


Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.								
Signed:	Officer:	LW	Date:	27/08/25	Manager:	KH	Date:	27/08/25

Application Ref:	3/2025/0275			 Ribble Valley Borough Council www.ribblevalley.gov.uk
Date Inspected:	12/08/25	Site Notice:	N/A	
Officer:	LW			
DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:				APPROVAL

Development Description:	Proposed conservatory to side.
Site Address/Location:	Clementina, Barker Lane, Mellor, BB2 7EE.

CONSULTATIONS:	Parish/Town Council
A consultation response from Mellor Parish Council was received on 24 th July 2025 raising no objections to the proposal.	

CONSULTATIONS:	Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies
LCC Highways:	N/A
CONSULTATIONS:	Additional Representations.
No representations received.	

RELEVANT POLICIES AND SITE PLANNING HISTORY:
Ribble Valley Core Strategy: Key Statement DS1: Development Strategy Key Statement DS2: Sustainable Development Key Statement EN1: Green Belt Policy DMG1: General Considerations Policy DMG2: Strategic Considerations Policy DME3: Site and Species Protection and Conservation Policy DMH5: Residential and Curtilage Extensions National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
Relevant Planning History: 3/2015/0957: Proposed front conservatory (Approved).

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:
Site Description and Surrounding Area: The application relates to a detached bungalow known as Clementina, accessed off Barker Lane, Mellor. The property comprises render and facing brickwork to the external elevations along with white uPVC windows, and benefits from 2no. existing conservatories, as well as a porch, pitched-roof extension and

detached garage. The property is located outside of any defined settlement area and on land designated as Green Belt. That aside, the dwelling benefits from no other designations or constraints.

Proposed Development for which consent is sought:

Consent is sought for the construction of a proposed conservatory to the south-eastern facing front elevation of the property.

The conservatory would measure 3m by 3m with a maximum height of 3.4m and would be constructed from brickwork, white uPVC windows and a polycarbonate roof.

Principle of Development:

The application site lies within the designated Green Belt and therefore Key Statement EN1 of the Core Strategy and National Green Belt policy contained within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is engaged.

The NPPF states that there is a general presumption against inappropriate development in the Green Belt and advises that when considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt.

As set out in the NPPF and Key Statement EN1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy, the essential characteristic of the Green Belt is its openness. NPPF paragraph 154 states that the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. However, the extension or alteration of a building that does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building is considered an exception where they preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land in Green Belt. Development which is harmful to the Green Belt should only be permitted in 'very special circumstances' and these will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

There are no specific definitions within the NPPF or Ribble Valley Core Strategy in relation to what constitutes 'disproportionate', however the generally accepted approach is for an assessment of the increased volume that the development would create above that of the original building.

The NPPF defines 'original building' as 'a building as it existed on 1 July 1948 or, if constructed after 1 July 1948, as it was built originally'. Therefore, any extensions built since 1948 cannot be used to justify additional floor space or volume. Furthermore, in terms of calculating the size of the 'original building', outbuildings are generally not included.

Historic planning applications and land maps appear to indicate that the original built form of the building included a modest bungalow property, with previous planning consent 3/2015/0957 allowing for the construction of the existing conservatory to the south-eastern front elevation of the dwellinghouse. The existing conservatory and porch to the north-western rear elevation, as well as the pitched roof element to the south-western side elevation, which is stepped down from the main ridgeline, also appear to be later additions to the original built form. However, there does not appear to be any planning history for these structures and therefore it is assumed that they have been built without formal planning consent.

Notwithstanding the above, volume calculations have been submitted in support of the application, taking account of the original building, the existing extensions and the proposal. These calculations indicate a 52% increase in cubic volume from original to existing, with the proposed extension resulting in a further 8% increase. This equates to a total increase in cubic volume from the proposal and aforementioned historic additions of 60%. With the above in mind, it is considered that the proposed works would result in a disproportionate addition to the original building in as much that the cumulative cubic volume increase of the additions would be significant in relation to the original built form.

Furthermore, there is no definition of openness in the NPPF but, in the Green Belt context, it is generally held to refer to freedom from, or the absence of, development. The degree of harm to openness is normally reliant on a spatial judgement, however, visual considerations can also be relevant. In this instance, the proposed development would result in an extension of the footprint of built form which would be visible from the public highway of Barker Lane, thus resulting in a clear impact upon the openness of the Green Belt.

Taking account of the above, it is considered that the proposed development would result in Green Belt harm contrary to the guidance set out in Paragraph 154 of the NPPF and Key Statement EN1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy. Furthermore, no very special circumstances have been demonstrated which would outweigh this harm.

Impact Upon Residential Amenity:

It is not considered that the proposed development would result in any measurable undue harm upon any nearby residential receptors. The openings proposed to the south-eastern and south-western elevations would provide views solely towards the private amenity space associated within the application property, while the openings to the north-eastern elevation would remain approximately 20m from the residential property at Rhyddyn Cottage and would provide similar views to those afforded by the existing openings featured to the north-eastern elevation of the main property. In this respect, it is not anticipated that the proposed development would result in any new opportunities for direct overlooking or loss of privacy. Furthermore, given the separation distance between the proposed development and neighbouring properties, it is not considered that any adverse harm by way of overshadowing, loss of outlook or daylight would be resultant.

Visual Amenity/External Appearance:

The proposal would be sited towards the south-eastern corner of the property and would therefore be visible from the public highway of Barker Lane. Despite this, the proposal would not appear an anomalous or discordant addition to the proposal site or surrounding area. The conservatory would be relatively modest in design and would be finished in external facing materials to match the existing conservatories featured to the front and rear of the property. Accordingly, the proposal is considered acceptable with respect to visual amenity and external appearance.

Highways and Parking:

No highway related impacts have been identified with respect to the proposal.

Landscape/Ecology:

A Preliminary Roost Assessment has been submitted with the application dated July 2025. The report concludes that no bats or signs of the presence of bats were found during the internal and external inspection of the house and given the location and the absence of potential roost features, the house is considered to have no suitability for bats. As such, the proposal to construct a conservatory is not expected to have any negative impact upon bats or their roosts and no further survey work or mitigation is considered necessary.

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.

RECOMMENDATION:	That planning consent be refused for the following reason:
01:	The proposed development would result in a disproportionate addition to the original property in as much that the cumulative volume increase of the previous extensions and current proposal would be significant in relation to the original property. The proposal is therefore considered to cause harm to the openness of the Green Belt contrary to the provisions of Key Statement EN1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy (2008-2028) and Section 13 of the National Planning Policy Framework which attaches substantial weight to Green Belt harm.