


Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.

Signed:	Officer:	BT	Date:	11/11/25	Manager:	LH	Date:	12/11/25
----------------	-----------------	-----------	--------------	----------	-----------------	-----------	--------------	-----------------

Application Ref:	3/2025/0696			 Ribble Valley Borough Council www.ribblevalley.gov.uk
Date Inspected:	3/10/25 & 10/11/25	Site Notice:	3/10/25	
Officer:	BT			
DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:				REFUSAL

Development Description:	Proposed demolition of existing bungalow, to be replaced with the erection of a new dormer bungalow on existing site.
Site Address/Location:	Markhor, Eaves Hall Lane, West Bradford, BB7 3JG.

CONSULTATIONS:	Parish/Town Council
West Bradford Parish Council:	Consulted 16/9/25 – no response received.

CONSULTATIONS:	Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies
LCC Highways:	No objections subject to conditions.

LCC PROW:	Consulted 16/9/25 – no response received.
------------------	---

RVBC Countryside:	No objections subject to a European Protected Species License being acquired.
--------------------------	---

United Utilities:	No objections subject to condition.
--------------------------	-------------------------------------

GMEU:	No objections subject to conditions.
--------------	--------------------------------------

CONSULTATIONS:	Additional Representations.
None.	

RELEVANT POLICIES AND SITE PLANNING HISTORY:
<p>Ribble Valley Core Strategy:</p> <p>Key Statement DS1: Development Strategy Key Statement DS2: Sustainable Development Key Statement EN2: Landscape Key Statement EN4: Biodiversity And Geodiversity Key Statement EN5: Heritage Assets Key Statement DM12: Transport Considerations Policy DMG1: General Considerations Policy DMG2: Strategic Considerations Policy DMG3: Transport & Mobility</p>

Policy DME1: Protecting Trees And Woodlands
Policy DME2: Landscape And Townscape Protection
Policy DME3: Site and Species Protection and Conservation
Policy DME4: Protecting Heritage Assets
Policy DME5: Renewable Energy
Policy DMH3: Dwellings in the Open Countryside and AONB
Policy DMB5: Footpaths And Bridleways

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Relevant Planning History:

3/2018/0371:

Proposed single storey extension, conversion of the garage and new garage/annex (Refused)

3/2015/0397:

Discharge of condition 4 (tree hedge protection) and 5 (balcony privacy screening) of planning permission 3/2013/0934 (Approved)

3/2013/0934:

Remodelling of dwelling incorporating erection of extensions, replacement roof with increased roof height and associated external alterations to provide additional living accommodation (Approved)

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:

Site Description and Surrounding Area:

The application relates to a detached true bungalow property located on the North-western edge of West Bradford. Access to the application property is from Eaves Hall Lane which also serves as Public Right Of Way BW0344003. The application property consists of rendered and stone elevations, UPVC doors and windows and a mixed roof profile consisting of flat, hipped and lean-to elements. The application property sits within a sizeable area of curtilage with the large majority of its perimeters bordered by trees and hedges, with the neighbouring properties of Cranbrook and Highfield lying adjacent to the North-west and South-east of the application property respectively. The application site lies within the Forest Of Bowland National Landscape with the wider area comprising a mixture of woodland, agricultural land and open countryside.

Proposed Development for which consent is sought:

Planning consent is sought for the demolition of the application property and erection of a replacement three bedroom dormer bungalow property with two-storey gable projections at the front and rear. Additional works proposed include alterations to the site's access and associated hard and soft landscaping.

Principle of Development:

The application site is situated outside of the defined settlement area of West Bradford and as such lies within the open countryside with regards to its strategic location. Policy DMH3 of the Core Strategy regards the rebuilding or replacement of dwellings within the open countryside as permissible subject to the following criteria:

- *The residential use of the property should not have been abandoned*

- *There being no adverse impact on the landscape in relation to the new dwelling*
- *The need to extend an existing curtilage*

Having regard to criteria points 1 and 3, the Council has no evidence to suggest that the residential use of the application property has been abandoned and the proposed development would not involve any extension of the property's existing curtilage area. The proposal would therefore satisfy criteria points 1 and 3 of Policy DMH3. Notwithstanding this, criteria point 2 states that proposals for replacement dwellings should not result in any adverse impacts upon the surrounding landscape however in this instance it is considered that the proposed dwelling would constitute a disproportionate, over dominant and incongruous form of development that would fail to successfully assimilate within the surrounding landscape (the visual impact of the proposed development is assessed in further detail in the report's 'Visual Amenity/External Appearance' section). For this reason, it is considered that the proposal would be in conflict with criteria point 2 of Policy DMH3. The proposed development would therefore fail to fully satisfy the requirements of Policy DMH3 and as such is considered to be unacceptable in principle.

Impact Upon Residential Amenity:

Paragraph 135 (f) of the National Planning Policy Framework states:

'Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users'.

Furthermore, Policy DMG1 of the Core Strategy requires all proposals for development to consider the effects of development upon existing amenities.

In this instance, the application property (along with the adjacent neighbouring properties of Cranbrook and Highfield) comprises a single storey dwelling with its South-eastern elevation sited approximately 15 metres away from the common boundary shared with Highfield. The North-western elevation of the application property lies within close proximity to the common boundary shared with Cranbrook however at present a grouping of trees forming this common boundary provides screening between the North-western side of the application property and Cranbrook. As such, the existing property on site provides no measurable opportunities for overlooking towards either of the adjacent neighbouring dwellings or their curtilage areas.

The proposed replacement dwelling would incorporate a projecting balcony on its rear North-eastern elevation however following concerns raised with the applicant with regards to the balcony potentially providing elevated unrestricted sideways views towards the adjacent neighbouring properties a 1.8m high privacy screen comprised of obscure glazing has been incorporated to the side elevations of the balcony which in turn would sufficiently safeguard the privacy of the adjacent neighbouring residents.

Notwithstanding this, the South-eastern elevation of the proposed dwelling would be sited in close proximity (approximately 3 metres away) to the common boundary shared with the adjacent neighbouring property of Highfield, with the rear North-eastern upper level of the proposed dwelling's South-western quadrant accommodating a fully glazed opening that would serve an exercise room. The fully glazed opening serving the exercise room originally accommodated two full height doors and a Juliet balcony and it was conveyed to the applicant that these features, in conjunction with the site's elevated topography above Highfield would likely allow for largely unrestricted sideways views into the rear neighbouring garden of Highfield which in turn could compromise the privacy of the neighbouring occupants (or at the very least create a distinct sense of being overlooked).

In light of the above issues, the applicant was advised to remove the proposed Juliet balcony feature from the dwelling and to relocate a dwelling of reduced width (either by way of removing the dwelling's double garage / storage component or kitchen & dining / exercise room component) to the centre of the

application site, so as to both address the aforementioned concerns with regards to overlooking and also additional concerns raised with respect to design and visual impact (as detailed below in the report's Visual Amenity/External Appearance' section). An amended proposal has since been submitted with the previously proposed Juliet balcony feature and full height doors having now been removed from the exercise room's rear facing fully glazed opening. Notwithstanding this, the originally proposed width and location of the replacement dwelling has been retained in the amended scheme, along with full height glazing to the North-eastern elevation of the exercise room. As such, given the height of the proposed glazed opening and its proximity to the neighbouring boundary, in conjunction with the elevated topography of the application site, the proposed development would allow for elevated and largely unrestricted views into and towards the rear garden area and lounge windows of Highfield respectively, as evidenced by the case officer's recent site visit photographs.

Accordingly, the proposed development would result in an unacceptable loss of privacy to the neighbouring occupants of Highfield and would therefore be in conflict with the aims and objectives of Paragraph 135 (f) of the NPPF and Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.

Visual Amenity/External Appearance:

Paragraph 135 (c) of the NPPF states:

'Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting'

Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy provides additional general design guidance as follows: *'All development must be sympathetic to existing and proposed land uses in terms of its size, intensity and nature as well as scale, massing and style...particular emphasis will be placed on visual appearance and the relationship to surroundings, including impact on landscape character.'*

With respect to development within National Landscapes (previously known as Areas Of Outstanding Natural Beauty) Paragraph 189 of the NPPF states:

'Great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty.'

The above is reiterated within Key Statement EN2 of the Core Strategy:

'The landscape and character of the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty will be protected, conserved and enhanced. Any development will need to contribute to the conservation of the natural beauty of the area. As a principle the Council will expect development to be in keeping with the character of the landscape, reflecting local distinctiveness, vernacular style, scale, style, features and building materials.'

In this instance, the application property comprises a modestly sized true bungalow property and is one of several bungalow properties within the existing street scene on the North-eastern side of Eaves Hall Lane, all of which comprise similar proportions with respect to their height and footprint and largely similar orientations with regards to their elongated profiles facing in a North-west / South-east direction in line with their respective plot perimeters.

In contrast, the proposed dwelling would be orientated in the opposite manner with its elongated front and rear elevations facing South-west and North-east respectively. Whilst it is noted that the neighbouring property of Peveril is orientated in a similar manner, its orientation is not reflective of the prevailing alignment of dwellings within the existing street scene therefore the orientation of the proposed dwelling would be largely at odds with the existing pattern of development within the street scene on Eaves Hall Lane. Furthermore, the proposed dwelling would comprise a sizeable width of 27

metres which would be significantly wider than the neighbouring property of Peveril to the extent that the proposed dwelling would occupy the large majority of the application plot width. As such, the proposed dwelling would read as a disproportionate and cramped addition to the site relative to the width of the application plot and would therefore be noticeably at odds with the spatial pattern of housing forming the existing streetscene on the North-eastern side of Eaves Hall Lane. The proposal as originally submitted also proposed to incorporate metal cladding to the entirety of the upper face sections of the property's projecting gable features which was considered to be overtly modern in character and not wholly in keeping with the rural character of the area.

In light of the above issues, the applicant was advised to reduce the footprint of the proposed dwelling and re-site a dwelling of reduced width centrally within the application plot, along with a reduction to the extent of metal cladding within the faces of the dwelling's projecting gable features. An amended proposal has since been submitted with the extent of metal cladding reduced as advised however the 27 metre width of the proposed dwelling has been retained, with the only change to the dwelling's footprint being a further (minor change) step back incorporated to the footprint of the dwelling's integral garage component. Furthermore, whilst the height of the replacement dwelling would be similar to height of existing property, the dwelling's sizeable width in conjunction with its overhanging gable roof profiles and projecting front and rear two-storey gable features would collectively exacerbate the overall bulk and massing effect of the proposed development to the extent that the replacement dwelling would read as a disproportionate, over dominant and incongruous addition to the application site and existing street scene.

In terms of the development's visual impact, it is noted that the application site and adjacent properties in the existing street scene on Eaves Hall Lane are afforded some screening by virtue of the existing tree cover in place along Eaves Hall Lane however the interior of the application site and adjacent plots are still visible in the public realm from the site access points of each of the dwellings and the existing extent of tree cover to the street scene would be reduced during the winter months. Furthermore, these trees could be removed in the future and as such cannot be relied upon as a means of justifying a development that is considered to be unacceptable with respect to its design and visual impact.

The application site's planning history indicates that planning consent was granted in 2013 for the extension of the existing property on site. The supporting information within the current application states that the proposed dwelling would be no larger than the scheme approved under the 2013 consent (application 3/2013/0934) with respect to its floor area and scale however comparative analysis shows that the dwelling proposed under the current scheme exceeds the width of the approved extended dwelling by a considerable measure, with the development approved under the 2013 consent reading as largely proportionate to its immediate surroundings, in contrast with the current scheme. As such, the current scheme and development approved under application 3/2013/0934 are not considered to be comparable forms of development.

Taking account of all of the above, it is considered that the proposed replacement dwelling by virtue of its orientation, width, bulk, massing and height would amount to an over dominant, unsympathetic and incongruous form of development that would be at odds with the prevailing character of residential development within the existing street scene on Eaves Hall Lane. Accordingly, it is considered that the proposed development would be harmful to the visual amenities of the area and for this reason it is not considered that the proposal would in this instance conserve or enhance the character of the surrounding National Landscape. The proposal would therefore fail to satisfy the requirements of Paragraphs 135 (C) and 189 of the NPPF and Key Statement EN2 and Policies DMG1 and DMG2 of the Core Strategy.

Highways and Parking:

The proposed development has been subject to review by Lancashire County Council Highways who have raised no issues with respect to access, parking provision or general highway safety. The LHA response recommends for the imposition of conditions with respect to the provision of parking and

turning areas, cycle storage, construction management, surface treatments, drainage and vehicular access, all of which would need to be imposed on any future planning consent granted. On this basis, it is not considered that the proposed development would have any undue impacts upon highway safety as such the proposal satisfies Policy DMG1 of the Core Strategy (highways).

Landscape/Ecology:

Protected species

A preliminary roost assessment was undertaken at the application property on 19/5/25, with emergence surveys subsequently undertaken on 19/5/25, 10/6/25 and 7/7/25 which confirmed the presence of a summer roost for an individual soprano pipistrelle within the roof space of the application property.

In this instance, the proposed demolition of the application property to facilitate a replacement dwelling would result in the loss of a confirmed bat roost therefore the proposed development could only be carried out under a relevant Natural England Protected Species Mitigation License.

In order for the Natural England license to be granted, Natural England requires 3 tests for the development to be met: (a) Preserving public health or public safety or other imperative reasons of overriding public interest; (b) there is no satisfactory alternative; and (c) the action will not be detrimental to maintaining the population of the species concerned at a favourable conservation status in its natural range. As competent authority the Habitats Directive places a duty on local planning authorities to consider whether there is a reasonable prospect of a license being granted and apply the three tests.

With regard to the first test, whilst the proposed development is considered to be unacceptable in principle with respect to its design and visual impact, the principle of replacing an older building of little architectural merit with a modern energy efficient dwelling is considered to be acceptable in principle as this would both deliver environmental benefits and improve the quality of the Borough's housing stock which in turn is considered to be in the public interest. As such, the proposal would meet the requirements of the first test.

In terms of the second test, the provision of any replacement dwelling on site would require the demolition of the existing property therefore there is not considered to be any satisfactory alternative.

The final test is an ecological one, which the submitted ecology survey suggests could be met, subject to careful planning and appropriate mitigation measures.

Accordingly, the proposed development would meet the requirements of all three tests therefore there is considered to be a reasonable prospect that Natural England would grant a license for the proposed development.

Trees

An Arboricultural Impact Assessment has been provided in support of the application which shows the presence of numerous tree and hedges within and around the application site. The submitted AIA shows that there would be a requirement to remove a Holly tree and a potential requirement to remove a Cupressus tree and grouping of ornamental trees (identified as T2, T1 and G4 in the AIA respectively) in order to accommodate the proposed development. In this instance, the trees subject to removal / potential removal comprise low value category trees of limited amenity value and all other trees and hedges on site would be retained under the proposed development. As such, the proposed extent of tree removal is considered to be acceptable. The submitted AIA includes a programme of tree protection for all additional trees within and around the application site for the construction phase of the

development and adherence with these measures would need to be secured through the imposition of a condition in the event of any future planning consent being granted.

BNG

A Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment has been provided in support of the proposed development which acknowledge that the proposed development would result in a biodiversity net loss, with no practical means of achieving the mandatory 10% net gain in biodiversity through on-site compensation. In light of this, the application's supporting information proposes to meet the required gains by purchasing biodiversity credits from an off-site habitat bank. The provision of off-site biodiversity gains constitutes a post-permission matter that would be subject to further assessment through the imposition of the mandatory biodiversity net gain condition in the event of any future planning consent being granted.

Observations/Consideration of Matters Raised/Conclusion:

The proposed replacement dwelling, by virtue of its orientation, width, bulk, massing and height would read as an over dominant, unsympathetic and incongruous addition to the application site and would therefore fail to successfully assimilate within the surrounding landscape. The proposed development would therefore fail to satisfy the requirements of Policy DMH3 and as such is considered to be unacceptable in principle.

In addition, the proposed development would result in an unacceptable loss of privacy to the neighbouring occupants residing at the property known as Highfield and would therefore be in conflict with the aims and objectives of Paragraph 135 (f) of the NPPF and Policy DMG1 of the Core Strategy.

Furthermore, the proposed replacement dwelling, by virtue of its orientation, width, bulk, massing and height would amount to an over dominant, unsympathetic and incongruous form of development that would be at odds with the prevailing character of residential development within the existing street scene on Eaves Hall Lane. In light of the above, it is considered that the proposed development would be harmful to the visual amenities of the area and for this reason it is not considered that the proposal would in this instance conserve or enhance the character of the surrounding National Landscape. The proposal would therefore fail to satisfy the requirements of Paragraphs 135 (C) and 189 of the NPPF and Key Statement EN2 and Policies DMG1 and DMG2 of the Core Strategy.

It is for the above reasons and having regard to all material considerations and matters raised that planning consent be refused.

RECOMMENDATION:

That planning consent be refused for the following reasons:

- | | |
|------------|--|
| 01: | The proposed replacement dwelling, by virtue of its orientation, width, bulk, massing and height would read as an over dominant, unsympathetic and incongruous addition to the application site and would therefore fail to successfully assimilate within the surrounding landscape. The proposed development would therefore fail to satisfy the requirements of Policy DMH3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and as such is considered to amount to unacceptable development in principle in this rural location. |
| 02: | The proposed development would result in an unacceptable loss of privacy to the neighbouring occupants residing at the property known as Highfield. The proposal would therefore be in conflict with the aims and objectives of Paragraph 135 (f) of the NPPF and Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy. |
| 03: | The proposed replacement dwelling by virtue of its orientation, width, bulk, massing and height would amount to an over dominant, unsympathetic and incongruous form of development that would be at odds with the prevailing character of residential development within the existing street scene on Eaves Hall Lane. Accordingly, it is considered that the proposed development |

<p>would be harmful to the visual amenities of the area and for this reason it is not considered that the proposal would in this instance conserve or enhance the character of the surrounding National Landscape. The proposal would therefore fail to satisfy the requirements of Paragraphs 135 (C) and 189 of the NPPF and Key Statement EN2 and Policies DMG1 and DMG2 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.</p>
