


**Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.**

<b>Signed:</b>	<b>Officer:</b>	<b>MC</b>	<b>Date:</b>	<b>30/07/2025</b>	<b>Manager:</b>	<b>LH</b>	<b>Date:</b>	<b>31/7/25</b>
----------------	-----------------	-----------	--------------	-------------------	-----------------	-----------	--------------	----------------

Application Ref:	3/2025/0195			 Ribble Valley Borough Council <hr/> www.ribblevalley.gov.uk
Date Inspected:	22/07/2025	Site Notice:	N/A	
Officer:	MC			
DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:				
				REFUSAL

<b>Development Description:</b>	Proposed first floor extension over existing garage to front.
<b>Site Address/Location:</b>	14 The Drive Brockhall Village Old Langho BB6 8BJ

<b>CONSULTATIONS:</b>	<b>Parish/Town Council</b>
No comments received with respect to the proposed development.	

<b>CONSULTATIONS:</b>	<b>Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies</b>
<b>RVBC Countryside Officer:</b>	Recommends the further survey referred to in the ecology report is undertaken.

<b>CONSULTATIONS:</b>	<b>Additional Representations.</b>
No additional representations received.	

**RELEVANT POLICIES AND SITE PLANNING HISTORY:****Ribble Valley Core Strategy:**

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

Policy DMG1: General Considerations  
Policy DMH5: Residential and Curtilage Extensions  
Policy DMG3: Transport & Mobility  
Policy DME3: Site and Species Protection and Conservation

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

**Relevant Planning History:****3/2018/1101**

Demolition of UPVC conservatory and replacement with single storey extension.  
Approved with Conditions

**3/2003/0363**

ERECTION OF EXTENSIONS TO FIRST FLOOR ABOVE GARAGE  
Approved with Conditions

**3/1999/0476**

RESERVED MATTERS APPLICATION FOR ERECTION OF A DWELLING

Approved with Conditions

**3/1999/0198**

OUTLINE APPLICATION FOR DEVELOPMENT OF REMAINDER OF VILLAGE (WITH EXCEPTION OF SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT) TO PROVIDE 261 NEW HOMES &amp; 10,500 SQ.M. OF EMPLOYMENT SPACE (RESUBMISSION OF 3/98/0426/P)

Approved with Conditions

**ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:****Site Description and Surrounding Area:**

The application relates to a two-storey detached dwellinghouse at 14 The Drive, Brockhall Village. The property comprises brickwork to the external walls, roof tiles and uPVC windows and has an existing gable projection to the front of the building with a lower gable set further down which serves the garage.

The site to which the proposal relates is located within the defined settlement of Brockhall and the surrounding area is predominantly residential in character. There are football training grounds adjoining the southern boundary with the site.

**Proposed Development for which consent is sought:**

Planning permission is sought for the construction of a first-floor extension above the existing garage to provide an additional bedroom.

The proposed first floor extension would involve the raising of the roof to match the existing front gable projection with a total height of approximately 7.4m. The roof would have concrete tiles to match the existing with horizontal composite cladding boards to the first-floor walls in an Anthracite Grey colour. To the front elevation, a large, glazed window which extends up to the apex would be inserted. This would be in Anthracite Grey too, as well as a new uPVC window at first floor level to the side/west elevation

It should be noted that the drawings incorrectly show the height of the existing first floor outrigger to the front elevation which is slightly set down from the main roof ridge.

**Principle of Development:**

The application relates to a domestic extension and alterations to an established residential property and is therefore acceptable in principle subject to an assessment of the material planning considerations.

**Impact Upon Residential Amenity:**

Ribble Valley Core Strategy Policy DMG1 provides specific guidance in relation to amenity and states that all development must:

- ‘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’*

The proposed development would raise the ridge height of the existing garage element by approximately 2.2 metres.

Turning to the impact on no. 12, there is a side facing first floor window along the western flank elevation which may receive less light as a result of the development, however this is not considered to constitute a primary window and as such, whilst there may be some loss of light, this would not be excessive. There is a rooflight inserted to the forward outrigger of no. 12 and it is unclear from the planning history what this room serves, however any overshadowing is likely to be in the latter part of the day and whilst there would likely be some loss of light if this room were to constitute primary living accommodation it is not considered that the proposal would result in any loss of light to other windows to no. 12 that serve primary living accommodation. A new first floor window is proposed which would face no. 12, however a condition could be added to ensure the window is fitted with obscure glazing to prevent any direct overlooking into the adjacent first floor side facing window of no. 12.

With regards to the impact on no. 15, the proposed extension includes a first-floor side facing window to serve the bedroom in addition to the first-floor front facing window. The planning history for no. 15 indicates that the first-floor side facing windows to no. 15 do not serve primary living accommodation and as such there would not be any detrimental overlooking from the first-floor side facing window. Turning to overshadowing and loss of light, due to the orientation of the property and the spacing between the extension and no. 15, the majority of overshadowing resulting from the extension would be contained within the driveway of no. 14.

As such, whilst there may be some impact to amenity, this is not considered to be adverse and would not warrant refusal of the scheme.

#### **Visual Amenity/External Appearance:**

Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy states that:

*“In determining planning applications, all development must:*

- 1. Be of a high standard of building design which considers the 8 building in context principles (from the CABE/English Heritage Building in 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 DMH5, 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.*

Policy DMH5 also states that:

*‘Proposals to extend or alter existing residential properties must accord with policy DMG1 and any relevant designations within which the site is located’.*

It should be noted that an extension of a similar size was granted in 2003 but has not been implemented. This extension did not include the large, glazed window to the front elevation or external cladding. In addition, the extension was set down from the main roof ridge.

The submitted elevation drawings indicate that the proposed extension would extend from the main roof ridge and extend from the existing first floor study to the depth of the existing garage, at approximately 5.6 metres. The proposed first floor extension would be fairly large in height and would extend at the same level as the

existing first floor outrigger to the front elevation and would not appear as a subservient addition to the main dwelling.

The proposal also includes the insertion of a number of new windows, including first floor side facing windows which would be Anthracite grey in colour. The windows on the existing property are currently white uPVC windows and the application form and submitted drawings do not indicate the existing windows would be replaced with grey uPVC to match the new windows. As such, the dwelling would have two different coloured windows in situ. The siting of the ground floor window would also appear off-centre with the first-floor glazed feature window which is considered harmful to the character of the dwelling.

The cladding proposed to the first floor would be added to all external elevations and the large, glazed apex window would be highly prominent within the street scene. Overall, the size, scale and design of the extension would not constitute a high-quality design and would not be sympathetic to the host building and would result in visual harm to the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area.

It is noted that the character and appearance of 'The Drive' comprises large self-build plots with varying sizes and designs, some of which have modern design features such as grey cladding and large expanses of glazing to the front elevation. In particular 'New Barn' which is located to the North-East of the application site on the opposite side of the road. However, this was a contemporary house type design approved in the nineties, assessed under different planning policies and is not directly comparable to the application property and proposed extension.

At no. 18 The Drive, planning permission was granted under planning ref: 3/2019/1115 in 2020 for alterations to the fenestration and surface materials of the front gable. This included the insertion of a large, glazed window to the front gable, similar in design to that which forms part of this application and the use of Anthracite grey cladding to the walls. This decision is a material planning consideration in the determination of this application and whilst some weight is given to this planning decision, it is considered that the site circumstances differ. The forward projection of the front gable to no. 18 is significantly smaller than that proposed at no. 14 and no. 18 is also set back further within the site than no. 14. No.18 is also sited centrally above the main property entrance and not as a side projection above a garage window as proposed at no.14. As such, whilst taken in isolation, the level of glazing is extensive at no. 18, it is not considered to appear as prominently sited within the street scene. In addition, the level of grey cladding proposed, at a depth of approximately 5.6 metres would be greater than the approved scheme at no. 18, making the extension more prominent within the street.

It should also be noted that the existing garage at no. 14 and no. 12 are approximately 2.8 metres apart. When compared to the distance at 'The Barn' which has a large forward gable projection, the distances between the gable and the neighbouring properties are over 4 metres which allows for views between the properties and retains a sense of openness. In contrast, the close siting of the proposed extension, in conjunction with the large depth, alterations to materials and the glazed feature window would appear incongruous with the adjacent property at no. 12.

For the reasons stated above, the proposal would fail to comply with Policies DMG1 and DMH5 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.

### **Highways and Parking:**

Ribble Valley Core Strategy Policy DMG3 states that:

*'All development proposals will be required to provide adequate car parking and servicing space in line with currently approved standards'.*

In addition, Policy DMG1 states that all development must:

- '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'.*

The proposed extension would not increase the number of bedrooms at the property, nor would it result in the loss of existing parking following completion of the works. As such, the scheme is not considered to impact on the highway safety or parking and would comply with Policy DMG1 and DMG3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.

#### **Landscape/Ecology:**

Policy DME3 states that development proposals that are likely to adversely affect the wildlife species protected by law will not be granted planning permission. exceptions will only be made where it can clearly be demonstrated that the benefits of a development at a site outweigh both the local and the wider impacts.

A Preliminary Roost Assessment has been submitted as part of the planning application. This report concludes that the dwelling is considered to have a low habitat value for roosting bats but nonetheless recommends that a proposal could result in the destruction of any bat roosts present and could cause disturbance, death or injury to bats. In addition, any bat roosts possibly within the main roof structure could be disturbed by noise and vibrations during works. The report recommends one bat emergence/re-entry survey to be undertaken to confirm the presence/likely-absence of bats roosting in or on the building.

The Council are required to be satisfied that an application appropriately considers the impact on protected species, as such are unable to condition that additional surveys are undertaken after the granting of planning permission. As the additional emergence/re-entry survey has not been submitted as part of the application and in the absence of this information, the proposal fails to demonstrate that appropriate assessments have been carried out to fully assess the impacts upon protected species. Therefore, notwithstanding the suggested mitigation measures outlined within the Preliminary Roost Assessment which could be secured by way of planning condition, the proposal fails to adequately protect and enhance protected species and habitat contrary to Key Statement EN4 and policy DME3 of the Ribble Valley Core and the National Planning Policy Framework.

The application is exempt from having to achieve the mandatory Biodiversity Net Gain requirements as it is a householder application.

#### **Observations/Consideration of Matters Raised/Conclusion:**

As such, for the above reasons and having regard to all material considerations and matters raised, the application is recommended for refusal.

<b>RECOMMENDATION:</b>	That planning consent be granted refused for the following reason(s):
<b>01:</b>	The proposed development by reason of its size, siting, design and external materials would fail to constitute a subservient addition to the main dwelling and would be incongruous with the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the immediate vicinity of the site, contrary to Policy DMG1 and DMH5 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.
<b>02:</b>	The proposal fails to demonstrate that appropriate assessments have been carried out to fully assess the impacts upon roosting bats. Therefore, the proposal fails to adequately protect and enhance protected species and habitat contrary to Key Statement EN4 and policy DME3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.