


Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.

Signed:	Officer:	MC	Date:	19/06/2025	Manager:	LH	Date:	23/6/25
----------------	-----------------	-----------	--------------	-------------------	-----------------	-----------	--------------	----------------

Application Ref:	3/2025/0324			 Ribble Valley Borough Council <hr/> www.ribblevalley.gov.uk
Date Inspected:	13/05/2025	Site Notice:	28/05/2025	
Officer:	MC			
DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:				APPROVAL

Development Description:	Planning Permission for replacement of rear porch, external steps and railings.
Site Address/Location:	12 Higher Road Longridge PR3 3SX

CONSULTATIONS:	Parish/Town Council
No response received.	

CONSULTATIONS:	Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies
LCC Highways:	Effect on the highway network would be negligible.
CONSULTATIONS:	Additional Representations.
None received.	

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

Key Statement DS1 – Development Strategy
Key Statement DS2 – Sustainable Development
Key Statement EN5 – Heritage Assets

Policy DMG1 – General Considerations
Policy DMG2 – Strategic Considerations
Policy DME4 – Protecting Heritage Assets
Policy DMH5 – Residential and Curtilage Extensions

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

Longridge Neighbourhood Development Plan:

Policy LNDP4 – Conserving and Enhancing Our Designated Heritage Assets
Policy LNDP3 – Design Principles

Relevant Planning History:**3/2025/0274**

Listed Building Consent for replacement of rear porch, external steps and railings.
Pending Consideration

3/2024/0080

Listed Building Consent for replacement of all windows (mix of timber and UPVC top-opening) with timber sliding-sash windows, plus one small flush timber casement window to rear.

Approved with Conditions

3/2011/0487

Application to discharge condition no. 2 (colour of paint for door and frame) of planning consent 3/2011/0182P.

Approved

3/2011/0182

Replacement of rotten door frame with wooden painted door frame. Replacement of front door with wooden panelled door (and small viewing glazed panel). Door and frame to be finished in a cream Farrow & Ball paint (Listed Building Consent).

Approved with Conditions

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

The site is occupied by a Grade II Listed Building located within the settlement of Longridge and within the Longridge Conservation Area. The building comprises a two-storey terraced dwelling with an existing porch to the rear of the site. Due to the land level changes, the rear of the building is raised, with steps down to the lower-level garden.

The Listing is as follows:

6-44, HIGHER ROAD

“Row of houses, begun in 1793. Squared coursed sandstone with slate roof and brick stacks, except that on the gable (left-hand) wall of No. 44. 2 storeys-with cellars entered at lower ground level to the rear. Windows have plain reveals and projecting stone sills, with modern windows. Each house is of one bay, with the doors of adjacent houses paired, with a third door, leading through a tunnel to the yard, between them. The doorways have plain stone surrounds. Some of the houses now have an extra window on the 1st floor over the door. Nos. 6, 8 and 44 have stone gutter brackets. A keyed joint between No. 24 and 26 indicates a break in construction. Built by the Longridge Building Society, one of the earliest terminating building societies in the country, and used as an example by Price, Seymour J., Building Societies, their Origin and History, Cambridge, 1958, pp 32-44.”

The site is also located within the adopted Longridge Neighbourhood Development Plan Area.

Proposed Development for which consent is sought:

The proposal is for the replacement of the existing timber lean-to porch and the replacement of the existing timber platform and steps down to the garden. The proposed rear extension would be similar in size, scale and appearance to the existing and would extend to a depth of approximately 2.1 metres, have a width of approximately 2.3 metres and would a total height from the lower ground level of 4.4 metres. When measured from the floor level immediately adjacent to the dwelling the extension would have an eaves height of approximately 2 metres and a total height of approximately 2.9 metres. The overall design would match the existing, in a similar position and would have black timber boarding to the lower level and black timber frames (as confirmed by email from the agent on 23/05/2025) with glazing to the walls and roof. In addition, the existing timber rail to the stair and platform area would be replaced with a steel railing to replicate castings and painted black. This would be similar in height to the existing.

Principle of Development:

12 Higher Road is Grade II listed and therefore the principle of the development is dependent upon the level of harm to the significance of the listed building and whether the proposal would conserve the character and appearance of the Longridge Conservation Area, together with compliance with policy.

Impact upon Designated Heritage Assets:

The building is Grade II listed and as such, in assessing the proposal, regard must be given to the statutory duties imposed on the authority in respect of the preservation and enhancement of such assets. In this respect, at a local level, Key Statement EN5 and Policy DME4 are primarily, but not solely, engaged for the purposes of assessing likely impacts upon designated heritage assets resultant from the proposed development.

Key Statement EN5 states that:

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

This will be achieved through:

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

With Policy DME4 stating, in respect of development within conservation areas or those affecting the conservation areas, listed buildings or their setting, that development will be assessed on the following basis:

1: CONSERVATION AREAS

Proposals within, or affecting views into and out of, or affecting the setting of a conservation area will be required to conserve and where appropriate enhance its character and appearance and those elements which contribute towards its significance.

This should include considerations as to whether it conserves and enhances the special architectural and historic character of the area as set out in the relevant conservation area appraisal. Development which makes a positive contribution and conserves and enhances the character, appearance and significance of the area in terms of its location, scale, size, design and materials and existing buildings, structures, trees and open spaces will be supported.

In the conservation areas there will be a presumption in favour of the conservation and enhancement of elements that make a positive contribution to the character or appearance of the conservation area.

2: LISTED BUILDINGS AND OTHER BUILDINGS OF SIGNIFICANT HERITAGE INTEREST

Alterations or extensions to listed buildings or buildings of local heritage interest, or development proposals on sites within their setting which cause harm to the significance of the heritage asset will not be supported. Any proposals involving the demolition or loss of important historic fabric from listed buildings will be refused unless it can be demonstrated that exceptional circumstances exist.

Policy LNDP4 of the adopted Longridge Neighbourhood Development Plan also states that:

All of the town's heritage assets, including the three Conservation Areas, will be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance.

Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990:

Given the proposal relates to a Grade II Designated Heritage Asset, special regard must also be given to the statutory duties imposed on the authority, pursuant to national legislation, particularly in respect of the preservation and enhancement of such assets.

The principle statutory duty under the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended by s.58B (1) of Levelling-up and Regeneration Act 2023) is to preserve or enhance the special character of heritage assets, including their setting. As such, in determining applications that affect designated heritage assets, the authority must consider the duties contained within the principle Act which states the following;

Listed buildings - Section 16 (2) (as amended by s.58B of Levelling-up and Regeneration Act 2023):

In considering whether to grant listed building consent for any works to a listed building the local planning authority shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the building. Under s.58B (2) this includes preserving or enhancing any feature, quality or characteristic of the asset or setting that contributes to the significance of the asset.

National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024):

The National planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out further duties in respect of determining proposals that affect heritage assets stating that *'in determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation'*.

The Framework sets out further duties in respect of considering potential impacts upon designated heritage assets with Paragraphs 207 – 221 reading as follows:

212: When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.

213: Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of:

- a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional;
- b) assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, registered battlefields, grade I and II* listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional.

214: Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to (or total loss of significance of) a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or total loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss, or all of the following apply:

- a) the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site; and
- b) no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation; and
- c) conservation by grant-funding or some form of not for profit, charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and
- d) the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use.

215: Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.

216: The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

217: Local planning authorities should not permit the loss of the whole or part of a heritage asset without taking all reasonable steps to ensure the new development will proceed after the loss has occurred.

218: Local planning authorities should require developers to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage assets to be lost (wholly or in part) in a manner proportionate to their importance and the impact, and to make this evidence (and any archive generated) publicly accessible. However, the ability to record evidence of our past should not be a factor in deciding whether such loss should be permitted.

219: Local planning authorities should look for opportunities for new development within Conservation Areas and World Heritage Sites, and within the setting of heritage assets, to enhance or better reveal their significance. Proposals that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to the asset (or which better reveal its significance) should be treated favourably.

220: Not all elements of a Conservation Area or World Heritage Site will necessarily contribute to its significance. Loss of a building (or other element) which makes a positive contribution to the significance of the Conservation Area or World Heritage Site should be treated either as substantial harm under paragraph 207 or less than substantial harm under paragraph 208, as appropriate, taking into account the relative significance of the element affected and its contribution to the significance of the Conservation Area or World Heritage Site as a whole.

221: Local planning authorities should assess whether the benefits of a proposal for enabling development, which would otherwise conflict with planning policies but which would secure the future conservation of a heritage asset, outweigh the disbenefits of departing from those policies.

Assessment of Impacts:

Firstly, turning to the impact on the Longridge Conservation Area, the new porch to the rear would be similar in size, scale and design to the existing structure and would be constructed of appropriate materials. The building would not be highly visible from any public viewpoints and as such, it is considered that the character and appearance of the Longridge Conservation Area would be preserved in accordance with Key Statement EN5 and Policy DME4 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy, as well as Policy LNDP4 of the adopted Longridge Neighbourhood Development Plan.

Turning to the impact on the listed building and its setting, the Heritage and Conservation Officer has provided comments on the scheme. They note that the proposal would not alter the rear doorway or external fabric of the property and there is no evidence to contradict the view that an existing porch structure has existed for some time and that the terrace of properties was listed with some sort of porch structure in place.

They do not feel the existing structure, including the steps are of any value and do not contribute to the significance of the listed terrace and raise no fundamental concerns over its removal and replacement. The Heritage and Conservation Officer considers the design of the replacement structure is more sympathetic to the appearance of the rear of the historic building and does not affect how the listed building or those cottages which adjoin it within the row are viewed. The work would be confined to the property and cannot be seen from the street and will not impact on any of the key features that contribute to the listed building's significance.

As such, it is considered that the proposal would have a neutral impact on the significance of the listed building and concluded that the proposal complies with the objectives contained in Chapter 16 of the NPPF, Key Statement EN5 and Policy DME4 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and Policy LNDP4 of the adopted Longridge Neighbourhood Development Plan.

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'*

Policy LNDP3 of the Longridge Neighbourhood Plan also states that proposals should:

Have no significant adverse impact on residential amenity for existing and future residents;

The existing rear porch would be similar in size and would be in the same location as the existing porch. As such, the proposal would have no greater impact by way of loss of light, overshadowing or overbearing impact when compared to the existing and on balance, would be acceptable on amenity grounds.

The applicant has installed a netting to prevent any direct overlooking into the primary living accommodation of the adjoining property. The submitted plans indicate that the windows which adjoins number 14 would be fitted with an internal film with an etched finish, however the Council raise concerns that as this would be installed to an internal window, there would not be any control over whether this is fully installed. Whilst the garden is already somewhat overlooked, due to rear extension being raised in relation to the neighbours' rear garden, it would result in the occupiers gaining a direct view down into the primary living accommodation of no. 14. As such, notwithstanding the details outlined on the approved plans, it is recommended that the windows are obscure glazed and secured by condition to prevent any detrimental overlooking into the neighbouring property.

Due to the presence of an existing single storey rear extension at no. 10, it is not considered that the proposal would result in any greater overlooking to the occupiers of no. 10 than the existing level.

As such, the proposal accords with Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and Policy LNDP3 of the adopted Longridge Neighbourhood Plan.

Visual Amenity/External Appearance:

Policy LNDP3 of the adopted Longridge Neighbourhood Plan states that:

All new development proposals will only be supported when they are of good design that responds positively to the local character and distinctiveness of the surroundings.

In addition, Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy states that development must '*not adversely affect the amenities of the surrounding area*' and '*consider the density, layout and relationship between buildings, which is of major importance*'.

Paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that planning decisions should ensure that development:

- a) will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development;
- b) are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping;
- c) are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities)

Due to the land level changes at the site, the existing rear porch appears fairly tall in relation to the rear of the building. Whilst the replacement extension would be of a similar height, it would be modest in footprint and would be constructed of appropriate materials. The introduction of steel railings painted black is also considered to be acceptable and would not be detrimental to the character and appearance of the dwelling.

As such, given the presence of the existing extension, the appearance of the new extension would be neutral and the proposal is considered to accord with Policy LNDP3 of the Longridge Neighbourhood Development Plan, Policies DMG1 and DMH5 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Highways:

The proposal is not considered to impact on existing parking arrangements or affect highway safety.

Landscape/Ecology:

With regards to biodiversity net-gain, the development is exempt from having to achieve the mandatory Biodiversity Net Gain requirement as it is a householder application.

RECOMMENDATION:

That Planning Permission be granted approved subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions.