


Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.

Signed:	Officer:	LW	Date:	13/11/25	Manager:	KH	Date:	13/11/25
----------------	-----------------	-----------	--------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------	--------------	-----------------

Application Ref:	3/2025/0607				Ribble Valley Borough Council www.ribblevalley.gov.uk
Date Inspected:	09/09/25	Site Notice:	09/09/25		
Officer:	LW				
DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:					APPROVAL

Development Description:	Proposed replacement self-build dwelling following demolition of existing house and garage plus extension of residential curtilage.
Site Address/Location:	Glendene, Barker Lane, Mellor, BB2 7EE.

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

CONSULTATIONS:	Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies
LCC Highways:	No objection to the proposal in principle, subject to three parking spaces being provided within the curtilage of the property and the imposition of conditions.

CONSULTATIONS:	Additional Representations.
One letter of representation has been received raising no objection to the proposal and stating that the development should improve the current site.	

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
Key Statement EN2: Landscape
Key Statement EN3: Sustainable Development and Climate Change
Key Statement EN4: Biodiversity and Geodiversity

Policy DMG1: General Considerations
Policy DMG2: Strategic Considerations
Policy DMG3: Transport & Mobility
Policy DME3: Site and Species Protection and Conservation

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Relevant Planning History:

3/2025/0239: Proposed replacement dwelling following demolition of existing house and garage plus extension of the residential curtilage (Refused).

3/2013/0721: Proposed detached dwellinghouse with integral garage following demolition of existing including external works and access (Approved)

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:

Site Description and Surrounding Area:

The application relates to a detached two-storey residential property known as Glendene, situated to the western side of Barker Lane, Mellor. The property appears to have remained relatively unaltered since its construction and is bordered to the north by the residential property known as Hillside and to the west and south by open fields.

The site to which the proposal relates is located outside of any defined settlement area and on land which benefits from a Green Belt designation. That aside, the property benefits from no other designations or constraints.

Proposed Development for which consent is sought:

Consent is sought for the construction of a replacement two-storey dwellinghouse, following the demolition of the existing property and detached garage, and extension of the residential curtilage. The proposal is a resubmission of refused application 3/2025/0239.

The dwellinghouse would measure a maximum of 13.6m by 12.4m and would incorporate a hipped roof form with an eaves and ridge height of 4.9m and 7.4m respectively. To the front elevation, two pitched roof forward projecting elements would be featured, separated by a single storey lean-to entrance canopy. To the rear elevation, a reverse gable single storey element would be incorporated.

With respect to materiality, the dwelling would be constructed in red facing brickwork with slate roof tiles and uPVC and aluminium windows and doors.

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 Green Belt. However, the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces, is considered an exception where it preserves the openness of the Green Belt and does 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 'materially larger', however the generally accepted approach is for an assessment of the increased volume that the development would create above that of the existing building.

This scheme is a resubmission of application 3/2025/0239 which was refused, in part, on Green Belt harm. The replacement dwelling proposed under the previous application included a two-storey dwelling with a gable roof form, along with a single storey integral garage, utility and sitting area. The planning statement submitted with the application provided a comparison of volumes, taking account of the existing dwellinghouse and the proposed replacement dwelling. These calculations indicated that the proposal would result in a total increase of 92% above that of the existing. The development was therefore considered to result in a materially larger building at the proposal site than that of the existing, the impact of which would only be exacerbated by the prominent views into the site, particularly upon approach from the south along Barker Lane.

The proposed replacement dwelling has been re-designed following the refusal of application 3/2025/0239 and more detailed volume calculations have been submitted in support of the proposal. These calculations indicate that the volume of the existing dwellinghouse, inclusive of the existing garage, is 533.6 cu.m, with the replacement dwelling proposed under this application being 771.2 cu.m. Whilst the volume of the existing dwellinghouse differs to that provided as part of the previous application, the new calculations have been checked and there is no evidence to suggest that they are incorrect. With this in mind, the calculations indicate that the proposal the subject of this application would result in an increase of 237.6 cu.m, equating to an increase of approximately 44.5% above that of the existing.

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, whilst the resultant cumulative volume increase would be relatively high, the proposal would replace the existing dwellinghouse and detached garage with a single building and it is not considered that the volume increase would have a significant impact upon openness when viewed from the adjacent public realm.

With the above in mind, although the proposal would increase the cumulative volume, it is not considered, on balance, that any additional harm upon the openness of the Green Belt would arise from the proposed development and therefore, in this particular instance, the principle of development is secured, subject to an assessment of the material planning considerations.

However, due to the extent of the increase in volume from the original structures it is considered appropriate to remove permitted development rights for extensions that would result in additional volume to that already proposed as part of this development. This can be managed by an appropriate condition.

Impact Upon Residential Amenity:

It is not anticipated that the proposed development would result in any significant detrimental harm upon the existing amenities of any nearby residential receptors by way of overshadowing, loss of outlook or daylight. The nearest residential dwellinghouse is Hillside, a bungalow property sited to the north of the proposal site. The site slopes down to the south, with the proposal site being located on lower land levels than that of Hillside. Furthermore, the proposed dwelling would remain approximately 11m from the main dwellinghouse at Hillside. As such, it is not anticipated that any significant undue harm upon the neighbouring residents would be resultant.

The window openings to the front of the dwelling would provide similar views to those afforded by the window configuration featured to the existing property, while the openings to the rear and southern side elevations would not have a direct interface with any nearby residential receptors and would provide views largely towards the open fields which border the site to the west and south. As such, no new opportunities for direct overlooking or loss of privacy are anticipated in this respect. The windows proposed to the northern side elevation would face towards Hillside, however these openings would serve the WC and kitchen at ground floor and a secondary bedroom window at first floor and therefore could

be obscure glazed to protect the amenity of the adjacent residential property and reduce any perceived sense of overlooking without detrimentally impacting the amenity of the future occupants of the replacement dwelling.

Taking account of the above, the proposed development is considered acceptable with respect to impact upon residential amenity, subject to a condition requiring the windows to the northern elevation of the dwellinghouse to be obscure glazed.

Visual Amenity/External Appearance:

The proposed replacement dwelling would appear relatively traditional in design, utilising facing brickwork, slate roof tiles and uPVC/ aluminium windows and doors. As such, it is not considered that the proposal would appear at odds with its surroundings, with the external facing materials of the dwelling appearing similar to the existing properties in the locality.

The proposal would also follow the established building line of the properties located to the north of the proposal site and would not be sited forward of the existing dwellinghouse. Although large, the form and siting of the dwelling would, on balance, remain sympathetic to the surrounding properties, which themselves are diverse in terms of their overall size, scale and architectural design. As such, it is not considered that the external appearance of the development would have a significantly harmful effect on the existing visual amenities of the area.

The proposal would also include an extension to the existing curtilage area to include an additional area of land to the rear of the replacement dwelling. The new section of curtilage would be enclosed by a boundary fence to match the existing boundary treatment and would align with the furthest point of the existing curtilage boundary. In this respect, it is not considered that the additional curtilage area would read as an inappropriate or easily identifiable expansion of domestic land use which would cause harm to the visual amenities of the surrounding area in this particular instance.

In view of the above, it is not considered that the proposed development would result in any significant detrimental harm upon the existing visual amenities of the immediate or wider locality that would warrant the refusal to grant planning permission.

Highways and Parking:

A consultation response from Lancashire County Council Highways was received on 1st September 2025 stating that there is no objection to the proposal in principle, subject to the submission of a parking plan showing that the required 3no. parking spaces can be accommodated within the proposal site and the imposition of conditions. Following this, an amended site plan (dwg no. A0.3 Rev A dated 5th November 2025) has been submitted which shows that at least 3no. parking spaces can be provided within the site. The proposal is therefore considered acceptable with respect to highway safety and parking, subject to the imposition of conditions.

Landscape/Ecology:

Bats

A Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment Survey was carried out at the proposal site on 18th March 2025 with the building assessed to have a low level of bat roost potential and recommendations subsequently made for further survey work to be undertaken. Following this, an emergence survey was carried out on 2nd July 2025. Common Pipistrelle bats were recorded emerging from a nearby roost, with bats also observed foraging to the east of the building; however, no bats were observed emerging from the building itself.

The submitted Bat Survey and Method Statement report concludes that the survey effort is considered appropriate to characterise the roost potential of the building and that the presence of a significant or low conservation value bat roost is unlikely. However, a Method Statement has been included within the report to ensure that bats and their roosts are fully protected. The details outlined with the submitted Method Statement and Reasonable Avoidance Measures have been secured via condition.

BNG

The development is exempt from having to achieve the mandatory Biodiversity Net Gain requirements as it is subject to the self-build exemption which has been secured through the provision of a unilateral undertaking.

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.

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