

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

|         |          |    |       |            |          |    |       |        |
|---------|----------|----|-------|------------|----------|----|-------|--------|
| Signed: | Officer: | EP | Date: | 31/07/2025 | Manager: | LH | Date: | 1/8/25 |
|---------|----------|----|-------|------------|----------|----|-------|--------|

|                                    |            |  |                     |   |
|------------------------------------|------------|--|---------------------|---|
| <b>Application Ref:</b>            | 2025/0339  |  |                     | <br><b>Ribble Valley<br/>Borough Council</b><br><a href="http://www.ribblevalley.gov.uk">www.ribblevalley.gov.uk</a> |
| <b>Date Inspected:</b>             | 05/06/2025 |  | <b>Site Notice:</b> | 05/06/2025  |
| <b>Officer:</b>                    | EP         |  |                     |   |
| <b>DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:</b> |            |  |                     | <b>REFUSAL</b>  |

|                                 |  |
|---------------------------------|--|
| <b>Development Description:</b> | Proposed two-storey extension to side with integral balcony. |
| <b>Site Address/Location:</b>   | Holly House, 8 Station Road, Rimington BB7 4DR.              |

|                              |                     |
|------------------------------|---------------------|
| <b>CONSULTATIONS:</b>        | Parish/Town Council |
| <b>No comments received.</b> |                     |

|                              |                                       |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <b>CONSULTATIONS:</b>        | Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies |
| <b>LCC Highways:</b>         | N/A                                   |
|                              |                                       |
| <b>CONSULTATIONS:</b>        | Additional Representations.           |
| <b>No comments received.</b> |                                       |

**RELEVANT POLICIES AND SITE PLANNING HISTORY:**

**Ribble Valley Core Strategy:**

Key Statement DS1: Development Strategy  
 Key Statement DS2: Sustainable Development

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

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

**Relevant Planning History:**

3/2025/0052: Proposed first floor extension above existing lean-to extension featuring overhang and integral balcony (refused).

**ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:**

**Site Description and Surrounding Area:**

The application relates to a detached dwelling within the defined settlement limits of Rimington. The application site is not on any designated land and the surrounding area is predominantly residential in nature.

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

Notwithstanding the description of development on the application form, based on the plans submitted consent is sought for the construction of a first-floor extension above the existing lean-to on the northern side of the dwelling. The extension will accommodate an additional bedroom with ensuite and would also benefit from an integral balcony.

For clarity, the original submission featured a first-floor extension that was entirely flush with the existing building line. In order to try and achieve a more accepted scheme that was not overly dominant, it was suggested by the council that the proposal be amended. The amendment suggested was a reduction in the width of the extension, to create a 'set-in' from the existing side elevation of the outrigger and allowing some of the existing roof slope to be visible. Subsequently reducing the overall bulk and massing. This was suggested as it was understood that the entire principal elevation could not be set back given the applicants intention to keep the existing ground floor outrigger in place and build above. However, following discussion with the agent, the amendment submitted instead features a set-back at the front and rear elevations of the extension. As per the agent's instruction, this is the scheme that is being assessed (amended plan received 31/07/2025).

#### **Impact Upon Residential Amenity:**

The application dwelling has two immediately adjacent neighbours, known as No.2 Back Lane and No.6 Station Road. The proposed development is located to the northern side of the dwelling, away from both neighbouring receptors. As such, no adverse impact is expected in respect to loss of light or any sense of overbearing impact.

The land immediately opposite the proposed balcony consists of open fields and as such no loss of privacy would be created resultant. The balcony is recessed into the roof providing screening to either side. Therefore, no adverse impact on residential amenity would arise resultant of the development proposed.

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

The application dwelling is located in a visually prominent position being on a corner plot at the junction of Station Road with Back Lane. In addition to the prominent position, the dwelling sits on a higher ground level than the highway, increasing its visual prominence. As such, careful consideration must be given into the impact of the proposal on the character of the area.

Rimington is made up primarily of character properties comprising natural stone, timber windows and simple, linear formations. The application dwelling and its immediate neighbours have been built in a traditional manor to correlate with the surrounding development.

Policy DMG1 of the RVCS states that development must

- 1. Be of a high standard of building design which considers the 8 building in context principles (from the cabc/English heritage building on 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.*

The proposed first floor balcony extension would be constructed in stone to match the existing dwelling with a slate roof profile. Given the materials are consistent with the existing dwelling the proposal would integrate sufficiently in this respect. However, the proposed window/glazing arrangement is anomalous and unbalanced. The proposed principal elevation at first-floor level is blank and lacks any architectural interest. Given the prominence of this elevation and when viewed in relation to remainder of the fenestration, it reads as incongruous. In contrast to this, the proposed side elevation features several large sections of

glazing and a glazed balcony (in addition to rooflights) is somewhat overdeveloped, in contrast with the remainder of the dwelling but particularly to the proposed rear and principal extension elevations. It is therefore considered that the glazing arrangement is unbalanced of harm to the character of the dwelling. The visual harm would be further exacerbated by virtue of the first-floor extensions position on the northern elevation of the dwelling, immediately adjacent to the highway.

The proposed first-floor extension will extend the entire width of the existing ground-floor outrigger and will feature a minor set-back from the rear and principal elevations of 0.16m. Whilst a set-back does generally help in reducing the overall bulk and massing of an extension, as well as helping to maintain subservience to the host dwelling, in this instance the set back is not substantial enough to achieve this. The proposed extension therefore results in the creation of a dominant and disproportionate addition to the property. Furthermore, given the proposal is only set back at first floor, with the ground floor elevations remaining flush with the existing building line, it results in the first-floor extension failing to appear cohesive with the existing dwelling. This results in a disproportionate form of development that will create imbalance. Upon the approach from the north of Station Road, the extension would host a dominant position and given the higher ground level in which the dwelling sits, would be the most visible feature upon said approach. The development would fail to take a subservient position to the application dwelling resultant.

As such, based on the above observations, the proposed development will have an unacceptable impact on the visual amenities of the area and the character of the application dwelling, by virtue of an anomalous and prominent feature to the northern elevation. This is contrary to Policies DMG1 and DMH5 of the RVCS.

#### **Highways and Parking:**

No highways implications identified.

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

##### Bats.

A preliminary bat roost assessment was conducted at the application site on 31.01.2025. The survey concluded that no evidence of bats was recorded, and the building itself offers negligible roosting potential. As such, no further survey work required.

##### BNG.

The development is exempt from having to achieve the mandatory Biodiversity Net Gain requirement 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 that the application is recommended for refusal.

#### **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

|            |   |
|------------|---|
| <b>01:</b> | The proposed development will have an unacceptable impact on the visual amenities of the area and the character of the application dwelling, by virtue of an anomalous and prominent feature being introduced to the northern elevation. This is contrary to Policies DMG1 and DMH5 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy. |
|------------|---|