


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

<b>Signed:</b>	<b>Officer:</b>	<b>LW</b>	<b>Date:</b>	<b>14/10/25</b>	<b>Manager:</b>	<b>KH</b>	<b>Date:</b>	<b>15/10/25</b>
----------------	-----------------	-----------	--------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------	--------------	-----------------

<b>Application Ref:</b>	3/2025/0662			 Ribble Valley Borough Council <a href="http://www.ribblevalley.gov.uk">www.ribblevalley.gov.uk</a>				
<b>Date Inspected:</b>	02/09/25	<b>Site Notice:</b>	02/09/25					
<b>Officer:</b>	LW							
<b>DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:</b>					<b>APPROVAL</b>			

<b>Development Description:</b>	Planning permission for proposed demolition of existing defective rear extension and external staircase to the basement. Erection of new two-storey rear extension with internal staircase for access to basement.
<b>Site Address/Location:</b>	38 Higher Road, Longridge, PR3 3SX.

<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>	N/A

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

<b>RELEVANT POLICIES AND SITE PLANNING HISTORY:</b>
<b>Ribble Valley Core Strategy:</b>  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  Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
<b>Relevant Planning History:</b>  3/2024/0291: Planning Permission for two storey extension to rear (Refused).  3/2024/0371: Listed Building Consent for two storey extension to rear (Refused).  3/2013/0959: Retrospective application for consent for roof repair and installation of damp proof course (Refused).

<b>ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:</b>
--

**Site Description and Surrounding Area:**

The application relates to a mid-terrace property at no.38 Higher Road, Longridge. The entire row of terraced properties, Nos. 6-44 inclusive, collectively form a Grade II Listed Building. The official listing description for Nos. 6-44 Higher Road reads as follows:

*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 floor 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 1<sup>st</sup> floor over the door. Nos. 6, 8 and 44 have stone gutter brackets. A keyed joint between No.24 and 26 indicated 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 application premises is situated on a main road location on the eastern side of the defined settlement area of Longridge and within the Longridge Conservation Area. The area surrounding the premises is predominantly residential in character.

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

The application seeks planning consent for the erection of an extension to the existing Grade II Listed dwellinghouse. The submitted details propose that the existing two-storey structure to the rear of the dwelling will be demolished and replaced with a new two-storey extension which will benefit from a footprint of 3m by 4.2m, have an eaves height of 4.3m and ridge height of 5.2m when measured from lower ground floor level.

The extension will be faced in random coursed natural stone and natural slate tiles to the roof. The extension will be of a lean-to appearance, with the rear elevation of the extension featuring timber French doors at lower ground floor level and 1no. window opening to the upper ground floor. It is proposed that the window opening will be of a timber construction, with the existing timber framed first floor windows also proposed to be replaced with new timber windows.

As part of the overall development, a new WC would also be created at lower ground floor/basement level.

The proposal is a resubmission of refused application 3/2024/0291.

**Principle of Development:**

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

**Impact upon Designated Heritage Assets:**

The application relates to and seeks consent for works to a Grade II Listed Building. 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**

In this respect 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.*

#### **Policy DME4:**

With Policy DME4 stating, in respect of development within conservation areas or those affecting the listing 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 conserved 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 DMG1:**

Policy DMG1 is also engaged in concert with Key Statement EN5 and Policy DME4 insofar that the policy sets out general Development Management considerations, with the policy having a number of inherent criterion that are relevant to the assessment of the current proposal, which state:

*In determining planning applications, all development must:*

#### **DESIGN**

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.*

#### **AMENITY**

1. *Not adversely affect the amenities of the surrounding area.*

#### **ENVIRONMENT**

2. *All development must protect and enhance heritage assets and their settings.*

#### **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 principal Act which states the following:

#### **Listed Buildings – Section 66(1) (as amended by s.58B of Levelling-Up and Regeneration Act 2023):**

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

#### **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 as 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 212-220 reading as follows:

**Considering Potential Impacts:**

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 of 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 bring 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.*

#### **Assessment of impacts:**

Firstly, with respect to the impact on the Longridge Conservation Area, the proposed extension to the rear 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.

With respect to the impact on the Listed Building and its setting, the proposed two storey extension would replace an existing lean-to structure featured to the rear elevation of the application property. This extension, whilst of no particular architectural merit, is a modestly sized structure in terms of its footprint and largely traditional in character by virtue of its lean-to roof form. Despite this, it is not considered the existing structure is of any significant value and does not contribute to the overall significance of the listed terrace. As such, no issues are raised over its removal and replacement.

The proposed extension is a resubmission of refused application 3/2024/0291. The previously refused scheme included a flat roof rear extension with a footprint of 3m by 4.2m and height of 4.9m. The scheme also included a 0.9m canopy overhang to the rear and modern uPVC framed openings. The development was refused on the grounds that the extension, by virtue of its design, bulk and use of modern materials would have a harmful impact upon the Grade II listed designated heritage asset.

Following this refusal, the proposed scheme has been amended. The overall form of the revised extension is a lean-to structure. In this respect, the proposed extension would be read in conjunction with a number of existing lean-to and pitched roof additions to the rear of the terraced row of Listed properties. With this in mind, the introduction of a lean-to extension in this location, taking account of the wider site context and character of the area, is unlikely to be read as being an anomalous introduction that would be unsympathetic to patterns of built form found in the area.

In respect of the impact of the proposed extension upon the inherent character and significance of the existing Grade II designated heritage asset, the proposed work is confined to the application property, cannot be seen from the public highway and would not impact on any of the key features that contribute to the listed building's significance. The proposed extension would benefit from a larger footprint than that of the existing structure which is proposed for removal; however, the replacement of the previously proposed flat roof form with a lean-to design and omission of the canopy overhang has reduced the overall bulk of the addition, ensuring that the dwellinghouse reads as the 'primary' building and the extension appears as a later addition whilst remaining sympathetic to and reflective of its overall

character. In this sense, a clear visual hierarchy would be retained which would ensure that the inherent character of the Grade II listed building is not compromised or undermined.

In respect of the external appearance of the extension, the proposed lean-to roof form, natural coursed stone, slate roof tiles and timber windows and doors with stone heads and sills would respond positively to the built form of the existing building.

The proposal also seeks to create a WC room by way partitioning off part of the property's basement utility/store which in turn would alter the existing plan form of the historic building. Notwithstanding this, the resultant enclosure created by the subdivision would be modest in terms of area with the extent of partition walling also being minimal. As such, the proposed internal works would not amount to any significant deviation from the building's historic plan form. Furthermore, new openings into the building's wall fabric would be limited to a new extractor fan ducting which would result in minimal disturbance to and loss of historic fabric. Moreover, whilst the proposed extractor fan grille would be externally visible, this would be a modestly sized feature to the rear elevation of the building and therefore its impact upon the character and appearance of the historic building would be negligible.

As such, taking account of the above matters, it is not considered that the proposed development raises any significant direct conflict with Key Statement EN5 or Policies DMG1 and DME4 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy, nor any significant measurable conflicts with the aims, objectives and requirements of Sections 16 and 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 nor paragraphs 212-220 of the NPPF.

**Impact Upon Residential Amenity:**

The window and door openings within the proposed extension would provide similar views to those afforded by the openings featured to the existing extension and predominantly into the application property's private amenity space. As such, no new opportunities for direct overlooking or loss of privacy are anticipated in this respect.

The proposed extension would be sited within close proximity to the shared boundary with no.36 and no.40 Higher Road. However, the proposal would project 3m from the rear elevation of the terraced row of properties and therefore it is not expected that the proposed extension would result in any significant degree of overshadowing, loss of outlook or daylight to these neighbouring residents that would warrant the refusal to grant planning permission.

Accordingly, the impact of the proposed development upon the amenities of nearby residents is considered acceptable.

**Visual Amenity/External Appearance:**

The proposed development would not be afforded a high level of visibility from the adjacent public realm, being sited to the rear of the application property and therefore screened from public viewing by the row of terraced houses themselves. Notwithstanding this, the proposed extension would appear appropriate in size and scale when read in context with the existing built form and would not read as an overtly incongruous or over dominant addition to the proposal site. The development would also utilise materials which would appear sympathetic to the external appearance of the existing dwellinghouse, further reducing the impact of development.

Taking account of the above, the proposal is acceptable with respect to visual amenity and external appearance.

**Highways and Parking:**

No highway safety concerns have been raised with respect to the proposed development.

**Landscape/Ecology:**

Bats

A Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment Report has been submitted with the application dated 29<sup>th</sup> September 2025. The Report concludes that the building was observed to have no obvious suitable roost features present and no evidence to suggest presence of roosting bats or use by bats was recorded despite suitable undisturbed horizontal surfaces being present, and at a time of year when such evidence would reasonably be expected. As such, when location, condition of the building, and surrounding habitat were taking into consideration the building was assessed as offering negligible bat roosting potential.

Given the lack of roosting potential, it is considered that the development does not risk negative impacts on roosting bats, and that reasonable avoidance measures offer an appropriate approach to managing risk of negative impacts during development. The measures outlined within the Precautionary Method Statement and Reasonable Avoidance Measures section of the Report have been secured via a condition.

BNG

The development is exempt from having to achieve the mandatory Biodiversity Net Gain Requirements 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, the application is recommended for approval.

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