

Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.

Signed:	Officer:	LW	Date:	08/09/26	Manager:	LH	Date:	8/9/26
----------------	-----------------	-----------	--------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------	--------------	---------------

Application Ref:	3/2025/0733			 Ribble Valley Borough Council www.ribblevalley.gov.uk
Date Inspected:	03/03/26	Site Notice:	N/A	
Officer:	LW			
DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:				APPROVAL

Development Description:	Proposed side extension with front and rear dormer roof extension.
Site Address/Location:	41 St Marys Drive, Langho, BB6 8DL.

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

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

CONSULTATIONS:	Additional Representations.
No representations 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:

No relevant planning history.

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

The application relates to a bungalow dwelling at No.41 St Marys Drive, Langho. The property comprises brick walling and concrete roof tiles and benefits from an existing single storey garage adjoined to the northern side elevation and a conservatory to the rear. The site to which the proposal relates is located within the defined settlement area of Langho and benefits from no other designations or constraints.

Proposed Development for which consent is sought:

Consent is sought for the demolition of the existing integral garage and conservatory and the erection of a two-storey side extension incorporating a recessed first-floor balcony, together with front and rear dormer extensions. The application has been amended during the course of its determination. As originally submitted, the proposal included a front dormer extending across the roof slopes of both the existing dwellinghouse and the proposed side extension. The revised scheme has reduced the width of the front dormer so that it is contained within the roof slope of the original dwelling, with the recessed balcony now occupying the roof slope of the side extension.

The proposed side extension would project approximately 3.8m from the north-eastern gable elevation of the dwelling and would measure approximately 9m in depth. It would be served by a pitched roof, measuring approximately 2.1m to the eaves and 5m to the ridge. The front elevation would incorporate a single window opening at ground-floor level and a set of glazed double doors at first-floor level, providing access to a recessed balcony within the roof slope. A further window would be provided within the rear elevation at ground-floor level.

The proposed front dormer would measure approximately 6.3m in width and 1.9m in height and would incorporate two window openings.

The proposed rear dormer would extend across the rear roof slope of both the existing dwelling and the proposed side extension, measuring approximately 10.2m in width and 2.3m in height. It would incorporate three window openings.

In terms of materials, the proposed side extension would be finished in render, with roof tiles matching those of the main dwelling. The proposed dormers would be clad in tiles to match the existing roof finish. As part of the overall proposal, the external walls of the existing dwelling would also be rendered.

The development would also include alterations to the ground-floor rear fenestration of the existing dwelling, including the installation of glazed patio 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 ground floor windows proposed within the side extension would provide views comparable to those already afforded by the existing window arrangement serving the main dwelling. As such, the development would not introduce any new opportunities for direct overlooking, and no unacceptable loss of privacy is anticipated in this regard.

The windows proposed within the front dormer, together with the first-floor balcony located within the roof slope of the side extension, would afford views towards No.26 St Mary's Drive. However, a separation distance of approximately 24m would be maintained between the properties, which is considered sufficient to prevent any significant loss of privacy or undue overlooking. Furthermore, as the proposed balcony would be recessed and contained within the roof form of the side extension, it is not considered that it would result in any material adverse impact upon the living conditions of the occupants of Nos. 39 and 43 St Mary's Drive.

The openings proposed within the rear dormer would provide elevated views towards the properties fronting Whinney Lane, namely Nos. 32 and 34. A minimum separation distance of approximately 18m would be retained between the proposed development and the rear elevations of these dwellings. Whilst some views towards the rear gardens of these properties would inevitably be afforded, this impact is not considered so significant as to warrant the refusal of planning permission. In reaching this conclusion, it is noted that Nos. 39 and 43 St Mary's Drive already benefit from rear dormer extensions that similarly face towards properties on Whinney Lane. Furthermore, No.41 St Mary's Drive retains permitted development rights that would allow for the erection of a similar rear dormer extension without the need for planning permission.

No.39 St Mary's Drive is situated immediately to the north of the application property. Whilst the proposed side extension would bring built development marginally closer to No.39 and would exceed the height of the existing garage it would replace, the southern elevation of No.39 already experiences a degree of overshadowing as a result of the existing dwelling and the prevailing change in land levels, with the application property occupying higher ground. In these circumstances, it is not considered that the proposed extension would give rise to any materially greater impact upon the residential amenity of No.39 than currently exists, nor would it justify the refusal of planning permission.

As the proposed dormer extensions would be contained within the existing roof slopes of the dwelling, they are not considered likely to result in any material adverse effects in terms of overshadowing, loss of outlook, or loss of daylight to neighbouring residential properties.

Taking account of the above, the proposal is considered acceptable with respect to impact upon residential amenity.

Visual Amenity/External Appearance:

As outlined elsewhere within this report, the application has been subject to a number of design amendments during the course of its determination. The scheme originally submitted comprised a two-storey side extension that was flush with both the principal elevation and main ridgeline of the dwelling, together with front and rear box dormers extending across the roof slopes of both the existing dwellinghouse and the proposed side extension.

In general, the Local Planning Authority seeks to ensure that two-storey side extensions are appropriately set down from the main ridgeline and set back from principal elevation of the host dwelling. This approach helps to maintain a clear subservient relationship between the extension and the original property, thereby preventing the addition from appearing overly dominant or incongruous. As such, amendments were requested to incorporate both a set-back and set-down to the proposed side extension.

Concerns were also raised regarding the scale and width of the proposed front dormer. Whilst similar in design to the rear dormer, the front-facing element would be significantly more prominent within the street scene. Furthermore, although front dormers are a well-established feature along St Mary's Drive, these are generally confined to the roof slope of the original dwellinghouse. It was therefore considered that the originally proposed front dormer, which extended across both the main dwelling and side extension, would appear unduly wide and incongruous when viewed in the context of the prevailing character and appearance of the surrounding built form.

In response to these concerns, the scheme was amended so that the front dormer is now limited to the roof slope of the original dwellinghouse, with a recessed balcony incorporated within the roof slope of the side extension instead. The revised front dormer is considered acceptable insofar as it reflects the scale and form of comparable dormer extensions present on neighbouring properties. Similarly, the proposed recessed balcony reflects a feature already implemented as part of the two-storey side extension at No. 53 St Mary's Drive. Having regard to these comparable developments, both elements of the proposal are considered, on balance, to be acceptable.

The proposed rear dormer would not occupy a prominent position within the public realm due to its location on the rear elevation, where it would largely be screened from public views by the dwellinghouse itself. Whilst relatively substantial in width, the dormer would remain appropriately contained within the roof slope, being set above the eaves, below the ridge line and in from the end walls. Consequently, it is not considered that the rear dormer would result in any significant harm to the character and appearance of the dwellinghouse or wider area that would justify a refusal.

In terms of materials, the proposed side extension and the external walls of the existing dwellinghouse would be finished in render, whilst the roof of the extension and the proposed front and rear dormers would be clad in tiles to match the existing roof. The proposed palette of materials is considered acceptable in this instance, given that render is an established feature within the street scene. In particular, No. 47 is finished entirely in render, whilst a number of other neighbouring properties incorporate render as a feature element.

Taking account of the above, it is not considered, on balance, that the scheme would result in significant harm to the character or appearance of the area. Accordingly, there are no significant adverse impacts that would justify the refusal of planning permission in this particular instance.

Highways and Parking:

The application has been assessed by Lancashire County Council Highways. In its consultation response dated 12 February, the Local Highway Authority (LHA) noted that the proposed development would result in the loss of the existing garage and increase the number of bedrooms within the dwelling from two to four. Consequently, the LHA advised that a minimum of three off-street parking spaces should be provided to serve the enlarged dwelling.

In response, the applicant submitted an amended site plan demonstrating the provision of three off-street parking spaces within the front curtilage. Following review of the revised layout, the LHA requested that each space measure a minimum of 5 metres in length and 2.4 metres in width to ensure adequate manoeuvring and parking provision in the interests of highway safety.

A further amended site plan has subsequently been submitted, which demonstrates that all proposed parking spaces exceed the minimum dimensions specified by the LHA. The revised plans have been reviewed by the LHA, who have confirmed that they raise no objections to the proposal, subject to the imposition of a condition requiring the driveway to be surfaced in a hard-bound material.

The LHA has also advised that, in order to facilitate the proposed parking arrangement, the existing vehicular crossing will need to be widened to the full width of the driveway to prevent damage to the adjacent footway. Such works fall within the public highway and can only be undertaken by a contractor approved by Lancashire County Council under Section 171 of the Highways Act 1980. Accordingly, the applicant is advised to contact Lancashire County Council Highways to obtain the necessary approvals prior to the commencement of any works.

The Local Planning Authority also considers it appropriate to impose a planning condition requiring the approved access and parking arrangements to be provided prior to the first use of the extensions and thereafter retained for the parking of vehicles for the lifetime of the development.

Having regard to the amended plans and the advice of the Local Highway Authority, it is considered that the proposal would provide an adequate level of off-street parking commensurate with the scale of the enlarged dwelling. The development would not result in any unacceptable impacts on highway safety or the operation of the local highway network and is therefore considered acceptable in highway and parking terms, subject to the imposition of appropriate planning conditions.

Landscape/Ecology:

A Preliminary Roost Assessment prepared by Arbtech and dated 14 November 2025 was submitted in support of the application. The assessment found no evidence of bat activity within the building; however, a number of features with potential to support roosting bats were identified, including gaps within the verge detailing and areas of brickwork. On this basis, the report concluded that the building had bat roost potential and recommended that a bat emergence/re-entry survey be undertaken during the active bat season (May to September) to establish the presence or likely absence of roosting bats.

The assessment also identified no evidence of nesting birds within or on the building. Notwithstanding this, it recommended that precautionary working methods be adopted during construction and that two bird boxes be installed as a biodiversity enhancement measure. The provision of these enhancement measures can be secured by way of an appropriately worded planning condition.

In response to the recommendations of the Preliminary Roost Assessment, a Night-Time Bat Activity Survey prepared by Simply Ecology and dated July 2026 was subsequently submitted. The survey recorded generally low levels of bat activity within the wider area and found no evidence of bats emerging from or re-entering the building. The findings therefore indicate that the building is unlikely to support a bat roost and that the proposed development can proceed without resulting in adverse effects on bats.

Having regard to the submitted ecological information, it is considered that the proposal would not result in unacceptable impacts on protected species or biodiversity interests. Subject to the recommended biodiversity enhancement measures, the development is therefore considered acceptable in ecological terms.

Observations/Consideration of Matters Raised/Conclusion:

As such, it is 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.
------------------------	---