


Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.

Signed:	Officer:	EP	Date:	25/07/2025	Manager:	SK	Date:	25.7.25
----------------	-----------------	-----------	--------------	-------------------	-----------------	-----------	--------------	----------------

Application Ref:	2025/0428			 <div>Ribble Valley Borough Council</div> <div>www.ribblevalley.gov.uk</div>
Date Inspected:	11/07/2025	Site Notice:	19/06/2025	
Officer:	EP			
DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:				APPROVAL

Development Description:	Proposed first floor extension and rendering.
Site Address/Location:	Riverside Lodge Sawley Old Brow Sawley BB7 4LF

CONSULTATIONS:	Parish/Town Council
No comments received.	

CONSULTATIONS:	Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies
LCC Highways:	No objection.

CONSULTATIONS:	Additional Representations.
<p>One representation has been received raising the following concerns</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Loss of privacy- Loss of light to habitable windows- Sense of overbearing- Loss of outlook.- Significant change to the appearance of the property.- Concerns over choice of materials.- Unsympathetic design.- The property cannot be considered sustainable.- Queries over the need for an additional bedroom/extension. <p>The materials planning considerations have been addressed in the following report.</p>	

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 DME2: Landscape & Townscape Protection
Policy DME4: Protecting Heritage Assets

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

Relevant Planning History:

2021/01065: Proposed car port and storeroom to existing greenhouse and potting shed.

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

The application relates to a detached dwelling in Sawley accessed via a private track leading off Sawley Old Brow. The surrounding area is predominately residential in nature, being typified of varying styles of property. The application site itself falls within Sawley Conservation area and within the designated National Landscape.

Proposed Development for which consent is sought:

Consent is sought for the construction of a first-floor extension to create an additional bedroom and bathroom. The extension will sit above an existing single storey outrigger which currently features a sloping roof form.

Impact upon Character/appearance of Conservations Area (Where Applicable):

The application property lies within the Sawley Conservation Area. With reference to making decisions on applications for development in Conservation Areas, 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."

This guidance is reiterated in Key Statement EN5 of the Ribble Borough Valley Core Strategy which stipulates that all development proposals should respect and safeguard the character, appearance and significance of all Conservation Areas.

In addition, Policy DME4 of the Core Strategy states that *'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'*.

The Sawley Conservation Area Appraisal (2005) identifies the *'continuing loss of original architectural details and use of inappropriate modern materials or details'* as being the primary threat to the Sawley Conservation Area.

The proposed first floor extension is located to the principal elevation of the dwelling and as such hosts a somewhat visible position from within the public realm. That being said, the property is located down a private access road which serves just a small cluster of dwellings. The existing dwelling benefits from a forward projecting outrigger with a cat slide roof slope. The intension is to remove the cat slide roof and erect a first-floor extension with a pitched roof. Whilst the principal elevation will be altered substantially through the erection of the extension, it is not considered that the proposal will read as out of character within the conservation area. The application dwelling itself is a relatively new dwelling and as such it is not considered to have any significant heritage contribution the conservation area. The surrounding area is typified of varying styles of property, with no defined sense of uniformity amongst them. As such, it is not considered that the proposed alteration would result in an incongruous addition to the conservation area. Furthermore, the front elevation of the dwelling is in a relatively isolated part of the conversation area and would not be afforded prominent views.

In respect to materials, the original scheme proposed the entire dwelling would be faced in render. Following discussion, the amount of render has been reduced to retain some of the original brickwork. As a result, the building will not appear overly contemporary within the conservation area. In addition, there are a number of properties within the vicinity of the dwelling that are faced in similar render. It's also important to recognise that the application dwelling is of more modern construction, and therefore the existing materials, namely uPVC windows and red facing brickwork, are more contemporary in nature. As such, it is not considered the development will be of harm to the visual amenities of the conservation area.

Impact Upon Residential Amenity:

The proposed extension is located to the Northeastern elevation of the dwelling, where the neighbouring property, Park House, is located. The proposed first-floor extension is an infill extension and will sit on the same footprint as the existing dwelling. As such, there is only a small increase in built form proposed. In respect to impact on habitable windows, the neighbouring dwelling to the northeast is approximately 12m from the proposed development. This is a sufficient distance to mitigate any significant loss of light to said windows.

It is recognised that there would likely be a small degree of overbearing impact to a small section of neighbouring private amenity space created resultant of the development. However, given the modest nature of the extension, it is not considered that this impact would be significant enough to warrant refusal in this instance. Particularly taking into consideration the south westerly orientation of the effected section of neighbouring garden and the position of the existing dwelling. There may be a slight loss of light to this section of neighbouring garden in the evening, however, given the position of the application dwelling it is likely a similar impact already exists. The hipped roof of the extension will aid in softening this impact, given it slopes downward from the ridge reducing the amount of solid built form.

It is recognised that concerns have been received in respect to loss of outlook. Loss of outlook/view is not a material planning consideration and therefore there are no ground for refusal on this basis. Nonetheless, given the extension is to be located on the existing footprint of the dwelling, any loss of outlook would be marginal.

The original plans demonstrate a number of trees along the adjoining shared boundary with Park House with the supporting statement suggesting these trees would provide a level of screening. However, a recent tree works application to remove the trees was approved and it was observed on the site visit that works for this had commenced. As such, amended plans were sought removing the trees. However, it is not considered that the existence of these trees would have provided a beneficial level of screening of the development, given the extension is to be sited in front of the previous treeline. This does therefore not have any bearing on the application as it is not considered the trees would have provided any reliable mitigation.

There is one new window opening proposed on the side elevation of the extension at first floor which faces the neighbouring property to the Northeast. This window will serve a bathroom and therefore it is expected that it would be fitted with obscure glazing. However, the plans do not stipulate this, so an appropriate condition will be placed on the decision notice to secure this, in the interest of mitigating any potential for overlooking.

In respect to the window opening proposed on the principal elevation of the dwelling, this will face southwest towards the neighbouring property The Cedars. There is a sufficient distance of in excess of 21 metres, which is sufficient to mitigate any loss of privacy or overlooking for this neighbour. In regard to the neighbouring Park House, the proposed window opening does not directly face the neighbouring dwelling or its curtilage. Whilst there may be a slight perception for sideways overlooking created, it is not to a degree that would justify refusal.

As such, whilst there may be a small sense of overbearing created for neighbouring receptors, it is not significant enough to warrant refusal in this instance, taking into consideration the modest nature of the development being an infill extension, paired with the position of the existing dwellings.

Visual Amenity/External Appearance:

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 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.*

The proposed first floor extension will have an eaves and ridge height of 5.1m by 7.5m respectively falling below the height of the existing ridge. As a result, the extension will not be an overly dominant addition to the property and will remain somewhat subservient, despite its forward projection.

The existing cat slide roof is not considered to provide any significant architectural interest to the property and therefore the removal of this and replacement with a pitched roof is not of detriment to the visual appearance of the property.

The existing outrigger is a converted garage in which the garage door opening has been replaced with patio doors. This does look somewhat anomalous on the principal elevation of the dwelling. The proposed scheme aims to remove the existing patio doors and replace them with a standard sized window opening. This will result in the fenestration reading as more cohesive and becoming consistent with a typical principal elevation.

Highways and Parking:

LCC Highways were consulted in relation to the proposal and raise no objection from a highway safety/amenity perspective.

Landscape/Ecology:

A preliminary bat roost assessment was conducted at the application site on the 14th May 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 approval.

RECOMMENDATION:

That planning consent be granted subject to the imposition of conditions.