


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

<b>Signed:</b>	<b>Officer:</b>	<b>LW</b>	<b>Date:</b>		<b>Manager:</b>	<b>KH</b>	<b>Date:</b>	<b>19/09/25</b>
----------------	-----------------	-----------	--------------	--	-----------------	-----------	--------------	-----------------

<b>Application Ref:</b>	3/2025/0549			 <b>Ribble Valley Borough Council</b> <a href="http://www.ribblevalley.gov.uk">www.ribblevalley.gov.uk</a>				
<b>Date Inspected:</b>	02/09/25	<b>Site Notice:</b>	N/A					
<b>Officer:</b>	LW							
<b>DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:</b>					<b>APPROVAL</b>			

<b>Development Description:</b>	Proposed extension and redevelopment of existing house including two-storey side extension, single storey rear extension with external flue and new front porch.
<b>Site Address/Location:</b>	6 Brookside, Langho, BB6 8AP.

<b>CONSULTATIONS:</b>	<b>Parish/Town Council</b>
No comments received with respect to the proposed development.	

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

<b>CONSULTATIONS:</b>	<b>Additional Representations.</b>
No representations have been received.	

**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 DMG3: Transport & Mobility  
Policy DME3: Site and Species Protection and Conservation  
Policy DMH5: Residential and Curtilage Extensions

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

**Relevant Planning History:**

3/1999/0310: Change of use of agricultural land to gardens (up to 10m fence erected by forestry agency) (Refused).

**ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:**

**Site Description and Surrounding Area:**

The application relates to a two-storey semi-detached dwellinghouse at No.6 Brookside. The property comprises render, concrete roof tiles and uPVC windows and doors and benefits from an existing single storey side extension and rear conservatory. The site to which the proposal relates is located within the defined settlement area of Brockhall and the property benefits from no other designations or constraints.

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

Consent is sought for the demolition of the existing single storey side extension and rear conservatory and construction of a two-storey side extension, single storey rear extension and new front porch.

The proposed two-storey extension would project 3.8m from the north-western side elevation of the application property with a depth of 7.4m. A pitched roof form would be incorporated measuring 4.9m to the eaves and 7.6m to the ridge. To the front elevation 2no. windows would be featured, along with a personnel door and ground floor window to the north-western elevation and 1no. first floor window to the rear elevation.

The proposed single storey extension would have a rearward projection of 3.3m and width of 10.6m. A lean-to roof form would be featured with a maximum height of 3.2m and to the rear elevation, a set of sliding doors and 1no. window would be included. The proposal would also incorporate 4no. rooflights and an external flue measuring 1.5m in height.

The proposed pitched-roof front porch would measure approximately 1.2m by 2.2m with an eaves and ridge height of 2.2m and 3.2m.

With respect to materiality, the proposal would be finished in render, concrete roof tiles and uPVC windows and doors.

**Principle of Development:**

The proposal relates to a domestic extension and alterations to an established residential property and is therefore acceptable in principle subject to an assessment of the material planning considerations.

**Impact Upon Residential Amenity:**

The openings proposed to the front and rear of the two-storey extension would provide similar views to those afforded by the existing window configuration featured to the main dwellinghouse, while the openings to the north-western side elevation would not have a direct interface with any habitable room windows featured to the gable elevation of the adjacent residential property at No.7 Brookside. With respect to the single storey rear extension, the proposed openings would provide views primarily towards the rear garden of the application property and land which borders the site to the rear. As such, no new opportunities for direct overlooking or loss of privacy are anticipated as a result of the works proposed.

Furthermore, it is not anticipated that the proposed development would result in any significant undue harm upon neighbouring residential receptors by way of overshadowing, loss of outlook or daylight. No.7 Brookside does not benefit from any existing window openings to its south-eastern gable elevation, facing the proposal site, and given the orientation and position of the application property in relation to this adjacent residential property, it is not anticipated that the proposed rear extension would result in any measurable loss of light or overbearing impact upon the openings featured to the rear of No.7 Brookside. With respect to No.5 Brookside, the proposed extension would be sited directly adjacent to the common boundary and the existing neighbouring conservatory. The proposal would therefore result in some loss of light to this conservatory; however, given the northerly siting of the extension and the extent of glazing featured to the other elevations of the conservatory, it is not considered that the development would

result in any significant detrimental impact upon the residents of No.5 Brookside that would warrant the refusal to grant planning permission.

The installation of the external flue would also fall to be permitted development and therefore any resultant impact upon surrounding residential receptors is considered acceptable under this fall-back position.

In view of the above, the proposed works are considered acceptable with respect to impact upon residential amenity.

**Visual Amenity/External Appearance:**

The application property is situated in a prominent location and therefore the proposed two-storey side extension would have a clear visual impact.

In most cases, the Local Planning Authority would seek to ensure that two-storey extensions are adequately set-down from the main ridgeline and set-back from the principal elevation so as to ensure that the proposal appears subservient to the main dwellinghouse. On this occasion, the proposed extension would be flush with both the principal elevation and ridge of the primary dwellinghouse. However, it is noted that permission was granted for similar two-storey side extensions at No. 7 Brookside under application 3/1998/0239, No. 1 Brookside under planning application 3/2014/0362, No.2 Brookside under planning application 3/2016/0039, and No.16 Brookside under planning application 3/2017/0948. While the development approved at No.16 Brookside does not appear to have been implemented, the proposed extension at the application property would appear similar to those built at Nos. 1, 2 and 7 Brookside, which are neither set down nor set back from the main dwellinghouse. Given these existing extensions fall within the visual context of the proposal site and include designs which match the proposal, it is not considered that the lack of set back or reduced ridge height for the proposed side extension would result in an incongruous or discordant addition that would be unduly harmful to the application dwelling or wider street scene in this particular instance. In addition to this, the degree of projection to the side would not be significant, insofar that the extension would have a width which is narrower than the existing two-storey dwellinghouse and the development would be finished in render, concrete roof tiles and uPVC windows to match the existing property, ensuring visual integration.

The proposed single storey rear extension would have a rearward projection of 3.3m with a maximum height of 3.2m. The proposal would therefore appear appropriate in size and scale when read in context with the built form of the application property. The proposed new front porch would also appear relatively modest in size, scale and design and would remain in keeping with the character of the surrounding area with numerous other properties along Brookside already benefitting from similar pitched-roof porches to their principal elevations. In this context, the proposed development would not appear an anomalous or discordant addition.

Taking account of the above, the proposed works are, on balance, considered acceptable with respect to impact upon the existing visual amenities of the immediate and wider locality in this particular instance.

**Highways and Parking:**

The application has been subject to review by Lancashire County Council Highway Authority. The Local Highway Authority do not raise an objection to the proposal and are of the opinion that the proposed development will not have a significant impact on highway safety, capacity or amenity in the immediate vicinity of the site subject to the imposition of conditions with respect to parking provisions.

**Landscape/Ecology:**

### Bats

A Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment Report has been submitted with the application dated 7<sup>th</sup> July 2025. The report concludes that no evidence of use by bats was recorded during the survey and when location, the well-sealed condition of the building, and surrounding habitat were taken into consideration the building was assessed as offering negligible bat roosting potential.

Given the lack of roosting potential, it is considered that the development proposal does not risk negative impact on roosting bats, and that reasonable avoidance measures offer an appropriate approach to managing risk of negative impacts during development. This has been secured by way of a condition.

### Trees

There are a number of mature trees within close proximity to the proposal site. However, it is not considered that the proposed development would result in any direct impact upon these trees and therefore no concerns are raised in this respect.

### BNG

The development is exempt from having to achieve the mandatory Biodiversity Net Gain requirements as it is a householder application.

### **Other Matters:**

#### Red-Edge Boundary

With reference to historic planning application 3/1999/0310 which refused planning consent for the change of use of agricultural land to garden, it appears that the red-edge boundary shown on the submitted Location Plan includes land to the rear of the property which does not form part of the lawful curtilage of the dwellinghouse. However, as the proposed development would be contained well within the lawful curtilage of the property, an amended red-edge boundary has not been sought.

### **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 approval.

<b>RECOMMENDATION:</b>	That planning consent be granted subject to the imposition of conditions.
------------------------	---