



Appeal Decision

Inquiry Held on 28 to 30 April & 7 May 2026

Site visit made on 1 May 2026

by G D Jones BSc(Hons) DipTP DMS MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11th June 2026

Appeal Ref: 6002485

Land south of Longsight Road, Langho

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Hallam Land Management Limited against the decision of Ribble Valley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 3/2025/0196, dated 6 March 2025, was refused by notice dated 27 June 2025.
 - The development proposed is up to 300 residential dwellings, associated access, rail station car park, green infrastructure and sustainable drainage systems.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for up to 300 residential dwellings, associated access, rail station car park, green infrastructure and sustainable drainage systems at Land south of Longsight Road, Langho in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 3/2025/0196, dated 6 March 2025, subject to the conditions contained within the Schedule at the end of this decision.

Preliminary Matters

2. The proposal is for outline planning permission with access only to be determined at this stage and with appearance, landscaping, layout and scale reserved for future approval. Whilst not formally part of the scheme, I have treated the submitted details, including those submitted after the application was determined, relating to these reserved matters as a guide as to how the site might be developed.
3. A multilateral legal agreement (the Legal Agreement) and a unilateral undertaking (the UU), both dated 26 May 2026 and made under s106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, were submitted after the Inquiry closed in accordance with an agreed timetable. I have had regard to the Legal Agreement and the UU when making my decision.
4. The evidence refers to the emerging Ribble Valley Local Plan. The main Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) indicates that the emerging Plan attracts no weight at this stage. For the avoidance of any doubt, while I have taken it into consideration, it has not affected the outcome of the appeal.

Main Issues

5. The main issues are:

- The proposed development's effect on the character and appearance of the area;
- Its effect on sustainable modes and patterns of transport;
- Its effects on biodiversity, including in terms of Biodiversity Net Gain; and
- Whether any harm that might result from the development would be outweighed by other considerations, including housing land supply.

Reasons

Character & Appearance

6. The appeal site is not allocated for development in the development plan. While adjacent to it, the site is not within the settlement boundary of Langho as defined in the development plan. It is, therefore, located within the open countryside as defined by Core Strategy Policy DMG2 of the Core Strategy 2008-2028 - A Local Plan for Ribble Valley, adopted December 2014 (the Local Plan).
7. Both main parties have undertaken their own assessments of the landscape and visual effects that would result from the appeal scheme. While they come to different conclusions, there are notable similarities between them. From all that I heard, saw and experienced during the appeal process, including during my site visit, in my view its effects in these respects would largely lie somewhere between each party's witness's assessments. Nonetheless, as a decision-making aid I have adopted the Council's witness's assessment as a benchmark.
8. On either assessment, the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, in that regard, it would conflict with Policies DMG2 (Strategic Considerations) and DME2 (Landscape and Townscape Protection) of the Local Plan. The proposed approach to the development of the site would be sympathetic in many respects and bring with it certain benefits. Nonetheless, transforming the fields in question to a developed site would also be at odds, in that regard, with Policy DMG1 (General Considerations) of the Local Plan and para 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).
9. The proposed development would result in the loss of some existing trees and hedgerow. Nonetheless, subject to controls that would be secured via planning conditions, the evidence indicates that the appeal scheme overall need not have any significant effects on trees or woodland, including those that are the subject of the Green Nook Wood Tree Preservation Order in the north eastern portion of the site. On this basis it would accord with Policy DME1 (Protecting Trees and Woodland) of the Local Plan.

Sustainable Transport

10. Langho is classed as one of nine 'Tier 1 Villages' in the Local Plan via Key Statement DS1. DS1 states that the majority of new housing development will be concentrated within the principal settlements of Clitheroe, Longridge and Whalley, including a strategic site south of Clitheroe. Tier 1 Villages sit below these areas in

the adopted development hierarchy and are described as the more sustainable of the 32 other defined settlements.

11. Nonetheless, the evidence indicates that the range of services available in Langho has diminished since the Local Plan was adopted. It is also clear that residents of the development, like existing residents of Langho, are likely to have to leave the village to access most services and facilities, including medical, retail and post-primary school education, as well as employment. Nonetheless, Langho does have some facilities within the settlement, including a small convenient store, a pharmacy and two primary schools. It is also well served by public transport via bus services through the village and along the A59 as well as the rail services that stop at the station, which stands adjacent to the site.
12. The railway line, nonetheless, separates the main part of the settlement and the site. Access from the developed site to local services would be constrained to some extent for at least some of its residents. The constraints are chiefly due to distance, pedestrian / cyclist safety, including in Whitehalgh Lane, and the presence of steps, notably those associated with the railway station and railway underpass. These would be eased, but not fully resolved, by proposed mitigation, including a pedestrian link to and traffic calming within Whitehalgh Lane, footway/cycleways on the A59, improved road crossings, and enhanced bus stops.
13. The A59 functions as a main bus corridor, providing reasonably regular services to nearby centres, including Clitheroe, Whalley, and Blackburn. These centres offer a wide range of employment, education, and retail opportunities. The appeal scheme would improve existing facilities associated with those bus services via bus stops, improved pedestrian access to those stops, and payments to support public transport and modal shift away from the private car. The highways specific SoCGs, including with the County Council as local highway authority, indicate that the measures proposed would reduce reliance on the private car.
14. I am also mindful of the evidence associated with the 'Connectivity Tool'. This is a population-based tool, which indicates that 80% of the UK population is based in a location which is more accessible than the appeal site. In the context of the UK's highly populated urban areas and bearing in mind the site's rural location, this is unsurprising. Nonetheless, the evidence suggests that, for a rural area, the site's score of 50 performs reasonably well in terms of connectivity. This too is unsurprising given the existing nearby bus and rail services.
15. Overall, while it would not be ideal in this regard, the appeal scheme would offer a genuine range of transport options to residents, which would allow appropriate access to services and opportunities within Langho or elsewhere without reliance on private cars. The proposed station car park would also be likely to promote the use of the railway station. Therefore, the appeal scheme would be likely to have an acceptable effect on sustainable modes and patterns of transport. On this basis, it would accord with Key Statement DMI2 (Transport Considerations) and Policies DMG1 and DMG3 (Transport and Mobility) of the Local Plan as well as with the Framework, in these respects.

Biodiversity

16. The extent of disagreement between the main parties relating to biodiversity has narrowed substantially, as reflected in the two topic specific SoCGs. By the time

the Inquiry opened, the points of dispute related only to lowland meadow and biodiversity net gain (BNG).

17. The Council maintains that the proposed translocation of the lowland meadow, as a priority habitat, from its current location to another part of the appeal site would not follow the mitigation hierarchy of Framework para 193(a), which advises avoidance of harm. For similar reasons, it also maintains that the Biodiversity Gain Hierarchy would not be followed. I am not persuaded, however.
18. Nonetheless, had I adopted the Council's position on these matters, there would remain several important countervailing considerations, which in my view indicate that any biodiversity harm and associated policy conflict would be mitigated and / or outbalanced by related biodiversity considerations. Central to this conclusion are the existing and likely future condition of the lowland meadow habitat on site compared to what is proposed.
19. The lowland meadow is of poor quality at present. It seems likely that this is due, at least in part, to the site-at-large being grazed by horses. There is currently no management regime in place to improve the condition of this priority habitat. Were the appeal to be dismissed, there is no good reason to believe that this would change. Indeed, it seems most likely that grazing would continue and that this would lead to further deterioration in the condition of the lowland meadow.
20. In contrast, were the appeal scheme to proceed, the sward would be moved to an inaccessible part of the site where it would be actively managed. While there is a risk that the translocation would not work, this approach has been successful elsewhere. The evidence indicates that the prospects of it being a success in this particular case are good. Rather than simply attempting to replicate the existing habitat over time, what is proposed offers genuine ecological continuity, albeit in a different location within the appeal site.
21. The proposals would deliver a net gain of 1.92 units of lowland meadow at the appeal site. Additionally, off-site compensation within Ribble Valley Borough is also proposed. The combined package would deliver a net gain of some 113% in lowland meadow units.
22. For the foregoing reasons, therefore, the appeal scheme would have an acceptable effect on biodiversity, including in terms of BNG. In these regards, it would accord with Key Statement EN4 and Policy DME3 of the Local Plan, as well as with the Framework and relevant statutory requirements.
23. Although I have not, even if I had accepted the Council's case that there would be conflict with Local Plan Key Statement EN4 and Policy DME3 and Framework para 193, due to the existing circumstances and future uncertainty associated with the lowland meadow compared to the likely biodiversity benefits offered by the appeal scheme, as outlined above, any such policy conflict would be clearly outweighed.

Further Considerations

Other Matters

24. The Council did not defend its first refusal reason regarding alleged conflict with the spatial strategy for the area as set out in the Local Plan. Although they were cited in that reason for refusal, the Council no longer contests conflict, in this regard, with Key Statements DS1 (Development Strategy) and H2 (Housing Balance) and

Policies DMG2 and DMH3 (Dwellings in the Open Countryside & the AONB) of the Local Plan. Nonetheless, as the site is located outside the settlement boundary of Langho, in the open countryside, the appeal scheme clearly was not envisaged by the Local Plan and is at odds with the spatial strategy for the location of new housing.

25. Although the main parties have differing views on the extent of the housing delivery shortfall, it is common ground between them that the Council cannot currently demonstrate a Framework compliant supply of housing land. While it may be lower, I have used the Council's figure of some 3.5 years as a benchmark to assist in making my decision. Accordingly, that the appeal development would be at odds with the spatial strategy for the Borough and conflict, in that regard, with the Local Plan, currently carries limited weight.
26. The evidence also refers to other appeal decisions. Those in other areas would have been the subject of different development plan policies compared to those before me. Moreover, I am not familiar with the full circumstances of any of those cases. While I am mindful of the importance of consistency in appeal decision making, it is also important that each decision is made on its individual merits. So, although I have taken all of the other appeal decisions into account, I have assessed and determined this appeal on the basis of the evidence before me in the relevant policy context. Having done so, none have altered the outcome of the appeal.

Interested Parties

27. In addition to the main issues and the other foregoing matters, concern has been expressed, including by those who spoke at the Inquiry, in respect to a number of considerations. These include the appeal development's effect on highway safety and congestion, including for pedestrians and cyclists; on flood risk; on living conditions of neighbours during the construction stage and following completion of the development, including in respect to noise, lighting, air quality and privacy; on wider biodiversity considerations; on anti-social behaviour; on public health; on peace and community cohesion; on urban regeneration; on the historic environment; on confidence in the development planning process; on house prices; on public rights of way; on local taxes; on noise, air, litter, light and water pollution; on parking; on horses; and on tourism.
28. The concerns raised also relate to the adequacy of existing and proposed infrastructure, services and facilities, including highways, public transport, cycling, recreation, pedestrian, drainage, sewerage, education, pre-school, village hall, retail, garage, pub, refuse, parking and medical; the scale of the development relative to the existing settlement and population; alleged lack of need for the housing, including affordable housing, or the car park; the loss of agricultural land; the potential creation of a precedent for other development; whether the additional homes would encourage use of public transport; the adequacy of public engagement; compliance with the development plan and the Framework; whether the station car park would encourage use of the car; and whether acceptable living conditions would be secured for residents of the development.
29. The objections also concern whether there are sites elsewhere better suited to this type of development; alleged shortcomings in the assessment of the development, including highways matters; overhead powerlines; trees; prematurity in the context

of the emerging local plan; a private water supply that crosses the site; affordability of the proposed homes; accessibility for all; delivery and monitoring of proposed mitigation; proposed tree planting; consistency of decision-making; settlement pattern; public open space and access to the existing woodland; existing and future rail use from Langho Station; renewable energy; the mix of proposed dwellings; density; access to employment; cumulative effects with other development.

30. These matters are largely identified and considered within the Council officer's report on the appeal scheme such that they were before the Council when the planning application was determined. They were also before it when it prepared its evidence and when it submitted its case at the Inquiry and are largely addressed in its evidence and in the various SoCGs. Other than as set out above, the Council did not conclude that they would amount to reasons to justify withholding planning permission. I have been provided with no substantiated evidence which would prompt me to disagree with the Council's conclusions in these respects subject to the imposition of planning obligations and conditions as discussed below.

Planning Obligations

31. In the event that planning permission were to be granted and implemented, the planning obligations within the Legal Agreement and the UU would secure:
- Delivery of on-site affordable housing, split 50/50 between affordable rented units and shared ownership or discount sale units, at an overall rate of 30% of the developed dwellings;
 - Delivery of over 55s accommodation on-site at a rate of 15% of the developed dwellings;
 - Delivery of the proposed railway station car park;
 - Delivery of the proposed on-site open space;
 - Arrangements for the maintenance and management of the proposed on-site public open space and car park;
 - A series of BNG Monitoring Reports;
 - Payments to be used to deliver:
 - Off-site 'open space' in the form of improved facilities at Langho Football Club;
 - Healthcare facilities through the expansion of the current Whalley Medical Centre premises;
 - On and off-site BNG land monitoring;
 - Public transport support;
 - Travel Plan support, promotion, monitoring and evaluation;
 - Incentivisation of modal shift amongst residents of the development linked to targets in the Travel Plan; and
 - Additional secondary education places at St Augustine's Roman Catholic School, Ribblesdale School, Bowland High School, Clitheroe Royal Grammar School, Longridge High School or St Cecilia's Roman Catholic Technology College.
32. The Council and the County Council have both submitted detailed statements (the CIL Compliance Statements), which address the application of statutory

requirements to the planning obligations within the Legal Agreement and the UU, and include the relevant planning policy support / justification.

33. I have considered the planning obligations of the Legal Agreement and of the UU in light of Regulation 122 of The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended) and government policy and guidance on the use of planning obligations. Having done so, I am satisfied that those obligations would be required by and accord with the policies set out in the CIL Compliance Statements. Overall, I am satisfied that all of those obligations are directly related to the proposed development, fairly and reasonably related to it and necessary to make it acceptable in planning terms.

Conditions

34. A schedule of 35 suggested conditions has been prepared jointly by the Council and the appellant. It includes the standard timing, implementation and reserved matters conditions. I have considered these in the light of government guidance on the use of planning conditions and made amendments accordingly. Of these 35 suggested conditions all but four are agreed between the main parties. Two are not considered necessary by the appellant. The remaining two are considered necessary by both main parties, but there remains disagreement between them regarding their precise wording.
35. To ensure that facilities, including public open space, are provided in a timely manner as part of the development relative to the proposed residential development, conditions would be necessary to control the phasing and detail of various aspects of the appeal scheme. In order to provide certainty, particularly in respect to the matters that are not reserved for future consideration, a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans would be necessary. A condition to control the detail and timing of the proposed station car park would be necessary in the interests of promoting sustainable modes of transport.
36. In the interests of highway safety, traffic management and to secure a satisfactory standard of development, a condition would be necessary to secure the proposed highways works. These include: footway/cycleways, signalised toucan crossing, reduction in speed limit to 40mph with enhanced gateway features and associated signing/lining on the A59; pedestrian/cycle link on Whitehalgh Lane with reduction of speed limit to 30mph and associated lighting and traffic calming measures; an upgrade of the zebra crossing and central pedestrian island on Whalley Road; and the upgrade/provision of bus stops on Whalley Road and the A59.
37. Also in the interests of highway safety, traffic management and to secure a satisfactory standard of development, conditions would be necessary to control details of on-site roads and the timing of implementation, as well as to secure their maintenance. To promote sustainable modes of transport, conditions would be necessary to secure the details and the delivery of the proposed pedestrian/cycle link onto Whitehalgh Lane and pedestrian link to Whalley Road via the existing public footpath as well as implementation of the Travel Plan.
38. To secure satisfactory living conditions would be achieved for occupiers of the site, a condition would be necessary to ensure the development complies with prescribed noise level criteria. A condition to ensure that the development proceeds in accordance with the appellant's Air Quality Assessment would be necessary in the

- interests of air quality. Conditions to manage surface water during construction and to help secure the installation and management of sustainable drainage would be necessary in the interests of flood prevention and biodiversity, to provide appropriate and adequate facilities and to protect the environment.
39. To protect the character and appearance of the area and in the interests of biodiversity, conditions would be necessary to ensure that retained trees are protected during the construction stage and to control lighting at the development. Also in the interests of biodiversity, conditions to secure the provision of biodiversity enhancement, reasonable avoidance measures for amphibians and the eradication of the Himalayan balsam on the site, the implementation of a Biodiversity Net Gain Plan, a strategy for the translocation of the lowland meadow, a Biodiversity Method Statement, a Construction Environmental Management Plan and a Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan, and measures to protect badgers.
40. A condition to safeguard against contamination that might affect the site, including unsuspected contamination, along with any requisite remediation, would be necessary to protect the health and well-being of future occupiers and off-site receptors as well as in the interests of biodiversity. To protect highway safety and the living conditions of local residents, a condition would be necessary to secure the implementation of a Construction Management Plan.
41. A condition would be necessary to secure the implementation of a strategy to protect the Ancient Woodland and in the interests of biodiversity. While I am mindful that the appellant would prefer greater flexibility in respect to the effect of this condition, given the importance and sensitivity of the Ancient Woodland, I have favoured the Council's preferred wording.
42. A condition would be necessary to secure the implementation of a Public Rights of Way Management Scheme in the interests of public safety and to provide a welcoming, attractive walking route through the site. In this case I have favoured the appellant's preferred wording on the basis it would afford reasonable flexibility while ensuring the timely, safe delivery of the Scheme.
43. The Council requested two further conditions. However, neither would be necessary. This is because the limit on the number of dwellings would be controlled via the description of the proposed development and building heights would be controlled by other proposed conditions. Therefore, neither should be imposed.

Planning Balance

44. I have found that the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area contrary, in that regard, to Local Plan Policies DMG1, DMG2 and DME2 as well as Framework para 135. This harm and the associated development plan policy conflict collectively carry significant weight against the appeal proposals.
45. For the reasons outlined above, I have not found that the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance, including in respect to biodiversity, provides a strong reason for refusing the development proposed. As the Council cannot currently demonstrate a Framework compliant supply of housing land, the so-called tilted balance applies, as set out in para 11 of the Framework. It provides that planning permission should be granted unless any

- adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole. In this case, they do not, such that planning permission should be granted.
46. Even when applying the Council's roughly 3.5 years supply figure, there is a serious and significant shortfall in housing delivery. It is unclear how and when this shortfall will be fully addressed. Within this context, the provision of up to 210 market homes, adjacent to an existing well-established settlement, carries significant weight in favour of the appeal scheme.
47. The development would also deliver up to 90 affordable homes. The evidence indicates that there is substantial unmet need for affordable housing in the Borough. The benefit of providing affordable homes differs from that of delivering market housing as they each respond to related yet discrete needs. Accordingly, the proposed provision of affordable housing also carries its own significant weight in favour of the appeal development.
48. Therefore, even without the 'tilted balance' the identified harm would be comfortably outweighed by the combined benefits of delivering the proposed market and affordable housing. Moreover, although I have not, had I agreed with the Council regarding the effect of the appeal scheme on sustainable modes and patterns of transport and on biodiversity, including in terms of BNG, it would not have altered the outcome of the planning balance due to the weight that I consider these matters would carry in this particular case.
49. I have not, but had I found that the development were to conflict with Local Plan Key Statement DMI2 and Policies DMG1 and DMG3 and the Framework in terms of its effects on sustainable modes of transport / patterns of development, that harm would attract no more than moderate weight bearing in mind the services that are available and fairly accessible in Langho or that are reasonably accessible by public transport elsewhere.
50. Similarly, had I found that the appeal scheme were to conflict with Local Plan Key Statement EN4 and Policy DME3 as well as with the Framework in terms of its effects on biodiversity, due to the existing circumstances and future uncertainty associated with the lowland meadow compared to the likely biodiversity benefits offered by the appeal scheme, any harm would carry no more than moderate weight rather than the significant weight claimed by the Council.
51. If these two matters and the conflict with the area's spatial strategy were combined with the harm to the character and appearance of the area and the associated development plan policy conflict, while collectively weighty, they would be outweighed by the substantial combined weight of the benefits associated with the delivery of market, affordable and over-55s housing alone, without taking into account wider, more modest benefits.
52. There is no doubt, therefore, that the appeal scheme would be sustainable development in the terms of the Framework for which there is a presumption in its favour. This is a material consideration that, in the particular circumstances of the case, outweighs the alleged conflict with the development plan as a whole, such that planning permission should be granted for the proposed development subject to the identified mitigation.

Conclusion

53. For all of the reasons given above and subject to the identified conditions, the appeal should be allowed.

G D Jones

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES¹

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Shemuel Sheikh, Counsel

Instructed by Mair Hill, Ribble Valley Borough Council

He called

Carl Taylor BA(Hons) LADip
CMLI

Landscape and Visual Impact

Derek Richardson BSc(Hons)
MPhil

Biodiversity

Chris Carter BA(Hons) Oxon
MCIHT

Sustainable Transport

Kathryn Hughes MPI MRTPI

Affordable Housing and Planning

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Paul Tucker², King's Counsel

Instructed by Mark Saunders, NJL Consulting

He called

Andrew Cook BA(Hons) MLD
CMLI MISEP Env

Landscape and Visual Impact

James Stacey BA(Hons)
DipTP MRTPI

Affordable Housing

Kurt Goodman BSc(Hons)
CEcol MCIEEM

Biodiversity

Peter Blair BEng CEng FICE
FCIHT

Sustainable Transport

Mark Saunders MA(Hons)
MRTPI

Planning

INTERESTED PERSONS:

Richard Evans

Local Resident

Chris Heap

Local Resident

Anne Slee

Local Resident

Tony Austin

Local Resident

Christopher Chadwick

Local Resident

Philip Collier

Local Resident

¹ Additionally, Lyndsey Hayes of Ribble Valley Borough Council and Kathryn Lawrance of Bevan Brittan LLP for the Council and Elliott Bullock of NJL Consulting and Ellis Cleland of Walker Morris LLP for the appellant contributed to the conditions and planning obligations sessions

² Assisted by Constanze Bell, Counsel

DOCUMENTS submitted at the Inquiry

ID01 - Replacement Plans:

- a) Illustrative Masterplan Drawing no. 0101 Rev. G
- b) Parameter Plans Movement & Access Drawing No. 0103
- c) Landscape Masterplan P24-2318-EN-07-C

ID02 - Site visit itinerary plans

ID03 - Appellant's Opening

ID04 - Appellant's Appearances

ID05 - Council's Opening

ID06 - Council's Appearances

ID07 - Suite of Suggested Planning Conditions, including final set of 11 May 2025

ID08 - Plan showing full extent of Local Character Area

ID09 - Parking notes for viewpoints

ID10 - Not used

ID11 - Final S106 and UU dated 26 May 2026

ID12 - Note on On-Site (Access) Loop Road

ID13 - Note on Connectivity Tool of 50

ID14 - Note on Affordable Housing

ID15 - Errata – Amendments to James Stacey's Proof of Evidence

ID16 - Lancashire County Council CIL Compliance Statement

ID17 - Appellant's note on the UU responding to Lancashire County Council

ID18 - Council's closing submissions

ID19 - Appellant's closing submissions

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS FOR APPEAL REF 6002485:

1. An application(s) for approval of all the Reserved Matters, namely appearance, layout, scale and landscaping, of the site shall be made to the Local Planning Authority not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission and the development shall be begun not later than whichever is the later of the following dates:
 - a) The expiration of three years from the date of this permission; or
 - b) The expiration of two years from the final approval of the reserved matter or, in the case of approval on different dates, the final approval of the last such matter to be approved.
2. Application(s) for approval of the Reserved Matters relating to scale and layout shall be accompanied by full details of existing and proposed ground levels and proposed building finished floor levels (all relative to the ground levels adjoining the site) including the levels of the proposed roads.
3. Prior to the commencement of development, a plan indicating the phasing of the proposed development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The phasing plan shall include the development phases and completion sequence, estate streets for each phase, details of the number of units, housing mix, affordable units, older persons housing, the new pedestrian/cycle access onto Whitehalgh Lane and delivery of public open space and the railway station car park. The development thereafter shall be carried out in complete accordance with the approved phasing plan.
4. Unless explicitly required by a condition within this permission, the development hereby permitted shall be carried out in complete accordance with the following plans:
 - Site Location Plan - Drawing No 0100
 - Parameter Plan - Land Use & Heights - Drawing No 0102
 - Parameter Plan - Movement and Access - Drawing No 0103
 - General Arrangement - Drawing No 100-P-001
 - Engineering Layout - Drawing No 100-P-002.
5. As part of any reserved matters application where layout is applied for, public open space shall be provided on site in the general location shown on the approved Drawing No 0101 Rev G.
6. No less than 43 spaces, including 5 accessible spaces, shall be provided on the site in the general location shown on the Parameter Plan - Land Use & Heights - Drawing No 0102 for the development of a railway station car park. No more than 75% (seventy five percent) of the total dwellings permitted shall be occupied until the railway station car park has been completed and is operational.
7. Details of the proposed arrangements for the future management and maintenance of the estate road within the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The streets shall thereafter be maintained in accordance with the approved management and maintenance details.
8. Prior to the commencement of development full engineering, drainage, street lighting and constructional details of the internal estate roads shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The

- development shall, thereafter, be constructed in accordance with the approved details.
9. Details of the pedestrian/cycle link onto Whitehalgh Lane and pedestrian link to Whalley Road via FP03-06006a shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to commencement of development. The details shall include provision for the design of access and surfacing, widths, gradients, landscaping and structures. The approved details shall be implemented prior to first occupation of any dwelling hereby permitted.
 10. The Framework Travel Plan Doc ref 4094 by Hydrock Fore dated 6 March 2025 shall be implemented in strict accordance with the actions and timetable contained within the Travel Plan Actions and Measures at Section 5.
 11. No dwelling shall be occupied until the carriageway and any footpath or footway from it which it gains access is constructed to base course level and connected to the existing highway network with any street lighting installed and in operation. The penultimate dwelling of any approved phase shall not be occupied until the access routes serving the development have been completed to wearing course level.
 12. Prior to the commencement of development, a scheme for the site access and off-site highway works shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The works shall include the following and be implemented prior to the first occupation of any dwelling:
 - a) New site access on the A59 and associated works shown on Drawing Nos 100-P-001 and 100-P-002, including new footway/cycleways on the A59, new signalised toucan crossing, reduction in speed limit to 40mph with enhanced gateway features and associated signing/lining;
 - b) New pedestrian/cycle link on Whitehalgh Lane with reduction of speed limit to 30mph with associated lighting and traffic calming measures;
 - c) Upgrade of zebra crossing and central pedestrian island on Whalley Road near Olive Bank and the primary school; and
 - d) The upgrade/provision of 4 bus stops (2 x Whalley Road A666 and 2 x Longsight Road A59) to support all users to travel to/from the site sustainably.
 13. a) The residential development hereby permitted shall be designed so that noise levels at each dwelling do not exceed the following levels as assessed in accordance with British Standard 8233 (2014) and WHO guidelines (or any subsequent replacement national standards / guidance):

LAeq 55 dB 16 hours - gardens and outside living areas, daytime (07.00-23.00)

LAeq 35 dB 16 hours - indoors, daytime (07.00-23.00)

LAeq 30 dB 8 hours - indoors, night-time (23.00-07.00)

LAFmax 45 dB 8 hours - indoors night-time (23.00-07.00)

LAFmax 45 dB 4 hours - indoors evening (19.00-23.00)

*The evening standard LAFmax will only apply where the evening LAFmax significantly exceeds the LAeq and the maximum levels reached are regular in occurrence, for example several times per hour.

b) Where noise mitigation measures are required to ensure compliance with the noise levels specified above e.g. acoustic glazing, noise barrier fencing and

ventilation, such mitigation details shall be submitted in each reserved matters application(s) relating to layout or appearance, demonstrating how they would mitigate noise to the approved levels together with a timetable for implementation. The approved noise mitigation measures shall be implemented in accordance with the approved timescale and shall thereafter be maintained and retained.

14. The development shall be carried out in strict accordance with measures set out in Section 7 (Mitigation) and Section 8 (Achieving Compliance with the PM2.5 Targets) of the Air Quality Assessment by Logika dated 25 February 2025.
15. No development shall commence in each approved phase until a detailed, final surface water sustainable drainage strategy for that phase has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The detailed surface water sustainable drainage strategy shall be based upon the site specific Flood Risk Assessment (26 February 2025 / 49343-ECE-XX-XX-RP-C-0001_Issue 3 / Eastwood) and indicative surface water sustainable drainage strategy (26 February 2025 / 49343-ECE-XX-XX-RP-C-0002_Issue 3 / Eastwood) submitted and sustainable drainage principles and requirements set out in the National Planning Policy Framework, Planning Practice Guidance and Defra Technical Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems. No surface water shall be allowed to discharge to the public foul sewer(s), directly or indirectly.

The details of the drainage strategy to be submitted for approval shall include, as a minimum:

- a) Sustainable drainage calculations for peak flow control and volume control for the:
 - i 100% (1 in 1-year) annual exceedance probability event;
 - ii 3.3% (1 in 30-year) annual exceedance probability event + 40% climate change allowance, with an allowance for urban creep;
 - iii 1% (1 in 100-year) annual exceedance probability event + 50% climate change allowance, with an allowance for urban creep.

Calculations shall be provided for the whole site, including all existing and proposed surface water drainage systems.

- b) Final sustainable drainage plans appropriately labelled to include, as a minimum:
 - i Site plan showing all permeable and impermeable areas that contribute to the drainage network either directly or indirectly, including surface water flows from outside the curtilage as necessary;
 - ii Sustainable drainage system layout showing all pipe and structure references, dimensions and design levels; to include all existing and proposed surface water drainage systems up to and including the final outfall;
 - iii Details of all sustainable drainage components, including landscape drawings showing topography and slope gradient as appropriate;
 - iv Drainage plan showing flood water exceedance routes in accordance with Defra Technical Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems;

- v Finished Floor Levels (FFL) in AOD with adjacent ground levels for all sides of each building and connecting cover levels to confirm minimum 150 mm+ difference for FFL;
 - vi Details of proposals to collect and mitigate surface water runoff from the development boundary;
 - vii Measures taken to manage the quality of the surface water runoff to prevent pollution, protect groundwater and surface waters, and deliver suitably clean water to sustainable drainage components;
- c) Evidence of an assessment of the site conditions to include site investigation and test results to confirm infiltration rates and groundwater levels in accordance with BRE 365.
- d) Evidence of an assessment of the existing on-site watercourse to be used, to confirm that these systems are in sufficient condition and have sufficient capacity to accept surface water runoff generated from the development.
- e) Evidence that a free-flowing outfall can be achieved. If this is not possible, evidence of a surcharged outfall applied to the sustainable drainage calculations will be required.

The sustainable drainage strategy shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

16. The occupation of any dwelling within each approved phase of development shall not be permitted until a site-specific verification report, pertaining to the surface water sustainable drainage system for the relevant phase, and prepared by a suitably competent person, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The verification report shall, as a minimum, demonstrate that the surface water sustainable drainage system has been constructed in accordance with the approved drawing(s) (or detail any minor variations) and is fit for purpose. The report shall contain information and evidence, including photographs, of details and locations (including national grid references) of critical drainage infrastructure (including inlets, outlets, and control structures) and full as-built drawings. The scheme shall thereafter be maintained in perpetuity.

17. The occupation of any dwelling within an approved phase of development shall not be permitted until a site-specific Operation and Maintenance Manual for the lifetime of the development, pertaining to the surface water drainage system of that phase and prepared by a suitably competent person, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details of the manual to be submitted for approval shall include:
- a) A timetable for its implementation;
 - b) Details of the maintenance, operational and access requirement for all Sustainable urban Drainage Systems components and connecting drainage structures, including all watercourses and their ownership;
 - c) Pro-forma to allow the recording of each inspection and maintenance activity, as well as allowing any faults to be recorded and actions taken to rectify issues;

- d) The arrangements for adoption by any public body or statutory undertaker, or any other arrangements to secure the operation of the sustainable drainage scheme in perpetuity;
- e) Details of financial management including arrangements for the replacement of major components at the end of the manufacturer's recommended design life;
- f) Details of whom to contact if pollution is seen in the system or if it is not working correctly; and
- g) Means of access for maintenance and easements.

Thereafter the drainage system shall be retained, managed, and maintained in accordance with the approved details.

18. No approved phase of development shall commence until a Construction Surface Water Management Plan for that phase, detailing how surface water and stormwater will be managed on the site during construction, including demolition and site clearance operations, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The details of the plan to be submitted for approval shall include method statements, scaled and dimensioned plans and drawings detailing surface water management proposals and shall include for each phase:

- a) Measures taken to ensure surface water flows are retained on-site during the construction phase(s), including temporary drainage systems, and, if surface water flows are to be discharged, they are done so at a restricted rate that shall not exceed the equivalent greenfield runoff rate from the site; and
- b) Measures taken to prevent siltation and pollutants from the site entering any receiving groundwater and/or surface waters, including watercourses, with reference to published guidance.

The development shall be implemented and thereafter managed and maintained in accordance with the approved plan for the duration of construction.

19. During the construction period, all trees to be retained within the site shall be protected in strict accordance with British Standard BS 5837:2012 or any subsequent amendment to the British Standard.

Furthermore, root protection measures shall be set up along the western boundary of the adjacent woodland to the northeast of the site. The exclusion zones shall remain in place throughout the demolition and construction phases and fully accord with the methodology set out in BS 5837:2012 during all site preparation/construction works.

No materials, soil, spoil or other substance shall be stored within the protective areas at any time and no changes in land levels shall occur within these areas. Any no-dig, hand-digging and protective membranes shall only occur within the protective areas with the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority.

20. Notwithstanding the submitted details, and prior to the installation of external lighting, a "lighting design strategy for biodiversity" in accordance with ILP Guidance Note for the reduction of obtrusive light 2021 (or later versions) and ILP Publications Guidance Note 08/23 Bats and Artificial Lighting at Night shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority for all

proposed lighting within the development hereby permitted. The strategy shall be based upon the site being within Zone E2 Rural with low district brightness:

- a) Identify those areas/features on site that are particularly sensitive for bats and other nocturnal wildlife that are likely to cause disturbance in or around their breeding sites and resting places or along important routes used to access key areas of their territory, for example, for foraging; and
- b) Show how and where external lighting will be installed (through the provision of appropriate lighting contour plans and technical specifications) so that it can be clearly demonstrated that areas to be lit will not cause further disturbance or prevent use of territory or restrict access to breeding sites and resting places. All external lighting shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and locations set out in the strategy, and these shall be maintained thereafter in accordance with the strategy.

Under no circumstances shall any other external lighting be installed without prior written approval from the Local Planning Authority.

21. Prior to the commencement of development, a Plan by an appropriately experienced ecologist shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority of the location of biodiversity features (e.g. bat bricks, bird boxes) to be provided. The approved Plan shall show the number, location and specification of the features. All approved features shall be installed in the presence of an appropriately qualified ecologist prior to first occupation of the dwelling on which they are located and retained thereafter.
22. No development shall commence on site, including any vegetation clearance, earth moving or other enabling works, until such time as a Reasonable Avoidance Measures Strategy for amphibians (common toad) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The method statement shall include the following measures:
 - Location of suitable protective fencing; and
 - Details of management of habitats and supervised (Ecological Clerk of Works) hand searching of features to be removed.The development shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved details.
23. A scheme for the eradication of the Himalayan balsam on the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to any works commencing on site. The development shall thereafter be carried out in strict accordance with the approved measures.
24. The Biodiversity Net Gain Plan for the entire development shall be prepared in accordance with the principles outlined in the submitted Biodiversity Net Gain Strategy (Rev A, November 2025). Any phase biodiversity gain plan shall be in accordance with the Overall Biodiversity Gain Plan submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority for the purposes of paragraph 13 of Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act.
25. Prior to the commencement of each approved development phase a re-survey of the site and adjoining land / ditches within a 30m buffer of the site shall be undertaken (unless proven to be inaccessible) for the presence of badgers together with proposals for mitigation/compensation, if required, and a timetable for implementation shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning

Authority. Any approved mitigation measures shall then be implemented in accordance with the approved details and timetable.

26. No approved phase of development shall commence until a Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan (the HMMP) prepared in accordance with the approved Biodiversity Gain Plan for that phase (as required by the 'Statutory Biodiversity Condition'), has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority (LPA).
- a) This shall include details of:
 - (i) A non-technical summary;
 - (ii) The roles and responsibilities of the people or organisation(s) delivering the HMMP;
 - (iii) The planned habitat creation and enhancement works to create or improve habitat to achieve the biodiversity net gain in accordance with the approved Biodiversity Gain Plan;
 - (iv) The management measures to maintain habitat in accordance with the approved Biodiversity Gain Plan for a period of 30 years from the completion of development; and
 - (v) The monitoring methodology and frequency in respect of the created or enhanced habitat to be submitted to the LPA.
 - b) Notice in writing shall be given to the LPA when the:
 - (i) HMMP has been implemented; and
 - (ii) Habitat creation and enhancement works as set out in the HMMP have been completed.
 - c) There shall be no occupation of any dwellinghouse approved until:
 - (i) The habitat creation and enhancement works set out in the approved HMMP have been completed; and
 - (ii) A completion report, evidencing the completed habitat enhancements, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA.
 - d) The created and/or enhanced habitat specified in the approved HMMP shall be managed and maintained in accordance with the approved HMMP.
27. Prior to the commencement of development, a Biodiversity Method Statement shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The statement shall be in accordance with the principles of the mitigation measures set out in Table 8 of the Ecological Impact Assessment by FPCR Environment & Design dated November 2025. The details shall include but not be limited to:
- a) Specification and location;
 - b) Programme and timetable for implementation;
 - c) Persons responsible for implementing the works;
 - d) Details of initial aftercare and long-term maintenance; and
 - e) Details of monitoring and remedial measures.

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details, and all enhancement measures shall thereafter be retained as such in perpetuity.

No site, preparation, scrub/hedgerow clearance or tree works/removal shall be undertaken on the site during the bird breeding season (March - August inclusive) unless a pre-work nesting bird survey of the site has been undertaken by a licenced ecologist.

28. Prior to the commencement of development within the site or within an approved phase:
- a) A site investigation report for the site (or approved phase) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority (in line with the principles of the submitted Preliminary Geoenvironmental Investigation Report no 5200/A1 by LITHOS dated February 2025) to identify the types, nature and extent of land contamination affecting the site (or phase) together with the risks to receptors and potential for migration within and beyond the site which has been carried out by an appropriately qualified geotechnical professional (in accordance with a methodology for investigations and assessments which shall comply with BS 10175:2001; and
 - b) In the event that the above report identifies the need for remediation, then a remediation strategy for the site (or approved phase) to include an implementation timetable, details of future monitoring and a verification methodology (which shall include a sampling and analysis programme to confirm the adequacy of land decontamination) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. All approved remediation measures shall be carried out in accordance with the approved measures and timetable.

Prior to first occupation of any dwelling requiring remediation, a validation report providing results of the verification programme of post-remediation sampling shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority to confirm that the approved remediation measures have been carried out in accordance with the approved details.

29. Prior to commencement of development operations, including ground investigation and vegetation removal, a detailed strategy for the translocation of the lowland meadow shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This strategy shall follow the outline prescriptions provided in the Biodiversity Net Gain Strategy (dated November 2025). The strategy shall also provide further detailing including:
- The timing for the translocation exercise;
 - The precise location of the receptor site;
 - Details for the preparation and translocation of the area of lowland meadow; and
 - Details for the preparation of the receptor site.

Within 21 days of completing the translocation exercise, a report detailing compliance with the approved translocation exercise shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, long-term management and remedial measures shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan.

30. No approved phase of development shall take place (including ground works and vegetation clearance) until a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP: Biodiversity) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local

Planning Authority for that phase. The CEMP: Biodiversity shall include the following:

- a) Risk assessment of potentially damaging construction activities;
- b) Identification of “biodiversity protection zones”;
- c) Practical measures (both physical measures and sensitive working practices) to avoid or reduce impacts during construction (may be provided as a set of method statements);
- d) The location and timings of sensitive works to avoid harm to biodiversity features;
- e) The times during which construction when specialist ecologists need to be present on site to oversee works;
- f) Responsible persons and lines of communication;
- g) The role and responsibilities on site of an ecological clerk of works or similarly competent person;
- h) Use of protective fences, exclusion barriers and warning signs if applicable; and
- i) Details of the means of protecting trees, hedgerows and the watercourse during the construction of development.

The approved CEMP shall be adhered to and implemented throughout the construction period strictly in accordance with the approved details, unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

31. No approved phase of development shall take place until a Construction Management Plan (CMP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority for that phase. The approved Plan shall be adhered to throughout the construction period. It shall provide for:
- i) The parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;
 - ii) The loading and unloading of plant and materials;
 - iii) The storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development;
 - iv) The erection and maintenance of security hoarding;
 - v) Arrangements during construction period to minimise the deposit of mud and other similar debris on the adjacent highways, i.e. wheel washing facilities;
 - vi) Measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction;
 - vii) Control of noise and vibration emanating from the site during the construction period;
 - viii) External lighting of the site during the construction period;
 - ix) Scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works;
 - x) Details of working hours; and
 - xi) Routing of delivery vehicles to/from site.

The construction of the development shall be carried out in strict accordance with the approved CMP.

32. Any reserved matters application relating to layout shall include details of a strategy for the establishment and management of a 15m buffer zone surrounding the Ancient Woodland together with an ecological corridor within the site to provide

connectivity to the Ancient Woodland shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This strategy shall provide details for the implementation of native species woodland or scrub within the buffer zone and corridor. The strategy shall not permit informal recreational use or development in the buffer zone and no formal footpaths shall be provided in the buffer zone. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved strategy.

33. Prior to the commencement of development, a Public Rights of Way Management Scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include provision for:
- a) The design of access and public rights of way route and their surfacing, widths, gradients, landscaping and structures;
 - b) Any proposals for the diversion or extinguishment of Public Rights of Way and alternative route provision as part of a Public Path Order; and
 - c) Any proposals and phasing for the diversion and temporary closure of Public Rights of Way and alternative route provision as part of a Traffic Regulation Order.

The approved scheme shall be implemented prior to occupation of the 50th dwelling hereby permitted.