


Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.

Signed:	Officer:	SK	Date:	24/10/25	Manager:	LH	Date:	24/10/25
----------------	-----------------	-----------	--------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------	--------------	-----------------

Application Ref:	2025/0745			 Ribble Valley Borough Council <small>www.ribblevalley.gov.uk</small>
Date Inspected:	3.10.25	Site Notice:	3.10.25	
Officer:	Stephen Kilmartin			
DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:				APPROVAL

Development Description:	Listed Building Consent for reinstatement of window and greenhouse in garden.
Site Address/Location:	Duke of York Inn Grindleton Brow Grindleton BB7 4QR

CONSULTATIONS:	Parish/Town Council
Grindleton Parish Council have raised no objection to the proposal.	

CONSULTATIONS:	Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies
N/A:	
N/A:	
CONSULTATIONS:	Additional Representations.
One letter of representation has been received supporting the proposal.	

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 EN4: Biodiversity and Geodiversity Key Statement EN5: Heritage Assets Key Statement DMI2: Transport Considerations</p> <p>Policy DMG1: General Considerations Policy DMG2: Strategic Considerations Policy DMG3: Transport & Mobility Policy DME1: Protecting Trees & Woodland Policy DME2: Landscape & Townscape Protection Policy DME3: Site and Species Protection and Conservation Policy DME4: Protecting Heritage Assets Policy DME5: Renewable Energy Policy DME6: Water Management</p> <p>Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)</p>
Relevant Planning History:
2025/0314:

Approval of details reserved by conditions 12 (biodiversity net gain) and 13 (habitat management and monitoring plan) and the statutory biodiversity condition of planning permission 3/2024/0439. (Approved)

2025/0214:

Approval of details reserved by conditions 3 (walling and roofing materials), 4 (specifications of proposed windows and doors), 5 (conservation roof lights), 6 (boundary treatments), 7 (archaeological investigation), 8 (staircase) and 9 (lighting) of Listed Building Consent 3/2024/0440. (Approved)

2025/0213:

Approval of details reserved by conditions 3 (walling and roofing materials), 4 (specifications of proposed windows and doors), 5 (conservation roof lights), 6 (boundary treatments), 7 (archaeological investigation), 8 (lighting), 10 (parking and turning), 11 (landscaping), 12 (biodiversity gain plan) and 13 (habitat management and monitoring) of planning permission 3/2024/0439. (Approved)

2024/0440:

Listed Building Consent for change of use from public house with living accommodation to residential use. Demolition of side and rear extensions and construction of single-storey extension to side and detached garage. Alteration to vehicle access and creation of domestic curtilage. (Approved)

2024/0439:

Application for planning permission for change of use from public house with living accommodation to residential use. Demolition of side and rear extensions and construction of single-storey extension to side and detached garage. Alteration to vehicle access and creation of domestic curtilage. (Approved)

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:

Site Description and Surrounding Area:

The application relates to the former Duke of York Inn located on Grindleton Brow, Grindleton. The building is a Grade II designated heritage asset (List entry number: 1072148), with the listing description as follows:

Public house, early C19th. Squared sandstone with diagonal tooling. Stone slate roof. Double-pile plan with end stacks and chamfered quoins. 2 storeys with attic, 2 bays. Windows sashed with no glazing bars and with plain stone surrounds. To the left of the door is a double window with central square mullion. The door, between the bays, has a plain stone surround and moulded open pediment on console brackets. The gables have copings and footstones. To the left is a further bay having a double window on the ground floor and a single window above, and with quoins having diagonal tooling. The right-hand return wall (facing east) has 3 windows on the ground floor and 4 on the 1st floor, similar to those of the main facade. Above is an attic window with plain stone surround and semi-circular head.

Listing NGR: SD7590045490

The application site is also located within the designated Grindleton Conservation Area, located at the western extents and within the defined settlement limits of Grindleton (Tier 2 settlement).

The application building benefits from an extant consent (3/2024/0439) for a change of use from a public house with living accommodation to that of C3 residential use, including associated external and internal alterations. The consent remains extant insofar that works pursuant to the consent have already commenced on site.

Proposed Development for which consent is sought:

The application seeks Listed building Consent for the erection of a 'greenhouse' structure within the curtilage of the building. With it also being proposed that a window on the rear elevation of the building, that served a previous stairwell will be reinstated.

It is proposed that the greenhouse structure will be located at the north-eastern extents of the 'garden' area of the property, being built off the existing shared boundary stone wall to the rear of numbers 2 and 3 Kayley Terrace. The greenhouse will benefit from a footprint of 10m by 3m with a small central gable projection projecting 600mm westward from the primary elevation of the structure. The structure will measure 2.9m at its highest point with an eaves height of approximately 2.1m.

The structure will be of a mono-pitch configuration with the elevations and roof being predominantly glazed, save that from a natural stone lower perimeter wall element upon which the glazed structure will be constructed. It is proposed that the greenhouse glazed element will be of a timber frame construction, with the highest part of the structure being approximately 600mm lower than the highest point of the boundary wall that it will benefit from a direct interface with.

In respect of the proposed window to be reinstated, the submitted details propose the window will be on the rear elevation of the building, with the window opening measuring 700mm in width, being 3.75m in height. The window will be multi-lite in design, of a timber frame construction benefiting from stone surround, head and sill detailing to match the detailing found on other windows on the rear elevation of the building.

Impact upon Listed Building(s) and Setting:

The application relates to the former Duke of York Inn located on Grindleton Brow, Grindleton. The building is a Grade II designated heritage asset (List entry number: 1072148), with the listing description as follows:

Public house, early C19th. Squared sandstone with diagonal tooling. Stone slate roof. Double-pile plan with end stacks and chamfered quoins. 2 storeys with attic, 2 bays. Windows sashed with no glazing bars and with plain stone surrounds. To the left of the door is a double window with central square mullion. The door, between the bays, has a plain stone surround and moulded open pediment on console brackets. The gables have copings and footstones. To the left is a further bay having a double window on the ground floor and a single window above, and with quoins having diagonal tooling. The right-hand return wall (facing east) has 3 windows on the ground floor and 4 on the 1st floor, similar to those of the main facade. Above is an attic window with plain stone surround and semi-circular head.

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 listed 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 conserves 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 on 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

3. *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 principle 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 feature, 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 2023):

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 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 205 – 214 reading as follows:

Considering Potential Impacts:

205:

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 or less than substantial harm to its significance.

206:

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.*

207:

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 bringing the site back into use.*

208:

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.

209:

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

210:

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.

211:

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.

212:

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.

213:

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:

Greenhouse:

It is proposed that the greenhouse structure will be located at the north-eastern extents of the 'garden' area of the property, being built off the existing shared boundary stone wall to the rear of numbers 2 and 3 Kayley Terrace. The greenhouse will benefit from a footprint of 10m by 3m with a small central gable projection projecting 600mm westward from the primary elevation of the structure. The structures will measure 2.9m at its highest point with an eaves height of approximately 2.1m, with the highest part of the structure being approximately 600mm lower than the highest point of the boundary wall that it will benefit from a direct interface with.

The structure will be of a mono-pitch configuration with the elevations and roof being predominantly glazed, save that from a natural stone lower perimeter wall element upon which the glazed structure will be constructed. It is proposed that the greenhouse glazed element will be of a timber frame construction.

The greenhouse structure will be sited towards the north-eastern extents of the curtilage of the property, approximately 11m to the east of a garage structure consented pursuant to Listed Building consent 3/2024/0440 and planning consent 3/2024/0439, which also granted consent for the change of use of the existing building to that of a C3 residential dwelling.

In respect of the extant consent, associated garage and currently proposed greenhouse structure. The character of the application building, upon works being completed relating to the extant permissions (3/2024/0440 and 3/2024/0439), will be predominantly residential and domestic in character compared to that of the previous commercial character of the building. In this respect the introduction of the greenhouse structure is unlikely to be read as being incongruous or anomalous.

In respect of the design and configuration of the greenhouse, the proposed elevational language, materials and glazing arrangement is considered to be sympathetic to the character of the existing building and by virtue of its distance from the Grade II Designated Heritage Asset, is unlikely to result in any significant measurable harm to the inherent character or significance of the asset.

It is recognised that the greenhouse structure will be afforded some limited visibility upon approach from the south from the public realm. However, given the location of the structure, in that it is to be sited at the north-eastern extents of the curtilage of the property, it is not considered that the structure will result in any adverse impacts upon the character or significance of the existing Grade II Listed Building nor any significant adverse visual impacts upon the character or visual amenities of the area.

Window Reinstatement:

In respect of the proposed window to be reinstated, the submitted details propose the window will be on the rear elevation of the building, with the window opening measuring 700mm in width, being 3.75m in height. The window will be multi-lite in design, of a timber frame construction benefiting from stone surround, head and sill detailing to match the detailing found on other windows on the rear elevation of the building.

The submitted information states that the window was a previous feature that served a staircase that was previously historically removed, with photographic evidence being submitted that suggests that this may be the case. In this respect, taking account of the configuration of the proposed window, it is not considered that the reinstatement of the feature will result in any significant adverse harm to the character or significance of the Grade II Designated Heritage Asset. Conditions will be imposed requiring sections details of the window to be submitted prior to installation to ensure the detailing of the window remains sympathetic and responds positively to the existing fenestrational arrangements found on the building.

Conclusion:

As such, taking account of the above matters, it is not considered that the proposed development raises any significant direct conflict(s) 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 205 and 208 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Particularly in relation to potential adverse impacts on a Grade II Designated heritage Asset.

Impact upon Character/Appearance of Conservation Area:

The application site lies within the designated Grindleton Conservation Area. 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 proposed development(s).

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.*

With Policy DME4 stating, in respect of development within conservation areas or those affecting the listed 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 conserves 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 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

- 4. Be of a high standard of building design which considers the 8 building in context principles (from the CABE/English Heritage building on context toolkit.*
- 5. 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.*
- 6. 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

- 2. Not adversely affect the amenities of the surrounding area.*

ENVIRONMENT

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

Assessment of Impacts:

Greenhouse:

It is proposed that the greenhouse structure will be located at the north-eastern extents of the 'garden' area of the property, being built off the existing shared boundary stone wall to the rear of numbers 2 and 3 Kayley Terrace. The greenhouse will benefit from a footprint of 10m by 3m with a small central gable projection projecting 600mm westward from the primary elevation of the structure. The structures will measure 2.9m at its highest point with an eaves height of approximately 2.1m, with the highest part of the structure being approximately 600mm lower than the highest point of the boundary wall that it will benefit from a direct interface with.

The structure will be of a mono-pitch configuration with the elevations and roof being predominantly glazed, save that from a natural stone lower perimeter wall element upon which the glazed structure will be constructed. It is proposed that the greenhouse glazed element will be of a timber frame construction.

The greenhouse structure will be sited towards the north-eastern extents of the curtilage of the property, approximately 11m to the east of a garage structure consented pursuant to Listed Building consent 3/2024/0440 and planning consent 3/2024/0439, which also granted consent for the change of use of the existing building to that of a C3 residential dwelling.

In respect of the extant consent, associated garage and currently proposed greenhouse structure. The character of the application building, upon works being completed relating to the extant permissions (3/2024/0440 and 3/2024/0439), will be predominantly residential and domestic in character compared to

that of the previous commercial character of the building. In this respect the introduction of the greenhouse structure is unlikely to be read as being incongruous or anomalous.

It is recognised that the greenhouse structure will be afforded some limited visibility upon approach from the south from the public realm. However, given the location of the structure, in that it is to be sited at the north-eastern extents of the curtilage of the property and taking account of the design, configuration and materials proposed, it is not considered that the greenhouse structure will result in any adverse impacts upon the character or visual amenities of the designated Grindleton Conservation Area.

Window Reinstatement:

In respect of the proposed window to be reinstated, the submitted details propose the window will be on the rear elevation of the building, with the window opening measuring 700mm in width, being 3.75m in height. The window will be multi-lite in design, of a timber frame construction benefiting from stone surround, head and sill detailing to match the detailing found on other windows on the rear elevation of the building.

The submitted information states that the window was a previous feature that served a staircase that was previously historically removed, with photographic evidence being submitted that suggests that this may be the case. In this respect, taking account of the configuration of the proposed window, it is not considered that the reinstatement of the feature will result in any significant adverse harm to the character or visual amenities of the designated Grindleton Conservation Area. Particularly insofar that the window will not be afforded any visibility from the wider public realm and is considered to be a positive introduction into the building.

As such, taking account of the above matters, it is not considered that the proposed development raises any significant direct conflict(s) 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 205 and 208 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Particularly in relation to adverse impacts upon the character of visual amenities of the Designated Grindleton Conservation Area.

Impact Upon Residential Amenity:

Given the application building and proposed greenhouse structure adjoins a shared boundary that serves a number of existing residential receptors, consideration must be given in respect of the potential for the proposal to result in undue impacts upon existing nearby residential amenities.

It is proposed that the greenhouse structure will be located at the north-eastern extents of the 'garden' area of the property, being built off the existing shared boundary stone wall to the rear of numbers 2 and 3 Kayley Terrace. The greenhouse will benefit from a footprint of 10m by 3m with a small central gable projection projecting 600mm westward from the primary elevation of the structure. The structures will measure 2.9m at its highest point with an eaves height of approximately 2.1m, with the highest part of the structure being approximately 600mm lower than the highest point of the boundary wall that it will benefit from a direct interface with.

The structure will be of a mono-pitch configuration with the elevations and roof being predominantly glazed, save that from a natural stone lower perimeter wall element upon which the glazed structure will be constructed. It is proposed that the greenhouse glazed element will be of a timber frame construction.

In respect of potential impacts upon existing residential amenities, given that the structure is to be set approximately 600mm lower than that of the shared boundary stone wall to the rear of numbers 2 and 3 Kayley Terrace, it is not considered that the structure will result in any adverse impacts by virtue of overbearing impact nor loss of light.

Furthermore, taking account of the relationship of the structure with the shared boundary wall and the orientation of the glazed elements of the greenhouse, it is not considered that the proposal will result in any adverse impacts upon the residential amenities of amenities of nearby residential occupiers by virtue of a loss of privacy.

As such, and taking account of the above matters, the proposal does not raise any significant direct conflicts with Policy DMG1 which seeks to ensure of adequate standards of residential amenity and protect against development(s) that would result in measurable detrimental impact(s) upon nearby existing residential amenities.

Landscape/Ecology:

The proposal does not directly affect any existing trees, hedgerow or habitats of conservation concern. As such and taking account of the above, the proposal does not raise any significant measurable conflict(s) with Policies DME1, DME2 nor DME3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy which seek to protect against adverse impacts upon habitat, biodiversity, ecology or protected species and species of conservation concern.

Observations/Consideration of Matters Raised/Conclusion:

As such, for the above reasons and having regard to all material considerations and matters raised that the application is recommended for approval.

RECOMMENDATION:

That Listed Building Consent be granted subject to the imposition of conditions.