


Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.

Signed:	Officer:	EP	Date:	24/07/2025	Manager:	SK	Date:	25/7/25
----------------	-----------------	-----------	--------------	-------------------	-----------------	-----------	--------------	----------------

Application Ref:	2025/0220			 Ribble Valley Borough Council <hr/> www.ribblevalley.gov.uk
Date Inspected:	05/06/2025	Site Notice:	05/06/2025	
Officer:	EP			
DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:				REFUSAL

Development Description:	Proposed single-storey extension to rear.
Site Address/Location:	4 West View Main Street Grindleton BB7 4RB.

CONSULTATIONS:	Parish/Town Council
No objection.	

CONSULTATIONS:	Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies
LCC Highways:	N/A

CONSULTATIONS:	Additional Representations.
One representation has been received querying the relation between the development with the boundary wall but raising no objection.	

RELEVANT POLICIES AND SITE PLANNING HISTORY:

Ribble Valley Core Strategy:

Key Statement DS1: Development Strategy
Key Statement DS2: Sustainable Development
Key Statement EN2: Landscape
Key Statement EN5: Heritage Assets

Policy DMG1: General Considerations
Policy DMG2: Strategic Considerations
Policy DMH5: Residential and Curtilage Extensions

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act
National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Relevant Planning History:

No planning history.

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:

Site Description and Surrounding Area:

The application property relates to a terraced property situated within the settlement boundary of Grindleton. The surrounding area is predominantly residential, being typified by varying styles of dwelling. The

site is situated within the Grindleton Conservation Area and falls within the boundary for the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

Proposed Development for which consent is sought:

Consent is sought for the construction of a single-story rear extension to accommodate an extended kitchen area.

Impact Upon Residential Amenity:

As per Core Strategy Policy DMG1, 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.

Given the application dwelling is a terraced property, careful consideration must be taken in regard to residential amenity and the potential impact on the adjoining neighbouring dwellings.

The proposed single storey extension is to project 3.61m rearwards and will extend the entire width of the existing dwelling. The adjoining dwelling to the south comprises an existing rear extension at the southern side of the property and also benefits from a ground floor habitable window at the northern side of the dwelling on the rear elevation. The proposed extension if implemented would lead to a tunnelling effect and sense of enclosure upon the occupying residents by virtue of its design and close proximity to the adjacent neighbouring window which provides light to a habitable room.

It is recognised that a 3m extension could be erected along the adjoining shared boundary utilising permitted development rights. However, given this extension is larger than that that could be allowed without consent, it is assessed against policy accordingly and the adverse impact on the neighbour cannot be justified. The applicant/agent was invited to amend the scheme either via a reduction in the length of the development to 3m lining up with that allowed under PD or by reducing the width and setting the extension away from the adjoining shared boundary to mitigate the tunnelling effect and overbearing impact. No amended plans to reflect these suggestions have been provided. However, an amended plan was received reducing the eaves height along the adjoining boundary to the south and this is the plan that is being assessed as per the agents request. The agent believes that by reducing the eaves height to 2m along the boundary, the impact would be comparable to a boundary wall and similar to an extension set away from the adjoining boundary. However, it is not considered that a boundary wall is comparable to a pitched roof extension in terms of bulk and massing and this amendment does not suitable mitigate the concerns raised. Ultimately, the proposed development has been applied for under a householder application, and it is assessed in line policy accordingly, the adverse impact on residential amenity is in contravention with policy and the proposal can therefore not be supported.

The proposed extension is to measure 2m to the eaves to the southern side but will have a maximum roof height of approximately 3.4m. Given there is no set in distance from the adjoining boundary, it would inflict an unacceptable overbearing impact and sense of tunnelling upon the neighbouring property. Furthermore, analysis shows that the extension would also be in contravention of the 45-degree rule in relation to the window previously discussed.

There are appeal decisions that support the above stance, that despite the fact similar development can be erected utilising PD rights, development that goes beyond this allowance is unacceptable where there is an adverse impact on neighbouring amenity. Appeal decision APP/M1595/D/24/3347795 confirms that 'the scope of the PD regime does not justify the larger proposal' which in that instance was only 500m greater.

The neighbouring dwelling to the north has a door opening on the southern side of the dwelling as oppose to a window, meaning there is a separation distance between the development and any habitable window, therefore no adverse impact on residential amenity is expected in this respect.

Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy states that all development must '*provide adequate day lighting*' and '*consider the density, layout and relationship between buildings*' however given the loss of natural light and sense of enclosure that would likely be experienced by the adjacent neighbouring resident as a result of the proposed works, it is considered that the proposal would be an unacceptable addition to the existing pattern of development and contrary to the aims of the above policy.

Visual Amenity/External Appearance:

Ribble Valley Core Strategy Policy DMG1 states that "development should be sympathetic to existing and proposed land uses in terms of its size, intensity and nature". Furthermore, emphasis is placed on visual appearance and the relationship to surroundings.

As the application site lies within the Forest of Bowland National Landscape, consideration must be given to the effect of the proposal on the surrounding natural landscape. Key Statement EN2 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy states that: "*The Council will expect development to be in keeping with the character of the landscape, reflecting local distinctiveness, vernacular style, scale, style, features and building materials.*"

The application site is situated within the boundaries of the Grindleton Conservation Area, and so consideration must be given towards the impact the proposal will have on the historic character of the surrounding area. With reference to making decisions on applications for development situated within a conservation area, Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that: "*...special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.*"

The Ribble Valley Borough Council Core Strategy also emphasizes the importance that all development within a Conservation Area should "*respect and safeguard the character, appearance and significance of the area*".

The proposed extension is located at the rear of the application dwelling and is therefore largely out of sight from within the public realm.

In respect to footprint, when assessed against the application dwelling, the extension is considered relative and will not read as an overbearing or prominent addition to the dwelling. The extension will be faced in render with uPVC windows and doors. This is consistent with materials found in the vicinity and will therefore integrate sufficiently into the area.

As such, the proposal does not raise any significant concerns from a visual perspective, nor would it be of harm to the wider conservation area.

Highways and Parking:

No highways safety or amenity concerns identified.

Landscape/Ecology:

A preliminary bat roost assessment was conducted at the application site on 01.05.2025. The survey concluded that no evidence of bats was recorded, and the building offers negligible roosting potential.

Observations/Consideration of Matters Raised/Conclusion:

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

RECOMMENDATION:	
------------------------	--

That planning consent be refused for the following reason(s).

- | | |
|------------|---|
| 01: | The proposal is considered to be in conflict with policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy in as much that the proposed extension, by virtue of its scale, proximity and orientation, would result in an unacceptable overbearing impact upon the residential amenities of the occupiers residing at the property immediately to the south also leading to an unacceptable loss of natural light. |
|------------|---|