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1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. PWA Planning is retained to appeal, under Section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), against the refusal to grant planning permission of application reference: 3/2016/1196 by Ribble Valley Borough Council (RVBC) for the erection of 5 dwellings and associated works (‘proposed development’) at land associated with Lower Standen Hey, Whalley Road, Clitheroe, Lancashire (‘appeal site’). This appeal statement of case should be read in conjunction with the other submitted documents and drawings that formed part of the original planning application.

1.2. The appeal site sits on the periphery of the town of Clitheroe, Lancashire within the Pendleton Parish. The appeal site forms part of an area of grass paddock associated with Lower Standen Hey Farm House. The house forms part of a cluster of dwellings located to the immediate south-west of the site which, like the proposed development, is accessed off Whalley Road. Land to the north of the site is urban in its nature whilst land in other directions is generally characterised as open land on the urban fringe.

1.3. The appeal site sits within an area identified as open countryside, which is covered by Policy DMH3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy (2014).

1.4. As part of the submitted application PWA Planning contested that the council had a sound 5-year housing supply with our calculations suggesting 3.84 years was all that was achievable having reviewed the evidence the Council have published. Prior to the determination of this application the Council conceded they had a housing shortfall, however they considered it to be more marginal (4.99 years). Moreover, following planning permission being granted for a large housing scheme at the February 2017 Planning Committee, the Council reverted back to the position that they had a demonstrable supply. In any event the housing scheme consented in February 2017 remains subject to a legal agreement, which to our knowledge is yet to be agreed, suggesting it is dubious as to whether the development should be included within any housing land supply calculations. However, we remain of the opinion that a five year housing supply cannot be demonstrated and evidence to support this claim accompanies this appeal.

1.5. The application for full planning permission to which this appeal relates was submitted to Ribble Valley Borough Council in December 2016 and a refusal was issued on the 28th February 2017. The application, was accompanied by the appropriate plans and supporting information and where additional information was requested during determination, namely additional drawings, the relevant works were undertaken and provided to the Council.

1.6. This Statement seeks to demonstrate that Ribble Valley Borough Council were wrong to have refused the application in that the proposal is consistent with the thrust of adopted development plan policy and that, where there is any degree of conflict, relevant material considerations would strongly suggest that planning permission ought properly to be granted. The remainder of this Appeal Statement comprises the following sections: -

2. Site Description and Proposed Development;

3. Relevant Planning Policy;

4. Reason for Refusal and Case for The Appellant;

5. Other Material Considerations;
6. Conditions;

7. Conclusions.
2. SITE DESCRIPTION AND PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

The Appeal Site

2.1. The appeal site forms part of the extensive curtilage associated with the aforementioned Lower Standen Hey Farm House. The site area is relatively open with a north-east facing undulation as the site nears the watercourse. The Site sits on the edge of the defined settlement boundary of Clitheroe and as such land to the north is generally urban in its nature, with commercial and residential land uses being the most prominent. Land in other directions is in the most part agricultural, although other residential development does exist intermittently along Whalley Road.

2.2. The appeal site and the cluster of buildings located around Lower Standen Hey Farm are all accessed via a road which leads directly off the A671 Whalley Road. The existing development located off this road is residential, although commercial development does exist to the immediate north-west of the site. Additionally, other residential dwellings along the settlement boundary are becoming of growing prominence as development pressure for large detached homes in Clitheroe increases. The application incorporates an additional access drive taken off the existing track solely intended to serve the proposed dwellings.

The Proposed Development

2.3. The Proposed Development involves the development of portion of a paddock which forms part of the ownership of Lower Standen Hey Farm, and lies on the very edge of Clitheroe, Lancashire. The scheme looks to deliver 5 no. detached dwellings which are made up of three different house types, 4 of which are 5 bedroom two storey homes, whilst the fifth is 4-bed bungalow. The proposed dwellings, whilst retaining a degree of originality also look to mirror the adjacent development on the other side of Pendleton Brook, allowing the proposal to sit well within the context of the surrounding landscape and approach to Clitheroe along Whalley Road. Incidental parking / garages are provided to the dwellings, as is garden space.

2.4. As part of the development of the proposals formal pre-application discussions were conducted (pre-application reference RV/ENQ/2016/00057). These discussions led to fundamental changes to the initial scheme ensuring the proposal which was put forward reflected the comments of RVBC and mitigated against any significant concerns. Further references to the pre-application discussion are made within section 4 of this statement.
3. **RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY**

3.1. Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires planning applications to be determined in accordance with the Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

3.2. The Development Plan for the purpose of this appeal comprises the Ribble Valley Borough Council Core Strategy 2008 – 2028 (2014). Within the reasons for refusal detailed in the decision notice (discussed in Section 4) the local planning authority has referred to six planning policies. It is accepted that these policies are relevant for the purposes of considering the appeal proposals. These policies are:

- **Key Statement DS1**: Development Strategy;
- **Key Statement DS2**: Sustainable Development;
- **Key Statement ENS**: Heritage Assets;
- **Key Statement DMG1**: General Considerations;
- **Key Statement DMG2**: Strategic Considerations; and
- **Key Statement DME4**: Protecting Heritage Assets.

3.3. It is not proposed to repeat or quote the wording of the above policies since these are set out clearly in the relevant policy documents to which the Inspector has access. However by way of assistance, a copy of the text of the policies is included at Appendix 1. Reference to these policies will be made, where appropriate, in the context of rebutting the local planning authority’s reasons for refusal.

**National Planning Policy Framework**

3.4. The NPPF was issued in March 2012 and immediately replaced the old system of PPG and PPS documents. The golden thread running throughout the NPPF is the Government’s presumption in favour of sustainable development (paragraph 14) whereby proposed developments which correctly balance the requirements of economic, social and environmental issues should be granted planning permission unless there are overrising reasons that would suggest that permission should be withheld. Paragraph 14 specifically states that:

> “At the heart of the National Planning Policy Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan-making and decision-taking.

*For decisions, this means:*

- Approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay; and
- Where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out-of-date, granting permission unless:
  - Any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the polices in this Framework taken as a whole; or
  - Specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted.”

3.5. In relation to achieving sustainable development, paragraph 9 details that the concept involves seeking positive changes to the quality of the built environment and support development which
enhances people’s quality of life. The section considers that this can be achieved by replacing poor design and improving the conditions in which people work and live.

3.6. Paragraph 17 outlines 12 principles of the planning system, those deemed of notable relevance are detailed below:

- “not simply be about scrutiny, but instead be a creative exercise in finding ways to enhance and improve the places in which people live their lives

- proactively drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver the homes, business and industrial units, infrastructure and thriving local places that the country needs. Every effort should be made objectively to identify and then meet the housing, business and other development needs of an area, and respond positively to wider opportunities for growth. Plans should take account of market signals, such as land prices and housing affordability, and set out a clear strategy for allocating sufficient land which is suitable for development in their area, taking account of the needs of the residential and business communities

- take account of the different roles and character of different areas, promoting the vitality of our main urban areas, protecting the Green Belts around them, recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and supporting thriving rural communities within it”

3.7. Paragraph 28 regarding ‘Supporting a prosperous rural economy’ outlines that planning policies should support economic growth in rural areas. It outlines that this can be done through the approval of well-designed new buildings.

3.8. Paragraph 49 details that housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date if the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites.

3.9. Paragraph 187 of the NPPF states that Local Planning Authorities should look for solutions rather than problems, and that decision takers at every level should seek to approve application for sustainable development where possible.
4. **HOUSING LAND SUPPLY**

4.1. Subsequent sections of this Appeal Statement will reinforce that, whilst we consider the proposed development is compliant with the adopted Development Plan, the proposal is also permissible on the basis that Ribble Valley Borough Council cannot demonstrate a five year supply of housing. This section looks to provide further clarification as to the ramifications of the under-supply and also how this conclusion was reached.

4.2. The annual housing requirement figure of 280 dwellings per annum, or 5600 dwellings over the 20-year period from 2008 to 2028, is contained within **KEY STATEMENT H1: HOUSING PROVISION** of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy, which was adopted on 16th December 2014 and now forms part of the statutory Development Plan for the Borough.

4.3. The requirement figure was subject to various increases throughout the process of adoption of the Core Strategy, culminating in the figure accepted by the Inspector following the examination of the plan. It is accepted that the figure therefore provides the appropriate basis for undertaking housing land supply assessments, until such time as it might be replaced, following updates to the objectively assessed need assessment and consultation on any revised figure.

4.4. As part of this appeal, and indeed as part of work for a separate appeal, PWA Planning have examined the Council’s latest housing supply assessment report1 and have concluded that Ribble Valley Borough Council cannot demonstrate the necessary five-year housing land supply. In such circumstances, and applying paragraph 49 of the National Planning Policy Framework, policies relevant to the supply of housing should be considered to be out-of-date. In such circumstances, the Framework requires at paragraph 14 that where policies are out-of-date, the presumption in favour of sustainable development is engaged.

4.5. The Council’s stated 5 year land supply position is shown at pages 10 and 11 of the Housing Land Availability Schedule - October 2016 (HLAS). Subsequent to the publication of the HLAS, the Council has acknowledged that the generally accepted convention is to also add the ‘buffer’ (in this case accepted to be 20%) to the ‘backlog’ in order to assess the adjusted 5 year requirement figure. As mentioned at Paragraph 1.4 above, this change is set out in the LPA’s response to a separate residential planning application and confirms that at the base date of 30 September 2016, the Council estimated the supply to represent 4.99 years. The Council therefore acknowledged that, at the 30th September base date, it was unable to demonstrate a five year supply.

4.6. For ease of reference, the relevant pages from the HLAS, as well as a copy of the Council’s acceptance of the revised ‘buffer’ calculation, together with a table prepared by PWA and showing the manner in which the 4.99 year supply is calculated, are included at **Appendix 2** of this statement.

4.7. Aside from the above, PWA also consider that in several cases the Council have used an overly optimistic delivery rate and in some cases have assumed delivery of completed dwellings will begin sooner than is realistic, based on the lag between grant of outline / reserved matters and commencement of development. Evidence and opinion has been provided by Savills in respect of realistic completion / delivery rates for the large sites in Ribble Valley and this indicates that 24 dwellings per annum is a realistic rate for assessment of housing land supply. Whilst this evidence

---

1 Ribble Valley Council Housing Land Availability Assessment – October 2016
https://www.ribblevalley.gov.uk/downloads/download/7171/housing_land_availability_surveys_and_reports
was provided for a separate site, its conclusions are applicable to Ribble Valley generally and hence have been used to undertake the housing land supply assessment. **Appendix 3** contains the Savills evidence, together with a table which combines these more realistic delivery rates with some minor changes to expected completion dates, for a number of the large sites within the HLAS. PWA consider that, in addition to the revised buffer calculation, the Council have over-estimated the total realistic housing supply figure by some 345 dwellings, resulting in a corrected figure of 2,362 dwellings being achievable within the five year period. This revised figure is combined within an updated supply assessment calculation (also included at Appendix 3) which (based on the adjusted annual housing requirement of 535 dwellings) indicates a supply equivalent to some **4.41 years**.

4.8. It is therefore clear that the requirements of NPPF Paragraph 49 are engaged and that the relevant policies of the Core Strategy for the supply of housing are out of date.
5. REASON FOR REFUSAL AND CASE FOR THE APPELLANT

Reasons for Refusal

5.1. For reference, the five reasons for refusal on the application for planning consent (3/2016/1196) are as follows:

1. The proposal is considered contrary to Key Statements DS1, DS2 and Policies DMG2 and DMH3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy in that the approval would lead to the creation of a new residential dwellings in the defined open countryside, located outside of a defined settlement boundary, without sufficient or adequate justification which would cause harm to the development strategy for the borough.

2. It is considered that the approval of this application would lead to the creation of an anomalous, discordant and incongruous pattern and form of development that is poorly related to the existing settlement by virtue of a significant degree of visual separation, being of significant detriment to the character, appearance and visual amenities of the area and defined open countryside contrary to Policies DMG1 and DMG2 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.

3. The proposal is considered contrary to Policies DMG1 and DMG2 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy insofar that it would result in the introduction of built form in a visually prominent location in the defined open countryside to a degree that cumulatively, would have a visual suburbanising effect upon the landscape and erode the sense of openness that defines the character of the area and open countryside in this location.

4. The proposal is considered contrary to Key Statement EN5 and Policies DMG1 and DME4 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy insofar that it would result in the erosion of the sense of openness associated with the setting of the adjacent Grade II Listed Building, Lower Standen Farmhouse. It is further considered that the proposed development is considered contrary to Key Statement EN5 and Policies DMG1 and DME4 in that the proposal would undermine and conflict with the inherent character of the aforementioned building by virtue of the overtly suburban arrangement, layout and orientation of the proposed dwellings and their associated outbuildings.

5. The proposed development would create a harmful precedent for the acceptance of other similar proposals in the defined open countryside without sufficient or adequate justification, which cumulatively would lead to the perpetuation of unsustainable patterns of development within the Borough, outside the existing defined settlement which would have an adverse impact on the implementation of the Development Strategy as adopted within the Ribble Valley Core Strategy, contrary to the interests of the proper planning of the area in accordance with the core principles and policies of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Case for the Appellant

5.2. The following sections look to detail why it is considered that the LPA was incorrect in its determination of the planning application and demonstrate further why the appeal should be allowed.
5.3. It is considered that the main issues are:

a) The degree to which the proposed development is consistent with the Development Plan, in particular those policies detailed in section 3.2 of this statement;

b) The extent to which the proposed development is compliant with guidance in the NPPF and would constitute sustainable development;

c) Whether there are any other material considerations, namely the Borough’s housing supply, which would influence the decision.

5.4. In relation to setting out the case of the appellant, the decision has been taken to group the reasons for refusal on the basis there is a notable degree of cross over and repetition within the 5 stated reasons. In this instance reasons 1 & 5 have been grouped together, as have reasons 2 & 3, reason 4 will be addressed in isolation.

1st and 5th Reasons for Refusal

5.5. Both the above reasons for refusal focus around the principle of development within the open countryside and the potential ramifications of permitting such proposals. Firstly, reference is made to Policy DS1 which outlines the development strategy for the region, detailing the locations in which development will be focused.

5.6. It is worth noting at this stage that the settlement boundaries and hence the definition between urban area and open countryside have yet to be fixed, and this will only occur following the adoption of the Housing and Economic Development DPD, which remains at an early stage (consultation on preferred options to take place in the coming months) and hence has limited weight. Although the Council have sought to indicate that the established settlement boundaries will be used for development management purposes until reviewed, these were established many years ago and clearly are out of date and in need of review. The emerging DPD will review thematic designations such as Green Belt, AONB, Open Countryside and it is therefore evident that, until such time as settlement boundaries are fixed, the site’s designation as Open Countryside is at the present time uncertain and will remain as such until the aforementioned DPD is adopted.

5.7. Even accepting that the site lies within the open countryside, it is clear that it represents a location which is immediately adjacent to the Borough’s principal settlement, Clitheroe. Its geographical proximity and functional relationship ensures that development in this location would be considerably more sustainable than other more isolated locations. In this respect we consider the site to be adjacent to the settlement boundary; it is acknowledged to be 30m from the previously defined settlement boundary.

5.8. Furthermore, Core Strategy Policy DS1 states that development in all settlements will be considered acceptable if it demonstrates regeneration benefits and is ‘appropriate for consolidation and expansion or rounding-off of the built-up area’. Therefore, as a site on the periphery of the settlement, which offers the opportunity to contribute to the housing supply within Clitheroe in a very accessible location and hence sustainable manner, we consider that the site can be considered to be consistent with Policy DS1, at least until such time as the settlement boundaries have been resolved through the emerging DPD.
5.9. It is not considered material to the appeal that planning consents exist which would ensure that Clitheroe is able to meet its requirements for new housing. Such targets as given as minimum requirements, with there being no maximum figure. It is therefore entirely misleading to suggest that the grant of planning permissions for housing to meet the minimum requirement then should act as a bar to further consents. On the contrary in order to ensure that minimum requirements are met, it is almost always necessary to ensure a level of supply well in excess of the minimum requirement. Such a strategy would more closely align with the stated intentions of the Core Strategy.

5.10. Moreover in the Council’s housing land supply calculations (Housing Availability Schedule - October 2016) there remains an allowance for windfall sites, with a total of 115 dwellings anticipated within the 5-year period. In order to meet the Council’s targets, it is necessary that a continuous number of windfall approvals are brought forward. In our view, the appeal site would constitute such a proposal and would help to address the windfall requirement within the Council’s housing supply calculations.

5.11. With reference to the requirements of Policy DS2, the proposal should be viewed in the context of the existing cluster of buildings associated with Lower Standen Hey Farm and those other recent dwellings to the north. In this context, it is not considered that the ‘linear’ nature of the development at all compromises this relationship, given the varying types of dwelling associated with the farmstead, namely the bungalow which neighbours the farmhouse and the modern dwelling associated with Application 3/2012/0096, which was consented at appeal in March 2013. Based on this and the information detailed within the submitted planning application it is quite apparent that the proposal represents sustainable development and as such is compliant with Policy DS2. Moreover, it was also demonstrated in sections 2.5 and 2.6 of the aforementioned Planning Statement that in respect of sustainable transport methods, including walking and cycling, the site was highly accessible.

5.12. Policy DMH3: Dwellings in the open countryside, clearly seeks to protect the open countryside from development for the sake of its character and visual amenity. It is not considered that the proposed development at Lower Standen Hey Farm would undermine the purpose of policies Policy DMH3 as it will not result in a harmful intrusion into open countryside in this location, rather it would constitute a logical extension/rounding off to the existing principal settlement. Moreover the proposed residential development in this location will not visually intrude into the wider open countryside and indeed the site is visually well contained and appears well-related to the built-up parts of the settlement.

5.13. In short, the appeal site represents an appropriate limited extension to the Borough’s principal settlements, and which would round-off the existing urban area in a manner which would not result in any material adverse impacts, ensuring it can be viewed favourably in the context of Policies DS1, DS2 and DMG2.

Reasons 2 & 3

5.14. Reasons 2 and 3 state that the form of the development would be incongruous, isolated and visually prominent, arguing that the proposal is subsequently in conflict with Policies DMG1 and DMG 2 of the Core Strategy. The following section seeks to detail why we believe this to be incorrect.
5.15. We entirely disagree with the Council’s assertions that the proposed development would lead to the creation of an anomalous, discordant and incongruous pattern of development. The site is closely aligned with the existing settlement, with the proposal and the adjacent modern development to the north seeking to frame and highlight the existing woodland and Pendleton Brook as a feature rather than compromise it. The prominence of said features and their ability to act as a gateway or ‘logical termination point to the settlement’ have in our view been overstated by the Council, as has the visual prominence of the site, which takes advantage of the topography to help ensure that it appears as part of the settlement, when viewed from more distant vantage points. Furthermore, the significant level of mature vegetation prevalent along the access track and indeed Whalley Road further limits the visual prominence of the site, ensuring the impacts are restricted to transient views available intermittently as one is very close to the settlement.

5.16. The proposed development would not be of detriment to existing or future infrastructure provision, nor would it generate the requirement for new facilities or place an unsustainable burden on existing provision. The submitted ecology report confirms no significant impacts would arise from the development and Lancashire County Council Highways had no objection to the scheme. Moreover, the case officer acknowledged in their report that no significant or detrimental impacts on residential amenity would be generated, suggesting that in relation to Policy DMG1 only the first section entitled ‘Design’ is of relevance to the 2nd & 3rd reasons for refusal.

5.17. Matters related to the listed building to the south-west are discussed later in the statement.

5.18. The first criteria laid out in this section of Policy DMG1 relates to the need to have regard for the “8 building in context principles”. The first three principles relate to the need to understand the place, existing features and the significance of the proposal. In relation to this it is considered that a thoughtful design process has resulted in the current scheme, following the formal pre-application exercise (pre-application reference RV/ENQ/2016/00057). As part of the exercise the applicant commissioned a heritage consultant to assist in the development of the proposals and had the benefit of the initial views of the Council in relation to matters of scale and design. This led to further iterations of the proposed plan and ultimately a reduction in scale of 40%, from that submitted with the pre-application. Copies of the submitted Pre-Application Statement and Layout are included in Appendix 4, as is a copy of the Council’s response.

5.19. The significant scaling back of the development also supports the view that the scheme is acceptable in the context of the 4th and 5th principles. The latter three principles cover similar matters to the criteria 2 and 3 of the aforementioned design section of Policy DMG1 and as such will be addressed in tandem. The criteria all relate to have regard for matters of density, layout and relationships with existing buildings and the surrounding landscape. With regard to such matters, it is considered the submitted application provides, in appropriate detail, the effort made to ensure that existing open views were not comprised and the density had been limited, so as to ensure it was not ‘excessive’ and could be viewed in the context of the adjacent settlement, as well as the immediate cluster of dwellings. The scale of the development has allowed the proposal to interact well with the existing buildings both to the north and south-west and this is further enhanced by the judicious use of materials which will complement the adjacent development. It is also of note that appeal reference APP/T2350/A/12/2186164 related to the erection of a modern dwelling just over 100m west of the appeal site. In respect of matters of visual impact, the Inspector in that case opined that :-
“Just as Primrose House and Lower Standen Farmhouse were built in the contemporary style of the early 19th century the proposed dwelling would reflect contemporary residential design... (as such) the dwelling would not, in itself be conspicuous, incongruous or visually intrusive.”

5.20. This is thought to be equally applicable to the appeal site, given the proposed development will be viewed in the context of the adjacent development to the north, which to a degree this proposal seeks to replicate. Additionally, the dwelling referred to as part of the above appeal was undeniably modern and of far greater contrast to the existing dwellings than those proposed as part of this appeal. However, the Inspector still concluded that the proposal was entirely appropriate for the location and would be complementary to the surrounding landscape. This conclusion was reached despite acknowledging the dwelling would “not reflect local vernacular, scale, style, features and building materials”. A copy of the aforementioned appeal decision is included within Appendix 5 of this statement.

5.21. In this case, significant regard has been had for the siting, materials, scale etc. of the proposals, which as a result would mean that the development would not lead to anomalous or incongruous development.

Reason 4

5.22. In addressing the above reason for refusal, it should be noted that there were no comments from the Council’s heritage/conservation team. Therefore, it can only be assumed that the comments made in the officer’s report regarding heritage were not informed by specialist advice.

5.23. In relation to the comments made in the officer’s report and reason for refusal, we do not believe that the linear format of the proposed development would result in a material detriment to the setting of the listed building by virtue of the proposals relationship with the existing ‘farmstead’ arrangement. Such a layout was explored as part of the pre-application but was shown to generate a significantly greater impact on the open eastern views enjoyed by the listed building and as such considered less preferable to that proposed as part of this appeal. The submitted design utilises the topography to ensure it’s less prominent in the context of both Whalley Road and the existing cluster of buildings. Furthermore, despite the comments raised in the officer’s report, in proposing a bungalow as unit 01 we have ensured that the listed farmhouse would remain the more visual prominent property built on the south to north axis. Whilst the footprint of the bungalow is larger and sited marginally further forward, the difference in height ensures that it does not undermine the visual prominence of the listed structure.

5.24. The impact of the development on heritage assets was considered as part the application by a professional heritage consultant who concluded as follows:

“The assessment of significance has revealed that the primary significances of the house relate to the evidential value of its authentic building fabric and primary views of the building from the east: these views have aesthetic value. Otherwise of secondary value is the illustrative historic value of the farmstead, which has been eroded through past conversion and change, and shared views of the building with the surrounding farmstead structures.

The finalised design of the housing scheme conserves the aforementioned primary views of the house and is set away from the historic farmstead. Through careful analysis and reference to policy and guidance, the proposals can be seen to successfully conserve the significances of the listed building
in its setting and thereby satisfy local and national planning policies aimed at conserving the historic built environment.”

5.25. Having regard for the above commentary it is considered that, contrary to the Council’s assessment, the proposal is not of detriment to the listed structure or its setting. The development seeks to retain the existing primary views with the high-quality design securing a positive contribution to the local distinctiveness/sense of place. As such it is not considered the development is in conflict with policies EN5, DMG1 and DME4 of the adopted Core Strategy and is therefore permissible in this context.

Other Material Considerations

5-year housing supply

5.26. As noted throughout the submitted application, it is our view that Ribble Valley Borough Council is unable to demonstrate a 5-year housing supply. We have undertaken a detailed assessment of the Council’s housing land supply calculations, including the prospects of some established consents being implemented, the likely commencement dates and the likely delivery rates. This has resulted in an assessment that the realistic housing supply sits at 4.41 years. The calculations and justification are outlined within the tables included in Appendix 3 of this statement. This evidence relates to the October 2016 Housing Land Availability Schedule which suggests that the authority has a 5.32-year supply. This is disputed for the reasons identified within the appendix.

5.27. It is also relevant to note that, as previously detailed, the aforementioned 5.32-year supply was further reduced to a 4.99-year supply on the basis that RVBC agreed to adjust the manner in which they calculate their requirement (now adding the backlog to the annual requirement prior to adding the necessary buffer). Despite more recent approvals, we remain of the opinion that, based on the October 2016 figures (adjusted to reflect realistic assumptions) the Council’s realistic supply is less than 5 years.

5.28. On the basis of our position, it is clear that Paragraph 49 of the National Planning Policy Framework is engaged, meaning that relevant policies for the supply of housing are out of date. As such, in accordance with NPPF Paragraph 14, planning permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole and those contained in the Development Plan. For the reasons explained earlier in this statement, we do not believe there to be any conflict with development plan policy or any adverse effects, less still any impacts which would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of a grant of planning permission in the context of the need to boost the supply of housing in the Borough in a sustainable manner.

5.29. We therefore consider the development to be broadly compliant with the relevant policies of the development plan and that it can also be considered as sustainable development, for which planning permission ought to be granted.

Other Matters

5.30. It is notable that no objections were received from the highway authority, ecology consultees, United Utilities and (to our knowledge) any heritage consultee.

5.31. The Parish Council did raise concerns over the application, however, this was in part due to highways concerns which were largely unfounded as is evidenced by the lack of any objection from LCC
Highways, who were content with the proposals. Concern was also raised in respect of the potential ‘precedent’ for other open countryside applications. As is evident, all applications are to be assessed on their own merits and in this case, given the particular circumstances, including the lack of a five year housing supply, we do not consider that the grant of planning permission would create any precedent which would prevent the refusal of less appropriate schemes.

5.32. No other considerations are considered material to the determination of this application.
6. **SUGGESTED CONDITIONS**

6.1. Government advice on the imposition of conditions in planning permissions is to be found in NPPF Paragraph 206 and expanded upon in PPG: Use of Planning Conditions. The guidance states that conditions should only be imposed where they are:

- Necessary;
- Relevant to planning;
- Relevant to the development to be permitted;
- Enforceable;
- Precise; and
- Reasonable in all other respects.

6.2. Other than statutory conditions, it is considered that there would be requirement for:

- Conditions related to the materials used in the construction of the dwellings; and
- Ecological conditions relating to the Bat surveys and ecological report submitted in support of the application.
7. CONCLUSION

7.1. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires planning applications to be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

7.2. It has been demonstrated within this statement that the proposed development is consistent with the provisions of the relevant development plan policies and would represent sustainable development and thus complies with the NPPF. It has also been identified that there are other material considerations which would support the proposed development and would suggest that planning permission ought to be granted. In particular it is demonstrated that the Council is unable to demonstrate a five year housing supply and hence the requirements of NPPF Paragraph 14 and 49 are engaged.

7.3. Accordingly, it is concluded that the Council’s reasons for refusal are unfounded and that the decision to refuse planning permission was unjustified.

7.4. The Inspector is therefore respectfully requested to allow the appeal and grant planning permission for the proposed erection of 5no dwellings at land associated with Lower Standen Hey Farm, Whalley Road, Clitheroe.
Appendix 1 – Relevant Policy Extracts
The Development Strategy

KEY STATEMENT DS1: DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY

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.

Strategic employment opportunities will be promoted through the development of:

- the Barrow Enterprise Site as a main location for employment; and
- the Samlesbury Enterprise Zone.

New retail and leisure development will be directed toward the centres of:

- Clitheroe;
- Longridge; and
- Whalley.
In addition to the 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:

- Barrow;
- Billington;
- Chatburn;
- Gisburn;
- Langho;
- Mellor;
- Mellor Brook;
- Read & Simonstone;
- Wilpshire.

In the 23 remaining Tier 2 Village settlements, which are the less sustainable of the 32 defined settlements, development will need to meet proven local needs or deliver regeneration benefits. The Tier 2 Village settlements are:

- Bolton-by-Bowland;
- Brockhall;
- Calderstones;
- Chipping;
- Copster Green;
- Downham;
- Dunsop Bridge;
- Grindleton;
- Holden;
- Hurst Green;
- Newton;
- Osbaldeston;
- Pendleton;
- Ribchester;
- Rimington;
- Sabden;
- Sawley;
- Slaidburn;
- Tosside;
- Waddington;
- West Bradford;
- Wiswell;
- Worston.

In general the scale of planned housing growth will be managed to reflect existing population size, the availability of, or the opportunity to provide facilities to serve the development and the extent to which development can be accommodated within the local area. Specific allocations will be made through the preparation of a separate allocations DPD.

In allocating development, the Council will have regard to the AONB, Green Belt and similar designations when establishing the scale, extent and form of development to be allocated under this strategy. The relevant constraints are set out as part of the strategic framework included in this plan.

Development that has recognised regeneration benefits, is for identified local needs or satisfies neighbourhood planning legislation, will be considered in all the borough's settlements, including small-scale development in the smaller settlements that are appropriate for consolidation and expansion or rounding-off of the built up area.

Through this strategy, development opportunities will be created for economic, social and environmental well-being and development for future generations.
4.13 Whilst Barrow is recognised as a Tier 1 Village settlement and therefore one of the more sustainable defined settlements, the distribution takes account of the large commitment to housing that exists as a result of planning permissions at Barrow and consequently further housing development is not being promoted at this settlement.

4.14 In relation to employment land, under the preferred strategy, it will continue to be possible to accommodate the minimum required level of land for economic development (8ha over the remainder of the plan period). It is considered that provision can be included within land at Standen to the south of Clitheroe to generate a mixed development opportunity as well as the opportunity to bring other sites forward to protect choice of locations. The existing site at Barrow Enterprise Park would continue in its role as the borough’s principle strategic location for employment. The designation of the Enterprise Zone at Samlesbury, which includes land within both Ribble Valley and South Ribble, offers the potential to support and strengthen the economy. Through specialist investment it provides an opportunity to develop further the economy of the Ribble Valley through service and supply chain growth and is recognised as a strategic site. Under the neighbourhood planning legislation, it would also be possible to bring forward land for economic development where there are demonstrable regeneration benefits and in locations where local communities would like to see development take place.

**KEY STATEMENT DS2: PRESCRIPTION IN FAVOUR OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT**

When considering development proposals the Council will take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the National Planning Policy Framework. It will always work proactively with applicants jointly to find solutions which mean that proposals can be approved wherever possible, and to secure development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area.

Planning applications that accord with the policies in this Local Plan (and, where relevant, with policies in neighbourhood plans) will be approved without delay, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Where there are no policies relevant to the application or relevant policies are out of date at the time of making the decision then the Council will grant permission unless material considerations indicate otherwise – taking into account whether:

- any adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework taken as a whole; or
- specific policies in that Framework indicate that development should be restricted.
WHY ARE WE TAKING THIS APPROACH?

The SA Scoping report highlighted a need to protect and enhance the historic environment of Ribble Valley. This includes heritage assets and their settings. The LDF evidence base provides up to date information on the historic environment such as up to date conservation area appraisals, which include information on issues such as listed buildings and buildings of townscape merit. There is a rolling programme to keep these appraisals up to date. It is clear through LDF evidence base work and reports such as the SA scoping report that Ribble Valley has a high quality environment (including historic environment) that must be preserved and enhanced for a variety of reasons, including their educational role. The historic environment should continue to inform and inspire new development of high quality.

KEY STATEMENT EN5: HERITAGE ASSETS

There will be a presumption in favour of the conservation and enhancement of the significance of heritage assets and their settings. The Historic Environment and its Heritage Assets and their settings will be conserved and enhanced in a manner appropriate to their significance for their heritage value; their important contribution to local character, distinctiveness and sense of place; and to wider social, cultural and environmental benefits.

This will be achieved through:

- Recognising that the best way of ensuring the long term protection of heritage assets is to ensure a viable use that optimises opportunities for sustaining and enhancing its significance.
- Keeping Conservation Area Appraisals under review to ensure that any development proposals respect and safeguard the character, appearance and significance of the area.
- Considering any development proposals which may impact on a heritage asset or their setting through seeking benefits that conserve and enhance their significance and avoids any substantial harm to the heritage asset.
- Requiring all development proposals to make a positive contribution to local distinctiveness/sense of place.
- The consideration of Article 4 Directions to restrict permitted development rights where the exercise of such rights would harm the historic environment.
subject to consultation claiming differing stages of their preparation. Separate reports are available relating to the consultation responses and how the Council has sought to address issues raised.

GENERAL

POLICY DMG1: GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

10.4 IN DETERMINING PLANNING APPLICATIONS, ALL DEVELOPMENT MUST:

DESIGN

1. BE OF A HIGH STANDARD OF BUILDING DESIGN WHICH CONSIDERS THE 8 BUILDING IN CONTEXT PRINCIPLES (FROM THE CABE/ENGLISH HERITAGE BUILDING ON CONTEXT TOOLKIT).

2. BE SYMPATHETIC TO EXISTING AND PROPOSED LAND USES IN TERMS OF ITS SIZE, INTENSITY AND NATURE AS WELL AS SCALE, MASSING, STYLE, FEATURES AND BUILDING MATERIALS.

3. CONSIDER THE DENSITY, LAYOUT AND RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN BUILDINGS, WHICH IS OF MAJOR IMPORTANCE. PARTICULAR EMPHASIS WILL BE PLACED ON VISUAL APPEARANCE AND THE RELATIONSHIP TO SURROUNDINGS, INCLUDING IMPACT ON LANDSCAPE CHARACTER, AS WELL AS THE EFFECTS OF DEVELOPMENT ON EXISTING AMENITIES.

4. USE SUSTAINABLE CONSTRUCTION TECHNIQUES WHERE POSSIBLE AND PROVIDE EVIDENCE THAT ENERGY EFFICIENCY, AS DESCRIBED WITHIN POLICY DME5, HAS BEEN INCORPORATED INTO SCHEMES WHERE POSSIBLE.

5. THE CODE FOR SUSTAINABLE HOMES AND LIFETIME HOMES, OR ANY SUBSEQUENT NATIONALLY RECOGNISED EQUIVALENT STANDARDS, SHOULD BE INCORPORATED INTO SCHEMES.

ACCESS

1. CONSIDER THE POTENTIAL TRAFFIC AND CAR PARKING IMPLICATIONS.

2. ENSURE SAFE ACCESS CAN BE PROVIDED WHICH IS SUITABLE TO ACCOMMODATE THE SCALE AND TYPE OF TRAFFIC LIKELY TO BE GENERATED.
3. CONSIDER THE PROTECTION AND ENHANCEMENT OF PUBLIC RIGHTS OF WAY AND ACCESS.

**AMENITY**

1. NOT ADVERSELY AFFECT THE AMENITIES OF THE SURROUNDING AREA.
2. PROVIDE ADEQUATE DAY LIGHTING AND PRIVACY DISTANCES.
3. HAVE REGARD TO PUBLIC SAFETY AND SECURED BY DESIGN PRINCIPLES.
4. CONSIDER AIR QUALITY AND MITIGATE ADVERSE IMPACTS WHERE POSSIBLE.

**ENVIRONMENT**

1. CONSIDER THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS SUCH AS SSSIS, COUNTY HERITAGE SITES, LOCAL NATURE RESERVES, BIODIVERSITY ACTION PLAN (BAP) HABITATS AND SPECIES, SPECIAL AREAS OF CONSERVATION AND SPECIAL PROTECTED AREAS, PROTECTED SPECIES, GREEN CORRIDORS AND OTHER SITES OF NATURE CONSERVATION.
3. ALL DEVELOPMENT MUST PROTECT AND ENHANCE HERITAGE ASSETS AND THEIR SETTINGS.
4. ALL NEW DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS WILL BE REQUIRED TO TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THE RISKS ARISING FROM FORMER COAL MINING AND, WHERE NECESSARY, INCORPORATE SUITABLE MITIGATION MEASURES TO ADDRESS THEM.
5. ACHIEVE EFFICIENT LAND USE AND THE REUSE AND REMEDIATION OF PREVIOUSLY DEVELOPED SITES WHERE POSSIBLE. PREVIOUSLY DEVELOPED SITES SHOULD ALWAYS BE USED INSTEAD OF GREENFIELD SITES WHERE POSSIBLE.
INFRASTRUCTURE

1. NOT RESULT IN THE NET LOSS OF IMPORTANT OPEN SPACE, INCLUDING PUBLIC AND PRIVATE PLAYING FIELDS WITHOUT A ROBUST ASSESSMENT THAT THE SITES ARE SURPLUS TO NEED. IN ASSESSING THIS, REGARD MUST BE HAD TO THE LEVEL OF PROVISION AND STANDARD OF PUBLIC OPEN SPACE IN THE AREA, THE IMPORTANCE OF PLAYING FIELDS AND THE NEED TO PROTECT SCHOOL PLAYING FIELDS TO MEET FUTURE NEEDS. REGARD WILL ALSO BE HAD TO THE LANDSCAPE OR TOWNSCAPE OF AN AREA AND THE IMPORTANCE THE OPEN SPACE HAS ON THIS.

2. HAVE REGARD TO THE AVAILABILITY TO KEY INFRASTRUCTURE WITH CAPACITY. WHERE KEY INFRASTRUCTURE WITH CAPACITY IS NOT AVAILABLE IT MAY BE NECESSARY TO PHASE DEVELOPMENT TO ALLOW INFRASTRUCTURE ENHANCEMENTS TO TAKE PLACE.

3. CONSIDER THE POTENTIAL IMPACT ON SOCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE PROVISION.

OTHER

1. NOT PREJUDICE FUTURE DEVELOPMENT WHICH WOULD PROVIDE SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL AND AMENITY IMPROVEMENTS.

This policy helps deliver the vision for the area and gives an overarching series of considerations that the Council will have regard to in achieving quality development.

POLICY DMG2: STRATEGIC CONSIDERATIONS

10.5 DEVELOPMENT SHOULD BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CORE STRATEGY DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY AND SHOULD SUPPORT THE SPATIAL VISION.

1. DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS IN THE PRINCIPAL SETTLEMENTS OF CLITHEROE, LONRIDGE 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.
WITHIN THE TIER 2 VILLAGES AND OUTSIDE THE DEFINED SETTLEMENT AREAS DEVELOPMENT MUST MEET AT LEAST ONE OF THE FOLLOWING CONSIDERATIONS:

1. THE DEVELOPMENT SHOULD BE ESSENTIAL TO THE LOCAL ECONOMY OR SOCIAL WELL BEING OF THE AREA.

2. THE DEVELOPMENT IS NEEDED FOR THE PURPOSES OF FORESTRY OR AGRICULTURE.

3. THE DEVELOPMENT IS FOR LOCAL NEEDS HOUSING WHICH MEETS AN IDENTIFIED NEED AND IS SECURED AS SUCH.

4. THE DEVELOPMENT IS FOR SMALL SCALE TOURISM OR RECREATIONAL DEVELOPMENTS APPROPRIATE TO A RURAL AREA.

5. THE DEVELOPMENT IS FOR SMALL-SCALE USES APPROPRIATE TO A RURAL AREA WHERE A LOCAL NEED OR BENEFIT CAN BE DEMONSTRATED.

6. THE DEVELOPMENT IS COMPATIBLE WITH THE ENTERPRISE ZONE DESIGNATION.

WITHIN THE OPEN COUNTRYSIDE DEVELOPMENT WILL BE REQUIRED TO BE IN KEEPING WITH THE CHARACTER OF THE LANDSCAPE AND ACKNOWLEDGE THE SPECIAL QUALITIES OF THE AREA BY VIRTUE OF ITS SIZE, DESIGN, USE OF MATERIALS, LANDSCAPING AND SITING. WHERE POSSIBLE NEW DEVELOPMENT SHOULD BE ACCOMMODATED THROUGH THE RE-USE OF EXISTING BUILDINGS, WHICH IN MOST CASES IS MORE APPROPRIATE THAN NEW BUILD.

ITS SIZE, DESIGN, USE OF MATERIAL, LANDSCAPING AND SITING. THE AONB MANAGEMENT PLAN SHOULD BE CONSIDERED AND WILL BE USED BY THE COUNCIL IN DETERMINING PLANNING APPLICATIONS.

FOR THE PURPOSES OF THIS POLICY THE TERM SETTLEMENT IS DEFINED IN THE GLOSSARY. CURRENT SETTLEMENT BOUNDARIES WILL BE UPDATED IN SUBSEQUENT DPDS.

This policy assists the interpretation of the development strategy and underpins the settlement hierarchy for the purposes of delivering sustainable development. In establishing broad constraints to development the Council will secure the overall vision of the Core Strategy.

**POLICY DMG3: TRANSPORT AND MOBILITY**

10.6 IN MAKING DECISIONS ON DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY WILL, IN ADDITION TO ASSESSING PROPOSALS WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF THE DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY, ATTACH CONSIDERABLE WEIGHT TO:

THE AVAILABILITY AND ADEQUACY OF PUBLIC TRANSPORT AND ASSOCIATED INFRASTRUCTURE TO SERVE THOSE MOVING TO AND FROM THE DEVELOPMENT -

1. THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE SITE TO THE PRIMARY ROUTE NETWORK AND THE STRATEGIC ROAD NETWORK.

2. THE PROVISION MADE FOR ACCESS TO THE DEVELOPMENT BY PEDESTRIAN, CYCLISTS AND THOSE WITH REDUCED MOBILITY.

3. PROPOSALS WHICH PROMOTE DEVELOPMENT WITHIN EXISTING DEVELOPED AREAS OR EXTENSIONS TO THEM AT LOCATIONS WHICH ARE HIGHLY ACCESSIBLE BY MEANS OTHER THAN THE PRIVATE CAR.

4. PROPOSALS WHICH LOCATE MAJOR GENERATORS OF TRAVEL DEMAND IN EXISTING CENTRES WHICH ARE HIGHLY ACCESSIBLE BY MEANS OTHER THAN THE PRIVATE CAR.

5. PROPOSALS WHICH STRENGTHEN EXISTING TOWN AND VILLAGE CENTRES WHICH OFFER A RANGE OF EVERYDAY COMMUNITY SHOPPING AND EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES BY PROTECTING AND ENHANCING THEIR VITALITY AND VIABILITY.
POLICY DME4: PROTECTING HERITAGE ASSETS

10.15 IN CONSIDERING DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS THE COUNCIL WILL MAKE A PRESUMPTION IN FAVOUR OF THE CONSERVATION AND ENHANCEMENT OF HERITAGE ASSETS AND THEIR SETTINGS.

1. CONSERVATION AREAS

PROPOSALS WITHIN, OR AFFECTING VIEWS INTO AND OUT OF, OR AFFECTING THE SETTING OF A CONSERVATION AREA WILL BE REQUIRED TO CONSERVE AND WHERE APPROPRIATE ENHANCE ITS CHARACTER AND APPEARANCE AND THOSE ELEMENTS WHICH CONTRIBUTE TOWARDS ITS SIGNIFICANCE. THIS SHOULD INCLUDE CONSIDERATIONS AS TO WHETHER IT CONSERVES AND ENHANCES THE SPECIAL ARCHITECTURAL AND HISTORIC CHARACTER OF THE AREA AS SET OUT IN THE RELEVANT CONSERVATION AREA APPRAISAL. DEVELOPMENT WHICH MAKES A POSITIVE CONTRIBUTION AND CONSERVES AND ENHANCES THE CHARACTER, APPEARANCE AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE AREA IN TERMS OF ITS LOCATION, SCALE, SIZE, DESIGN AND MATERIALS AND EXISTING BUILDINGS, STRUCTURES, TREES AND OPEN SPACES WILL BE SUPPORTED.

IN THE CONSERVATION AREAS THERE WILL BE A PRESUMPTION IN FAVOUR OF THE CONSERVATION AND ENHANCEMENT OF ELEMENTS THAT MAKE A POSITIVE CONTRIBUTION TO THE CHARACTER OR APPEARANCE OF THE CONSERVATION AREA.

2. LISTED BUILDINGS AND OTHER BUILDINGS OF SIGNIFICANT HERITAGE INTEREST

ALTERATIONS OR EXTENSIONS TO LISTED BUILDINGS OR BUILDINGS OF LOCAL HERITAGE INTEREST, OR DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS ON SITES WITHIN THEIR SETTING WHICH CAUSE HARM TO THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE HERITAGE ASSET WILL NOT BE SUPPORTED.

ANY PROPOSALS INVOLVING THE DEMOLITION OR LOSS OF IMPORTANT HISTORIC FABRIC FROM LISTED BUILDINGS WILL BE REFUSED UNLESS IT CAN BE DEMONSTRATED THAT EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES EXIST.
3. REGISTERED HISTORIC PARKS AND GARDENS OF SPECIAL HISTORIC INTEREST AND OTHER GARDENS OF SIGNIFICANT HERITAGE INTEREST

PROPOSALS WHICH CAUSE HARM TO OR LOSS OF SIGNIFICANCE TO REGISTERED PARKS, GARDENS OR LANDSCAPES OF SPECIAL HISTORIC INTEREST OR OTHER GARDENS OF SIGNIFICANT LOCAL HERITAGE INTEREST, INCLUDING THEIR SETTING, WILL NOT BE SUPPORTED.

4. SCHEDULED MONUMENTS AND OTHER ARCHAEOLOGICAL REMAINS

APPLICATIONS FOR DEVELOPMENT THAT WOULD RESULT IN HARM TO THE SIGNIFICANCE OF A SCHEDULED MONUMENT OR NATIONALLY IMPORTANT ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES WILL NOT BE SUPPORTED.

DEVELOPERS WILL BE EXPECTED TO INVESTIGATE THE SIGNIFICANCE OF NON DESIGNATED ARCHAEOLOGY PRIOR TO DETERMINATION OF AN APPLICATION. WHERE THIS DEMONSTRATES THAT THE SIGNIFICANCE IS EQUIVALENT TO THAT OF DESIGNATED ASSETS, PROPOSALS WHICH CAUSE HARM TO THE SIGNIFICANCE OF NON DESIGNATED ASSETS WILL NOT BE SUPPORTED.

WHERE IT CAN BE DEMONSTRATED THAT THAT THE SUBSTANTIAL PUBLIC BENEFITS OF ANY PROPOSALS OUTWEIGH THE HARM TO OR LOSS OF THE ABOVE, THE COUNCIL WILL SEEK TO ENSURE MITIGATION OF DAMAGE THROUGH PRESERVATION OF REMAINS IN SITU AS THE PREFERRED SOLUTION. WHERE THIS IS NOT JUSTIFIED DEVELOPERS WILL BE REQUIRED TO MAKE ADEQUATE PROVISION FOR EXCAVATION AND RECORDING OF THE ASSET BEFORE OR DURING EXCAVATION.

PROPOSALS SHOULD ALSO GIVE ADEQUATE CONSIDERATION OF HOW THE PUBLIC UNDERSTANDING AND APPRECIATION OF SUCH SITES COULD BE IMPROVED.

IN LINE WITH NPPF, RIBLE VALLEY AIMS TO SEEK POSITIVE IMPROVEMENTS IN THE QUALITY OF THE HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT THROUGH THE FOLLOWING:

A) MONITORING HERITAGE ASSETS AT RISK AND;

I) SUPPORTING DEVELOPMENT/RE-USE PROPOSALS CONSISTENT WITH THEIR CONSERVATION;
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II) CONSIDERING USE OF LEGAL POWERS (BUILDING PRESERVATION NOTICES, URGENT WORKS NOTICES) TO ENSURE THE PROPER PRESERVATION OF LISTED BUILDINGS AND BUILDINGS WITHIN THE CONSERVATION AREAS.

B) SUPPORTING REDEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS WHICH BETTER REVEAL THE SIGNIFICANCE OF HERITAGE ASSETS OR THEIR SETTINGS.

C) PRODUCTION OF DESIGN GUIDANCE.

D) KEEPING CONSERVATION AREA MANAGEMENT GUIDANCE UNDER REVIEW.

E) USE OF LEGAL ENFORCEMENT POWERS TO ADDRESS UNAUTHORISED WORKS WHERE IT IS EXPEDIENT TO DO SO.

F) ASSESS THE SIGNIFICANCE AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR ENHANCEMENT OF NON DESIGNATED HERITAGE ASSETS THROUGH THE DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PROCESS.

The protection of heritage assets is recognised in national policy and makes a significant contribution to the character and inherent qualities of the borough. It is important to provide clear guidance on the treatment of these assets through the development management process.

POLICY DME5: RENEWABLE ENERGY

10.16 THE BOROUGH COUNCIL WILL SUPPORT THE DEVELOPMENT OF RENEWABLE ENERGY SCHEMES, PROVIDING IT CAN BE SHOWN THAT SUCH DEVELOPMENTS WOULD NOT CAUSE UNACCEPTABLE HARM TO THE LOCAL ENVIRONMENT OR LOCAL AMENITY. IN ASSESSING PROPOSALS, THE BOROUGH COUNCIL WILL HAVE PARTICULAR REGARD TO THE FOLLOWING ISSUES:

1. THE IMMEDIATE AND WIDER IMPACT OF THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT ON THE LANDSCAPE, INCLUDING ITS VISUAL IMPACT AND THE CUMULATIVE IMPACTS OF DEVELOPMENT.

2. THE MEASURES TAKEN TO MINIMISE THE IMPACT OF THE PROPOSALS ON RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

3. THE POTENTIAL BENEFITS THE PROPOSALS MAY BRING
Appendix 2 – RVBC’s 5-year Housing Supply Evidence.
### Annualised requirement

The Core Strategy was adopted on 16th December 2014. Policy H1 sets an overall requirement of 5600 dwellings for the plan period 2008 - 2028 which equates to 280 dwellings per year. The 5 year requirement is calculated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Planned provision 2008 - 2028</td>
<td>5600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Annual equivalent</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Five year requirement (B×5)</td>
<td>1400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Plus 20% buffer - NPPF para 47 (B+C)</td>
<td>1680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Completions since 1/4/2008 to 30/9/16 (8.5 years)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>1549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Shortfall to date ([8.5×280]-E)</td>
<td>831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Total five year requirement (D+F)</td>
<td>2511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Annual requirement (G÷5)</td>
<td>502</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Five Year Supply calculation

Types of sites with permission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. dwellings</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sites subject to Section 106 Agreements</td>
<td>8 A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites with planning permission not started:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites with full permission (market units only)</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites with outline permission (market units only)</td>
<td>1896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversions not started (market units only)</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Units</td>
<td>815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub total:</strong></td>
<td>3002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less dwellings on sites not deliverable (see note 1)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less dwellings on large sites deliverable beyond 5 year period (see note 2 part a)</td>
<td>1199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub total:</strong></td>
<td>1803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less 10% slippage</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub total:</strong></td>
<td>1623 B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plus sites under construction:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwellings not started</td>
<td>721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwellings under construction</td>
<td>434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversions</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub total</strong></td>
<td>1222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less sites not currently active (see note 3)</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less dwellings on large sites deliverable beyond 5 year period (see note 2 part b)</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub total</strong></td>
<td>928 C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plus windfall allowance (see note 4)</td>
<td>115 D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL SUPPLY (A+B+C+D)</strong></td>
<td>2674</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Five year supply position

= Identified supply ÷ annualised requirement
= 2674 ÷ 502
= 5.32

(note: figures rounded in calculation above)
Re: APPLICATION NO: 3/2016/0974/P
OUTLINE PROPOSAL: RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT INCLUDING THE ERECTION OF 275 DWELLINGS, LOCAL NEIGHBOURHOOD CENTRE AND ASSOCIATED LANDSCAPING/WILDLIFE INFRASTRUCTURE. GRIMBALDESTON FARM LONGRIDGE

The application is a resubmission, with a reduced number of dwellings of application number 3/2015/0393/P. That application was refused on the 5.1.16.

In terms of the Development Strategy the Core Strategy directs development to main settlements, such as Longridge. As previously indicated on the earlier application, my advice is maintained that in locational terms the site in principle is capable of being considered a sustainable location in strategic terms. The principal policy consideration was the harm to the Core Strategy as a result of surplus housing measured against the Core Strategy requirements. At the time of determination of application 3/2015/0393 the Council could demonstrate a 5 year land supply position, giving primary weight to the core strategy provisions.

Circumstances have since changed. Work in relation to submissions made to the Council’s Regulation 18 consultation on the Housing and Economic DPD, means that there needs to be an adjustment made to the Council’s housing land calculation in relation to the application of the 20% buffer. Extensive research has been undertaken to review changes to best practice since early 2016, and in particular the approaches taken by Inspectors reporting on Local Plans as well as reviewing relevant appeals as part of that evidence search. This has given rise to a need to revise the application of the buffer which in my view the Council will need to recognise. This issue has been discussed with the Development Plan Working Group in some detail at the meeting held on 12 January where the need to make an adjustment to the methodology was supported.

The net effect of this is to generate a revised 5 year supply figure of 4.99 years when measured against our most recent monitoring information. The significance being that the Council cannot demonstrate a 5 year supply and the implications of paragraph 49 of NPPF must be taken into account in making any decisions on the application.

NPPF Paragraph 49 states that:

“Housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date if the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites.”

Where the council cannot demonstrate a 5 year supply the presumption is in favour of sustainable development.
The Council is required to deliver sustainable development and my view is that when looking at the implications of NPPF it is also important to have regard to the provisions of the Core Strategy which provides the Council’s expression of sustainable development. As indicated, the location at Longridge is considered a sustainable location. Longridge is identified as a main settlement where housing is to be directed. The Core strategy recognises that the housing numbers are minimum requirements, but also seeks to manage the rate at which the settlements develop. The main issue is one of permitting a surplus against planned requirements and the impact this has upon controlling the underlying scale, delivery and phasing of growth. Notwithstanding that, the development would deliver additional housing which meets the Governments (and the Framework objective) of boosting housing supply, it would also deliver affordable housing both of which are significant benefits.

This application is for a reduced number of dwellings when compared to the previous application and if the identified residual is taken off, the relevant number of additional dwellings is in the order of some 250 dwellings. Taking into account the fact that this is an outline application and allowing for reserved matters and the sale of the site to be completed, delivery would be likely to be deferred following conventional practice, in my view, for up to 2 years. Assuming that a site of this nature would be developed by one developer on the basis of 30 units per annum, the total amount that would be added to our supply in the five year period (up to 2023) if this application was approved would be around 90 units. The immediate impact is therefore mitigated. Clearly if a second housebuilder was active on the site this mitigating effect would be less but the agent has indicated that a single developer will deliver the site.

Approving the site still generates a surplus. However taking account of the likely delivery the net impact of the units delivered in practice is reduced to a level where it would be difficult to demonstrate clearly that there is significant harm to the underlying Core Strategy.

The Core Strategy at Key Statement DS2 addresses the presumption in favour of sustainable development and in the circumstances where para 48 is applicable, the Core Strategy states; “… Where there are no policies relevant to the application or relevant policies are out of date at the time of making the decision then the Council will grant permission unless material considerations indicate otherwise --- taking into account whether:

- any adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework when taken as a whole; or
- specific policies in that Framework indicate that development should be restricted.

In the current circumstances I do not consider, in policy terms that there are any material considerations that would significantly or demonstrably outweigh the benefits of boosting housing supply in these circumstances or delivering affordable housing. In a position where the council cannot demonstrate a 5 year supply the Core Strategy directs towards the grant of permission. As a matter of policy principle the application is consistent with the Core Strategy.

In summary, the application has to be determined against the Council’s ability to demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply, National Planning Policy and the consequent provisions of the Core Strategy. Having considered the relevant policy matters I raise no policy objections to the application.

Colin Hirst
Head of Regeneration & Housing.
### Annualised Requirement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>Planned provision 2008 - 2028</th>
<th>5,600</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Annual Equivalent</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Five Year Requirement</td>
<td>1,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Completions 1/4/2008 - 30/9/16</td>
<td>1,549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Shortfall</td>
<td>831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Plus 20% buffer (20% of C+E)</td>
<td>446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Total five year requirement (C + E + F)</td>
<td>2,677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Annual Requirement (G/5)</td>
<td>535</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Identified Supply (base date 30th September 2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sites subject to s106 agreements</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sites with planning permission</td>
<td>2,187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites with planning permission (affordable dwellings)</td>
<td>815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less dwellings on large sites with planning permission deliverable beyond 5 year period</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less further dwellings deliverable beyond the five year period (PWA Assessment)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total dwellings with permission in 5 year supply</td>
<td>1,811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slippage (10%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total - dwellings with permission in 5 year supply</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,630</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwellings under construction (new build)</td>
<td>434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwellings under construction (conversions)</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwellings not started on sites under construction</td>
<td>721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites 'not active' (identified by RVBC)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwellings on large sites under construction deliverable beyond 5 year period</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub total - dwellings under construction in 5 year supply</strong></td>
<td><strong>928</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windfall allowance in 5 year supply</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL SUPPLY (I+J+K)</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,673</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Land Supply (number of years)**

| Land Supply (number of years) | 4.99 |

No reductions for large site assumptions.
Appendix 3 – Savills Ribble Valley Development Land Market Analysis and PWA 5-year supply calculation.
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Letter to Paul Walton, 04.10.2016

Grimbaldeston Farm Trustees & Neil Forshaw
c/o Paul Walton
PWA Planning
Ribble Saw Mill
Paley Road
Preston
PR3 3BN

Dear Paul,

RE: RIBBLE VALLEY DEVELOPMENT LAND MARKET

I am writing to outline our general views on the Ribble Valley development land market. This in relation to a planning application for 305 residential dwellings on a site to the west of Preston Road, Longridge (ref: 3/2015/0393). I understand that this was refused by the Local Planning Authority and that you have been provided with a date for Appeal in May 2017.

You have requested that we set out our views on the local land market and delivery rates in the area in order to support your assessment of the current housing land supply in the area. We believe that the Council have been overly optimistic in their assessment and set out our views below.

Development Land Market

The land market in the North West is in a position of recovery with most plc housebuilders now active in the region. Certain locations, however, in particular the Ribble Valley, are starting to suffer with short term over supply as a result of the amount of land that has gained planning consent over the past four years since the introduction of the National Planning Policy Framework in 2012. A side effect of this is that urban sites are becoming more popular with many developers actively seeking development opportunities in well connected and established urban locations like Greater Manchester.

![UK Development Land Index](source:Savills)
According to the latest Savills Research, UK urban land values are continuing to increase at a faster rate than Greenfield values, growing 1.3% in Q2 2016 (up from 1% in Q1 2016) taking annual growth to 4.2%. UK Greenfield land values increased by 0.7% in Q2 2016 (down from 1% in Q1 2016) bringing annual growth to 2.1%.

The Help to Buy scheme has been pivotal for the new homes market outside London and is expected to continue to support the new build market, with 8,000 Help to Buy sales having occurred in the North West from April 2013 – March 2016. There have been circa 35,000 new homes completions in the North West in the same period, meaning that Help to Buy is accounting for approximately 23% of new build sales. This is supporting the market by providing house builders with additional sales market confidence.

Material and labour shortages are putting pressure on build costs with BCIS reporting that build cost inflation was 11.2% over the course of 2015. According to the latest HBF survey, the availability of materials, materials prices and labour costs were the fastest growing constraints on development, which in turn leads to less room for land price growth. Announcements regarding affordable housing funding and starter homes have also created some uncertainty in the market pertaining to how developers will dispose of and value affordable housing which has a consequent effect on land values. As a result the risks associated with selling the completed units are increased, particularly in Local Authority areas where full affordable housing provision is expected.

Following the Referendum result in June 2016, there were some house builders who put a hold on the purchase of land to wait for more certainty and review the impact of the vote on their sales. Many are now reporting that sales and interest levels since the vote have been largely unaffected. From a land perspective, more popular sites are still seeing high levels of bids, but there appears to be a preference for lower risk sites since the vote outcome. The medium to long term effect of the result of the Referendum on the UK property market remains unclear. The impact on the employment and financial markets will be key to the effects on the property markets.

Within the Ribble Valley, housebuilder demand is focussed around locations along the A59 corridor up to Clitheroe and those areas within relatively easy reach of the M6 and M65 because of the connectivity for commuting purposes. Residential locations outside of these areas are generally out of favour due to concerns over housing demand.

National and regional housebuilders are currently looking to increase output, meaning that rate of sale is becoming an increasingly important factor when selecting and bringing forward sites. We have seen a vast increase in interest for well connected urban sites, particularly in Greater Manchester, where household growth has resulted in a cumulative housing shortfall of over 40,000 houses and increasing levels of household growth are putting further pressure on housing need. The reverse of this is that there has been a decrease in interest for sites in locations such as the Ribble Valley that are more remote and where there are concerns over the rate of sale in the local market.

The higher values residential locations, typified by the Ribble Valley are carrying less importance to national housebuilders who prefer the higher rates of sale associated with cheaper, more attainable sites. A faster rate of sale allows for an improved return on capital. The current supply pipeline being developed in the Ribble Valley, as a result of the historic under supply of sites in the area, is serving to dampen demand for land. This is particularly concentrated around the Clitheroe / Whalley area. The supply that is due to come forward in the nearby North Preston area where there is a 177 hectare site allocated for up to 5,300 dwellings has also impacted on the land market in the Ribble Valley.

Alongside this, there is considered to be a relatively small number of active plc housebuilders in the North West land market, the majority of which already control a site in the Ribble Valley. We would therefore expect housebuilders to be selective about sites in the area. The subject site is however situated in a desirable village location within relative close proximity of the M6, therefore we would expect interest because housebuilder demand is focussed around well connected attractive locations in the area.
Deliverability

Savills is active in the Ribble Valley market with the Residential Development Department currently selling, valuing and advising on land in the area. We are in contact with developers active in the area who are reporting that sales demand is typically from locally based purchasers looking to move, upsize or downsize with families generally the most active segment of the market. There can be seasonal variances and the current supply in the area serves to slow sales rates as purchasers have a range of sites in the area to consider.

As such sales rates are relatively slow with a range of developers reporting to us average sales rates of between 1 – 2 units per month across new build sites in the area. There are no developers reporting average sales rates in excess of 2 units per month and we therefore consider this to be the upper limit.

We would expect a similar rate of sale on the subject site should it come forward for residential development, subject to a market appropriate development. For clarity, we would expect 2 sales per month as a best case scenario in which the development would need to include a wide range of unit types to appeal to all sectors of the market and ideally a number of sales outlets from housebuilders who offer differing products.

It is also worth noting that the impact of the UK voting to leave the European Union is as yet unknown and there are some concerns this may result in a slow down in the sales market as a result of economic and political uncertainty.

Housebuilder Demand

In the context of the current market, we would expect some demand from regional and national house builders with the capability and expertise to deliver a site of this scale. The pace of the local sales market and current pipeline is a concern for some housebuilders but the location of Longridge within relatively easy reach of the M6 and the attractive village setting should generate interest.

As we have already mentioned, many housebuilders control a site in the area but we believe that those who do not would pursue a site like the subject in order to be active in the Ribble Valley area. Others may consider developing another site in the area. The over supply of large sites is mostly concentrated in the Clitheroe / Whalley areas which should help attract potential purchasers to the subject site.

Summary

The land market in the North West is performing relatively well but this is largely led by land transactions and demand for Greater Manchester with more peripheral rural sites attracting less interest. This is the case in the Ribble Valley where the short term over supply in the area, particularly in Clitheroe / Whalley and nearby North Preston areas, is suppressing demand for land.

Housebuilders currently have a preference for sites in locations where rates of sale in the local market are strong as they are ramping up output and this improves return on capital. The Ribble Valley is currently characterised by slow rates of sale in the order of 1-2 sales per month on the active sites in the area. We would expect a similar rate of sale at the subject site should it come forward for residential development.

We would expect some interest from regional and national housebuilders for the subject site. The pace of the local sales market and current pipeline is a concern for some housebuilders but the location of Longridge outside of the Clitheroe / Whalley areas where the over supply is concentrated, within relatively easy reach of the M6 and the attractive village setting should generate interest.

If required, we can produce a full market research report which outlines current rates of sale across active development sites in the area and the expected delivery rates of sites that are due to come forward. Should you require any further information or clarification please do not hesitate to contact me.
Yours sincerely

Laura Mackay MRICS
Surveyor
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Total Dwellings (including affordable) RVBC HLAS 09/2016</th>
<th>Complete (at 30th September 2016)</th>
<th>Delivery Year 1</th>
<th>Delivery Year 2</th>
<th>Delivery Year 3</th>
<th>Delivery Year 4</th>
<th>Delivery Year 5</th>
<th>PWA total in 5 year period (from 30th September 2016)</th>
<th>PWA total in 5 year supply (30th September 2016)</th>
<th>PWA additional non-deliverable in 5 year period</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land SW &amp; W Whalley Road (&quot;The Barrowlands&quot;)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>Planning permission granted 20th February 2014 in outline. Reserved matters for two phases of residential development remain to be approved. Allowance for completions in year 2 and delivery rate of 24 dpa (Savills) applied across 4 years with allowance for 2 outlets in later years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Standen Farm</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1040</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Reserved matters approval for 229 dwellings granted 8th March 2017 for Taylor Wimpey as single developer - 3/2016/0324. Allowance for completions in year 2 but with delivery rate of 24 dpa (Savills).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-25 Old Row</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Outline permission expired 27/02/2016; new application 3/2014/0324 for 167 dwellings rejected at appeal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honthorn Road (Story Homes)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Delivery rate of 24 dpa (Savills) applied across 5 year period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land off Waddington Road</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Outline application approved March 2015. No reserved matters at base date. Delivery rate of 24 dpa applied across 3.5 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North of Dilworth Lane, Longridge</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Delivery rate of 24 dpa (Savills) applied across 5 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of Clitheroe Road (Lawsonsteads Phase 2)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Delivery rate of 24 dpa (Savills) applied across 5 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land at Mitton Road</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Delivery rate of 24 dpa (Savills) applied across 5 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>900</strong></td>
<td><strong>1245</strong></td>
<td><strong>345</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Annualised Requirement

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Planned provision 2008 - 2028</td>
<td>5,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Annual Equivalent</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Five Year Requirement</td>
<td>1,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Completions 1/4/2008 - 30/9/16</td>
<td>1,549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Shortfall</td>
<td>831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Plus 20% buffer (20% of C+E)</td>
<td>446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Total five year requirement (C + E + F)</td>
<td>2,677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Annual Requirement (G/5)</td>
<td>535</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Identified Supply (base date 30th September 2016)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sites subject to s106 agreements</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sites with planning permission</strong></td>
<td>2,187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sites with planning permission (affordable dwellings)</strong></td>
<td>815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Less dwellings on large sites with planning permission deliverable beyond 5 year period</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Less further dwellings deliverable beyond the five year period (PWA Assessment)</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total dwellings with permission in 5 year supply</strong></td>
<td>1,466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td><strong>Slippage (10%)</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sub-total - dwellings with permission in 5 year supply</strong></td>
<td>1,319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Dwellings under construction (new build)</strong></td>
<td>434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Dwellings under construction (conversions)</strong></td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Dwellings not started on sites under construction</strong></td>
<td>721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sites 'not active' (identified by RVBC)</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Dwellings on large sites under construction deliverable beyond 5 year period</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td><strong>Sub total - dwellings under construction in 5 year supply</strong></td>
<td>928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td><strong>Windfall allowance in 5 year supply</strong></td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL SUPPLY (I+J+K)</strong></td>
<td>2,362</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Land Supply (number of years) (PWA Assessment)**

|   |                                                                 | 4.41  |
Appendix 4 - Pre-Application Documentation
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Lower Standen Hey Farm, Whalley Road, Clitheroe, BB7 1EA

Proposed residential development of up to 9 no. dwellings, associated works and landscaping.
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1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 PWA Planning is retained by the landowner to advise on planning and related matters and in particular to seek pre-application advice in connection with a proposal to develop land at Lower Standen Hey Farm, for the erection of up to 9 no. dwellings, associated works and landscaping.

Existing Site

1.2 The application site comprises a grassed area of land split into two portions by wooden post and rail fencing which runs through the proposal site. The site benefits from mature tree and hedge screening along the eastern and southern boundaries which limits the site visibility when viewed from the highway.

1.3 The site borders buildings associated with Lower Standen Farm to the west; to the immediate east is Whalley Road (A671) beyond which is predominately agricultural land, as is the same to the south. To the north the field begins to bank leading down to Pendleton Brook, which is lined with mature trees that separate the site from existing industrial and recent residential development.

1.4 The request for pre-application advice is accompanied by drawn information defining the intended application boundary and the immediate surrounds (see Appendix 1). An aerial image of the site within its wider setting is provided below at Figure 1.

![Aerial image showing the location of the site (not to scale)](Figure 1: Aerial image showing the location of the site (not to scale))

1.5 The site lies close to Whalley Road (A671) one of the main routes for travel to and from Clitheroe. In addition to providing direct access to Clitheroe, the Whalley Road also provides a direct link to the A59 thus linking the site to the wider road network.
1.6 A variety of local services are available in Clitheroe, being the nearest settlement, such as a local food stores, primary and high schools, nurseries, public houses, places of worship and post offices. The site is well connected by public transport: 300m away from the nearest bus stop which is utilised by several different services/routes. Clitheroe train station provides regular services to Blackburn, Manchester and other surrounding towns. Burnley, the closest larger settlement is located approx. 8 miles from the site where there are more substantial facilities and services available. Clitheroe is situated 7 miles away from the M65, providing fast links to major settlements across the region and further access to the wider motorway network.

1.7 The site is not within an area identified by the Environment Agency’s flood risk map as being subject to flooding. There are no known Tree Preservation Orders nor any statutory designations within the intend application site boundary.

Proposals

1.8 It is proposed to develop land to the north and east of Lower Standen Hey Farm to provide up to 9 no. dwellings, associated works and landscaping. This request for pre-application advice is accompanied by an indicative layout, which is provided at Appendix 1 of this statement. The layout is purely illustrative at this stage as it is the principle of residential development on the site for which we currently seek the Council’s advice.

1.9 It is the applicant’s intention to deliver a scheme in a manner which seeks to reflect the character of the local area. The scale is thought to be acceptable in the context of the settlement/surrounding development and additionally, any final scheme will also seek to ensure that the amenities of existing and future residents will not be compromised by the proposals.

1.10 The proposed access will utilise an existing access point off Whalley Road south east of the site, which at present represents a safe and convenient access with wide visibility splays. An internal spine road and footway will be provided off the existing track to provide access to the new properties. The property to the north west of the proposed development site will accessed by an existing track which currently links the Lower Standen Hey Farm access road with Primrose road to the north.

2 PLANNING HISTORY

2.1 A search of Ribble Valley Borough Council’s planning register has been carried out to understand the site’s planning history.

2.2 It would appear that no applications relating directly to the land in question are displayed on the Council’s online planning register. However, there are a number of applications which relate to Lower Standen Farm but for which there are insufficient documents available within the applications pages as to wholly confirm the location each application relates to. Therefore, should the council know of any applications which relate directly to the land in question, it would be appreciated if they could be identified as part of this pre-application request, this would allow for their full consideration within any future application.
3 PLANNING POLICY ISSUES

3.1 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires planning applications to be determined in accordance with the Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

3.2 The statutory development plan for the application site comprises the Ribble Valley Borough Council Core Strategy 2008 – 2028 (2014). Currently the proposal maps published within the now replaced Districtwide Local Plan remains adopted until a revised set of plans are produced as part of the Housing and Economic Development DPD become available. An extract from the Districtwide Local Plan Proposals Map (1998) is provided at Figure 2, the site is located in the open countryside and falls just outside of the settlement boundaries of Clitheroe.

3.3 The following saved Policies of the Ribble Valley Borough Council Core Strategy 2008 – 2028 (2014) are considered relevant to the site’s proposed redevelopment for housing.

- Key Statement DS1: Development Strategy
- Key Statement DS2: Sustainable Development
- Key Statement EN2: Landscape
- Key Statement EN5: Heritage Assets
- Key Statement H1: Housing Provision
- Key Statement H2: Housing Balance
- Key Statement H3: Affordable Housing
- Policy DMG1: General Considerations
- Policy DMG2: Strategic Considerations
- Policy DME2: Landscape and Townscape Protection
- Policy DME3: Site and Species Protection and Conservation
- Policy DME4: Protecting Heritage Assets
3.4 Key Statement DS1 seeks to outline briefly the locations in which growth will be focused. Whilst the statement refers to strategic sites already allocated for development, it does also infer that all other development will be focused around principal settlements, one of which is Clitheroe. The proposed development site sits just outside of and indeed directly adjoins the Clitheroe boundary and as such could be seen as development on the periphery of an existing settlement rather than less preferable, sporadic development of Open Countryside in more rural areas or smaller settlements.

3.5 Key Statement DS2: Sustainable Development looks to mirror Paragraph 14 of the NPPF which details the sustainable development principle that seeks to guide both authorities and developers. Further to that it places emphasis on the council to develop proactive relationships with applicants to ensure that where possible applications are approved unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

3.6 It is thought that with the notable level of mature screening which currently exists on site, plus the additional scope to improve further, that the proposal would serve to prevent any significant landscape impact. Key Statement EN2: Landscape, focuses mainly on the local AONB however it does go further to say that the council will expect all development to be:

"in keeping with the character of the landscape, reflecting local distinctiveness, vernacular style, scale, style, features and building materials."

3.7 The purpose of the policy to protect existing landscape features is also prevalent in Key Statement DME2: Landscape and Townscape Protection. However, whilst the finer details of the style and building materials are yet to be established it is thought the proposal is not of a scale that is out of context with the surroundings, or one that could indeed significantly detract from the local vernacular style.

3.8 Key Statement EN5 may be relevant to this proposal, though the proposals will not result in any listed building being modified or materially impacted in any way and therefore the assessment of the proposal against this policy should be limited to any perceived impacts to the setting. The policy states the enhancement and conservation of heritage assets will be achieved through the following:

- "Recognising that the best way of ensuring the long term protection of heritage assets is to ensure a viable use that optimises opportunities for sustaining and enhancing its significance.

- Keeping Conservation Area Appraisals under review to ensure that any development proposals respect and safeguard the character, appearance and significance of the area.

- Considering any development proposals which may impact on a heritage asset or their setting through seeking benefits that conserve and enhance their significance and avoids any substantial harm to the heritage asset.

- Requiring all development proposals to make a positive contribution to local distinctiveness/sense of place."
• The consideration of Article 4 Directions to restrict permitted development rights where the exercise of such rights would harm the historic environment."

3.9 Regarding point three of the above excerpt, incorporating measures that would in the Council’s view reduce or remove any impact on the listings setting, would be something we would seek to adhere to and as such would request any such measures that would be beneficial are outlined in the Council’s response to this pre-application advice request. However, it should be noted that the setting of the listed building in question has already been subject to change as more modern buildings have been erected within close proximity to the asset. Therefore, the impact of the proposal should be considered in the context of the other surrounding development.

3.10 Policy DME4: Protecting Heritage Assets, is a continuation of the aforementioned heritage policy and outlines the council’s presumption in favour of conservation and enhancement of heritage assets. With regard to listed buildings the policy concerns itself more with the alterations, extensions and demolition of such assets but does go further to state that proposals which will cause harm to the setting of a listed building will not be supported. With regard to the proposal it is clear that provided that the development is undertaken in a manner which respects local character and is of the scale suggested it would not be of detriment to the heritage; the proposals can therefore be considered wholly acceptable in the context of this policy.

3.11 Key Statement H1 focuses on housing provision, it states that the requirement for new homes will be delivered in line with the Council’s Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. Further to this it states the council will adopt a ‘plan-monitor-manage’ approach to guarantee the assessment is continuingly monitored to ensure a rolling five-year land supply is achieved and maintained.

3.12 The subsequent statement Key Statement H2: Housing Balance, follows on from the above to outline that planning permission will be granted when the proposal is in line with local demand as evidenced in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA). The SHMA (2008) acknowledges that detached housing in rural and suburban areas, such as that proposed is clearly in demand. Furthermore, the report outlines that within Clitheroe there exists a majority of and at nearly 2,750 terraced properties, therefore the requirement for smaller housing may not be as relevant in Clitheroe in particular as it is to the wider region.

3.13 The proposal site lies just outside the settlement boundary of Clitheroe and therefore under Key Statement H3: Affordable Housing outlines a requirement for 30% of housing proposals to be Affordable Housing. However, advice is sought in this respect and due to the nature of the proposal, as large detached homes. The proposal has been designed to meet an obvious housing demand whilst also ensuring that this development will sit well within the landscape and protecting the setting of the listed building. The proposal site being on the approach to Clitheroe sits in an area where the local character comprises of large detached properties and barns which have been converted and are now domestic in nature. As such and given demand for such house types from Registered Providers would be unlikely, any future application may – dependant on the pre-application advice of officers – propose a commuted sum in lieu of on-site provision.

3.14 A general guide to the expectations of proposals is outlined in Policy DMG1. This policy sets out the requirements of the Council in regard to design, access, amenity, environment and infrastructure.
Whilst the proposals are provided in an illustrative manner for the purposes of this pre-application advice request, hence not possible to assess the proposal fully in the context of this policy, it is considered a scheme which respects the surroundings and is of an appropriate scale can be achieved on the proposed site without inducing unacceptable impacts on local amenity and highways. Comments in respect of design matters and in relation to Policy DMG1 are welcomed and will enable the eventual planning application to take into account any specific concerns the Council may wish to raise.

3.15 Policy DMG2 outlines further strategic considerations. The policy assists in the interpretation of the Development Strategy and underpins the settlement hierarchy for the purposes of delivering sustainable development. The policy also states that within the Open Countryside development will be required to be in keeping with the character of the landscape and acknowledge the special qualities of the area by virtue of its size, design, use of materials, landscaping and siting. As mentioned previously it is anticipated this is achievable regarding the proposal at hand.

3.16 Whilst Policy DME3: Site and Species Protection and Conservation, remains a relevant policy, such surveys/assessments which would seek to demonstrate the developments impact, or lack of, on the sites ecological value have not yet been undertaken. However, despite it not being available at this time, there remains the intention to provide the required information when/if works commence on a formal full planning application.

National Planning Policy Framework

3.17 The golden thread running throughout the NPPF is the Government’s presumption in favour of sustainable development (paragraph 14) whereby proposed developments which correctly balance the requirements of economic, social and environmental issues should be granted permission unless there are overriding reasons that would suggest that permission should be withheld. Paragraph 14 specifically states that:

“At the heart of the National Planning Policy Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan-making and decision-taking.

For decision-taking this means:

- approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay; and

- where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date, granting permission unless:
  - any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole; or
  - specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted.”
3.18 The proposed redevelopment of land associated to Lower Standen Hey Farm to provide up to 9 no. dwellings is considered sustainable in the context of Paragraph 14; the site sits on the edge of an existing settlement, is easily accessible via public transport and is close to local facilities and services. Development of the site would bring economic benefits to the area in so much as it would provide a positive contribution to the local economy during the construction phase. From a social dimension, the proposals would result in a contribution to the Borough’s future housing stock, and it is not considered that the proposals would have any significant adverse impacts on the environment.

3.19 In summary, the proposed development of the site in the manner proposed, offers the opportunity to deliver a sustainable housing site to assist the Council in meeting their need for new homes in the short term period, including the facilitating the provision of affordable housing elsewhere.

3.20 Detailed development management and associated matters, e.g. detailed design / landscape / ecology will be dealt with as part of the main application submissions and the relevant matters will flow from pre-application discussions so that the applicant is aware of the Council’s expectations in this respect. It is not considered that there are any matters which would render the scheme unacceptable or undeliverable. The Environment Agency’s Flood Risk Map confirms that the site is not within an area at risk of flooding and the site is not designated as a heritage asset, nationally nor locally.

4 PRE-APPLICATION REQUEST

4.1 Taking into account the above matters our client is keen to progress with a planning application and as a precursor to this we seek pre-application advice, to ensure that we are able to proceed with the Council’s support for the development.

4.2 It is requested that the proposals submitted herein be considered by officers and that a meeting is arranged to discuss matters in more detail and that written response be provided; in particular, the Council’s pre-application advice and assistance is required regarding:

(a) The principle of the proposed development in the context of the Development Plan, NPPF and NPPG;
(b) The scale, layout and design of the proposed development, taking reference form the appended plans;
(c) Any specific issues that may be seen to be critical to the success of the application;
(d) The nature and extent of supporting information required to ensure a valid planning application;
(e) Any other matters considered to be of relevance to the planning process.
Dear Katie,

I write in response to your client’s pre-application enquiry regarding the proposal for nine dwellings at Lower Standen Hey Farm, Clitheroe. For information, a meeting was held on the 25th April 2016.

Relevant Policies

- Key Statement H1: Housing Provision
- Key Statement: H2: Housing Balance
- Key Statement H3: Affordable Housing
- Key Statement DS1: Development Strategy
- Key Statement DS2: Sustainable Development
- Key Statement EN5: Heritage Assets
- Policy DMG1: General Considerations
- Policy DMG2: Strategic Considerations
- Policy DME2: Landscape and Townscape Protection
- Policy DME4: Protecting Heritage Assets
- Policy DMH1: Affordable Housing Criteria
- Policy DMH3: Dwellings in the open countryside and AONB
- Policy DMB5: Footpaths and Bridleways

Principle of the Development:

The proposal is for residential development for 9 dwellings and lies outside of the existing settlement boundary of Clitheroe. As part of the evidence base work for the Housing and Economic Development DPD (HED DPD), a series of proposed interim settlement boundaries (PISB) have been established. These boundaries were published as part of a report to Planning and Development Committee on 14th April 2016 and endorsed as interim settlement boundaries for consultation purposes as part of the HED DPD preparation process. The final boundary outcomes cannot be pre-empted at this stage.

The site in question lies outside of Clitheroe PISB and is designated as Open Countryside. Key Statement DS1 of the Core Strategy seeks to direct the main focus of new house building to the Council’s Strategic Site and the Principal Settlements of Clitheroe, Longridge.
and Whalley and then through to Tier 1 Villages which are considered the more sustainable of the 32 defined settlements. In this case, the site is just outside the designated settlement of Clitheroe and thus not considered acceptable in principle. The Borough currently has a 5.36 (as of March 2016) supply of housing and subsequently only in very exceptional circumstances would new housing in the Open Countryside be supported. These include; agricultural or forestry use or for an identified local need. The principle of residential development on this site is therefore contrary to Policies DS1, DMG2 and DMH3 of the Core Strategy.

Irrespective of the principle of the development, other material considerations will need to be addressed, as follows:

**Visual Impact of the proposal:**

Although it may be considered that the development would not be wholly isolated from existing built form, the proposal would still be read as a remote cluster of buildings. This is largely exacerbated by the high level of visibility the development will be afforded upon approach from the south and the level of frontage that would directly front Whalley Road. This would be largely incongruous and atypical taking into account the inherent pattern of development in the vicinity. To the North of the proposal, there is an area of woodland which to some extent provides a clear and logical visual termination point for what could be considered the settlement boundary of Clitheroe. Overall, the development is likely to be read as isolated; in terms of built form and a logical pattern of development, and would cause harm on a designated area of open countryside.

**Layout and Density:**

I am aware that an indicative layout plan has been given as part of this Pre-Application Enquiry and as such, comments will be given in regards to the general layout and density of the proposal.

In some cases, a linear arrangement may be considered appropriate in that it could be representative of a typical farmstead/courtyard arrangement. However in this instance, the layout would not be considered appropriate given the level of development proposed, in particular the extent of frontage adjacent to Whalley Road. This frontage could be articulated in a manner that visually breaks down the proposal into smaller visual parcels or reflects an element of ‘changefulness’ and this could be complimented with articulation within the roofscape however at this stage I am unconvinced that this alone would be adequate to visually counter what I would consider to be a detrimental impact upon the character of the defined open countryside. Additionally, The density of the development and level of development proposed raises further concerns in that it does not appear to take account of adjacent densities of development to which the proposal would be read in context with. I further consider that the development as proposed would fundamentally compromise a sense of openness which contributes to the character of the immediate landscape and a landscape that plays an inherent role in defining the character and setting of a gateway arrival point into the settlement of Clitheroe. For information, I have attached the Local Authority’s Urban Design officers comments for you to review.
Listed building

There is a listed building within close proximity of the proposal, and therefore this listed building should be thoroughly considered should a formal application be submitted. In its current form, views from the listed building to the open countryside and development site are uninterrupted. It is considered that this development may cause harm to the character and setting of the Grade 2 listed building as the views to and from the listed building will be obscured by the proposed development. There are also local footpaths that run past the listed building and therefore could potentially affect the character of the area and listed building, for the same reasons outlined above. Furthermore, any development in the vicinity of a listed building should conserve and enhance heritage assets and their settings (as per Policy DME4), and any harm to a Grade 2 listed building needs to be thoroughly mitigated and justified within a planning statement and heritage statement.

Affordable housing

For information, on the 19th May 2016, the government has issued a revision on the National Planning Policy Guidance in relation to affordable housing. It states that affordable housing “should not be sought from developments of 10-units or less, and which have a maximum combined gross floorspace of no more than 1000sqm”.

The Local Authority is currently reviewing this change to legislation the affects it will have upon relevant policies within the core strategy.

Public Footpath:

There is a Public Right of Way (footpath 1) directly adjacent to the proposal site. This footpath currently offers close and uninterrupted views of the development site and also designated open countryside, and it is considered that the users of this right of way would have a less enjoyable experience of the area as a result of the development.

Trees

It is the opinion of the Local Authority’s Countryside Officer that the trees on the eastern side of the development may be affected by the proposed development. Should you submit a formal planning application, you will need to produce a Tree constraints plan as well as an Arboricultural Impact Assessment. These documents will then inform where the proposed dwellings can be located without impacting on any trees within the vicinity.

Highways

Please be advised that Lancashire County Council Highways department will no longer be supplying Pre-Application advice at this time and they are currently considering charging for such advice. If you require any additional information with regards to Highway issues, you will be expected to request this information through your own initiative and contact LCC direct for further advice.

Conclusions
To summarise, the principle of residential development within the Open Countryside and outside of the Principal Settlements, and the nine Tier 1 Village Settlements, is not acceptable, as it would result in the approval of dwellings in an unsustainable location without specific justification. As detailed above, the proposal as submitted would cause harm to the setting of a listed building, as well as a visual impact on an area of open countryside. For the above reasons, I cannot offer any support to this application.

Please be mindful of the fact that the above advice has been given on the basis of the level of information submitted as part of the pre-planning enquiry. I trust that you find the above observations of use and stress that they represent officer opinion only, at the time of writing, given without prejudice to the final determination of any application submitted.

Submission Requirements

If you wish to submit an application irrespective of my advice please ensure that the following documents are submitted:

- Planning Statement
- Proposed elevations of the proposed dwellings
- Scaled Location Plan
- Indicative Masterplan
- Tree Survey (constraints plan) / Arboricultural Impact Assessment
- Phase 1 Habitat Survey
- Indicative Landscape Plan
- Heritage Statement
- Utilities Statement
- Design and Access Statement
- Flood Risk Assessment if over 1ha

Kind regards,
Victoria Walmsley
Appendix 5 - Appeal decision APP/T2350/A/12/2186164
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 March 2013

by John Braithwaite  BSc(Arch) BArch(Hons) RIBA MRTP
an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 13 March 2013

Appeal Ref: APP/T2350/A/12/2186164
Kemple Barn, Whalley Road, Pendleton, Clitheroe  BB7 1PP

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs D Hancox against the decision of Ribble Valley Borough Council.
- The application Ref 3/2012/0096, dated 18 January 2012, was refused by notice dated 17 July 2012.
- The development proposed is a dwelling with garages, garden and landscaping.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a dwelling with garages, garden and landscaping at Kemple Barn, Whalley Road, Pendleton, Clitheroe in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 3/2012/0096, dated 18 January 2012, subject to the following conditions:

   1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
   2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with approved drawing nos. 4172-10B, 11B, 12A, 13A, and 14A.
   3. No development shall take place until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the building hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved samples.
   4. No development shall take place until details of hard and soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and these works shall be carried out as approved. The details shall include finished levels or contours, types and heights of means of enclosure, type and extent of hard surfacing materials, types, numbers and locations of trees and shrubs to be planted, a programme for implementation of the landscape works, and a five year maintenance scheme for the trees and shrubs planted in accordance with the approved details.
   5. No development shall take place or deliveries made to the site until all trees identified for retention in the Tree Impact and Protection Report by Bowland Tree Consultancy (Ref. BTC271) have been protected in accordance with details shown on drawing no. BTC271-TPP Rev. A and in accordance with BS5837 ‘Trees in Relation to Construction’, and a tree protection monitoring schedule has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority.
6. All tree protection measures established in accordance with condition 5 shall remain in place until all construction work has been completed and all excess materials and spoil have been removed from the site. During the construction period nothing shall occur or be carried out within any protected area and no tree surgery or pruning shall occur to any protected tree without the prior written approval of the local planning authority.

Reasons

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on; first, the setting of nearby heritage assets; and second, the character of the landscape.

The first issue – the setting of heritage assets

3. Kemple Barn is a dwelling that has been created by the conversion of former agricultural buildings and is one of a small group of similar dwellings and Lower Standen Farmhouse. Kemple Barn is at the north-west corner of the group of dwellings and the roughly triangular area of residential land associated with the dwelling extends out to the west. The group of dwellings and the land associated with Kemple Barn is bounded to the north by the steep sided bank of Pendleton Brook. Along the bank of the brook are many tall mature deciduous trees and on the north side of the brook is an extensive range of former print works buildings in industrial use, Primrose Works. To the west of the works is Primrose House.

4. Lower Standen Farmhouse and Primrose House are Grade II listed buildings and Primrose Works is regarded by the Council to be a non-designated heritage asset. The appeal site is the majority of the triangular area of land associated with Kemble Barn. It is the effect of the proposed development, the construction of a single dwelling, on the setting of the designated and non-designated heritage assets that concerns the Council.

5. Primrose Mill, now demolished, was established as a water powered cotton mill in 1787 and Primrose Works was established subsequently. Lower Standen Farmhouse was built in the early 19th century and Primrose House was built in 1809. By the 1840s Primrose Mill, Primrose Works, Primrose House and Lower Standen Farm formed Primrose Estate and an OS map of 1844 shows the appeal land to be a garden. In 1854 the owners of Primrose Estate were bankrupt and the estate was sold off in three lots. Lot 1 included Primrose Mill, Primrose Works, Primrose House and the appeal site. Lot 2 was Lower Standen Farm.

6. An OS map of 1883 does not identify any ‘garden’ on the south side of the brook and the appeal land is part of a larger area probably at that time in agricultural use given its close association with the farm. An OS map of 1907 shows the land to be used to tip spoil probably from an expansion of the works on the opposite side of the brook. Primrose House is now no longer associated with any of the former mill buildings, with the farm or with any land on the south side of the brook. Lower Standen Farmhouse is now no longer associated with any of the former farm buildings that have all now been converted to dwellings.

7. The documented history of the appeal land and its historical association with Primrose House and later with the farm would not be undermined by the proposed development. There is no inter-visibility between the two listed buildings and they are now independent residential properties. The proposed dwelling, given its flat roofed form and setting at a lower level than Kemble Barn, would not be visible from the curtilage of the farmhouse and, given the substantial tree belt alongside the brook, would not be visible from the curtilage of Primrose House. Primrose
Works now has a modern metal roof and its heritage value is dubious. Taking all these factors into account the construction of the dwelling on the appeal site would not adversely affect the setting of nearby heritage assets.

8. The proposed dwelling would be undeniably modern. It would be two interlocking rectangular flat roofed blocks connected to another flat roofed garage block. The roofs of the blocks would be at or below the ground floor level of Kemble Barn and the dwelling would be framed and contained by existing mature trees both alongside the brook and along the south boundary of the site. The topography, shape and orientation of the site, and the point of access into it, have all been carefully considered in the design of the scheme. Just as Primrose House and Lower Standen Farmhouse were built in the contemporary style of the early 19th century the proposed dwelling would reflect contemporary residential design. The dwelling would not, in itself, be conspicuous, incongruous or visually intrusive.

9. Neither the proposed development nor the contemporary design of the dwelling would adversely affect the setting of nearby heritage assets. The proposal does not thus conflict with saved policy ENV19 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan (LP). The design of the proposed dwelling is the high quality design that is sought by a core planning principle of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the proposal does not conflict with advice on conserving and enhancing the historic environment found in section 12 of the NPPF.

The second issue – the character of the landscape

10. Pendleton Brook, in this location, marks the south boundary of the built-up area of Clitheroe. A track, off Primrose Road within the built-up area, that crosses a bridge to the east side of Primrose Works, is a public footpath and leads to Lower Standen Farmhouse and the group of converted farm buildings. The footpath continues south-westwards into the countryside alongside a field to the south of the appeal site. From this footpath there are views to the west and south-west across the flood plain of the River Ribble towards fells in the distance. In the foreground of these views is a railway line that crosses a viaduct across Pendleton Brook, a tributary of the river, to the west of the appeal site.

11. From the footpath there would be views northwards towards the proposed dwelling. The backdrop for the dwelling would be the roofs of Primrose Works and the tall trees alongside the brook. Given the topography of the site and its design, the dwelling would ‘sit down’ in the landscape and would be enveloped by existing trees around the site. The dwelling, given its elongated form, its projecting first floor balconies and its flat projecting roofs, would have a strong horizontal emphasis that would reflect the railway line and the viaduct, which are distinctive features of the landscape. The horizontal emphasis of the dwelling would be complemented by the vertical emphasis of the tall trees behind, which would be reflected in the vertical timber boarding that would clad parts of the dwelling.

12. The proposed dwelling has not been designed in a vernacular style. But construction materials and technology, and building design, have moved forwards particularly in the last 15 years since the LP was adopted. In this regard, saved LP policy ENV3, which requires that development in the countryside should reflect local vernacular, scale, style, features and building materials, is somewhat out of step with the NPPF which promotes, at paragraphs 55 and 60, innovative and original design. In paragraph 63, in particular, it is stated that “In determining planning applications, great weight should be given to outstanding or innovative designs which help raise the standard of design more generally in the area”.
13. The proposed dwelling has been carefully and sensitively conceived. It would be innovative and original and would raise the standard of design in the area. The design and form of the dwelling would be entirely appropriate for the site and would be complimentary to its surroundings. The dwelling would not reflect local vernacular, scale, style, features and building materials but it would be in keeping with the character of the landscape. The proposed development would not adversely affect the character of the landscape. The proposal complies with the intent of saved LP policy ENV3 and is in step with design principles in the NPPF.

Conditions

14. Condition one is the standard time limit condition, condition two is for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning, and condition three will ensure that the dwelling has a satisfactory appearance. Condition 4 will ensure that the site is landscaped to complement the building and conditions five and six are necessary to protect retained trees during the construction period. The six conditions reflect those suggested by the Council though the suggested conditions have been amended, where necessary, in the interests of clarity and precision.

*John Braithwaite*

Inspector