phase, expenditure within the local economy and support for the construction supply chain which would be equally limited by the scale of the proposal. Whilst these benefits are acknowledged, they attract limited weight.

Against the proposal and as set out earlier in this report, whilst future occupiers of the development would have access to some alternative modes of transport for everyday journeys and would not be wholly reliant on the private car, the absence of a continuous dedicated footway along Vicarage Lane, would limit the attractiveness and accessibility of walking as an alternative, particularly for vulnerable road users. It is acknowledged that most of the walking route between the site and Ribchester Road follows the wider section of Vicarage Lane, where street lighting and roadside verges provide some mitigation. As such, the shortcomings in pedestrian connectively in terms of the sustainability of the site attract limited adverse weight in the overall balance.

Of greater concern is the suitability of Vicarage Lane to accommodate the additional vehicular traffic associated with up to nine dwellings. As detailed elsewhere in this report, the restricted carriageway widths, adjacent drainage features and vegetation constrain opportunities for vehicles to pass safely and increase the potential for conflict with vulnerable road users, including those using Bridleway BW0346027. These concerns are compounded by the absence of evidence demonstrating that the necessary access improvements could be delivered, particularly where works may depend on land outside the applicant's control.

Having regard to the Local Highway Authority's advice, it has not been demonstrated that safe and suitable and access can be secured for the residential development of the site. These concerns relate to the suitability of the location to accommodate development of this scale and cannot simply be deferred to a subsequent Technical Details application. Significant adverse weight is therefore afforded to the unresolved highway safety concerns.

The proposal consequently conflicts with Policy DMG1 and Policy DMG3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and the aims and objectives of Policy TR6 of the NPPF which states that '*development proposals should be refused if they would have a severe adverse impact on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion, including cumulative impacts), or an unacceptable impact on highway safety'*.

On balance, the Council considers that the adverse effects arising from the proposal, principally the unresolved highway safety concerns, substantially outweigh the benefits associated with the delivery of up to nine dwellings.

Accordingly, and for the reasons set out in this report, the application is recommended for refusal.

RECOMMENDATION:	That planning consent be refused for the following reason:
01:	The application site is not suitable for a residential development of up to nine dwellings, having regard to its location, use and amount of development proposed. The proposed development would intensify vehicular use of Vicarage Lane, a constrained access route where insufficient evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the improvements necessary to secure safe and suitable access are deliverable. The proposal would therefore result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety, contrary to Policies DMG1 and DMG3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and Policy TR6 of the National Planning Policy Framework.