


Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.

Signed:	Officer:	BT	Date:	22/12/25	Manager:	LH	Date:	22/12/25
----------------	-----------------	----	--------------	----------	-----------------	----	--------------	----------

Application Ref:	3/2025/0880			 Ribble Valley Borough Council www.ribblevalley.gov.uk
Date Inspected:	13/11/25	Site Notice:	13/11/25	
Officer:	BT			
DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:				REFUSAL

Development Description:	Retrospective application for single storey side extension.
Site Address/Location:	26 Whalley Road, Langho, BB6 8EJ.

CONSULTATIONS:	Parish/Town Council
Billington & Langho Parish Council:	Object to the proposed development on the basis that the unauthorised development disregards previous planning consents and neighbouring residents.

CONSULTATIONS:	Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies
LCC Highways:	No objection subject to condition.
United Utilities:	Consulted 7/11/25 – no response received to date.
CONSULTATIONS:	Additional Representations.
None.	

RELEVANT POLICIES AND SITE PLANNING HISTORY:

Ribble Valley Core Strategy:

- Key Statement DS1: Development Strategy
- Key Statement DS2: Sustainable Development
- Key Statement DMI2: Transport Considerations
- Policy DMG1: General Considerations
- Policy DMG2: Strategic Considerations
- Policy DMG3: Transport & Mobility
- Policy DMH5: Residential and Curtilage Extensions

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Relevant Planning History:

3/2025/0268:

Non material amendment to planning permission 3/2012/0034 involving alterations to the design of the previously approved side extension which remains extant following the implementation of other elements of the approved scheme (Approved)

3/2024/0155:

Retrospective change of use from a dwelling house (C3) to a residential institution (C2) including demolition of garage and construction of a single-storey extension to the side and additional parking to front (Refused)

3/2012/0034:

Proposed dormer windows to the front, together with a side extension to the bungalow and demolition of the existing garage (Approved)

3/2010/0020:

Amendment to approved consent 3/2009/0663P to incorporate a window to the first floor rear elevation (storage area only) (Approved)

3/2009/0663:

Extension to rear of dwelling (Approved)

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:

Site Description and Surrounding Area:

The application relates to a semi-detached dormer bungalow property in Langho. The property comprises rendered elevations, UPVC doors and windows and a cross gabled roof detailed in concrete tiles. The property has previously been extended by way of two gabled front dormer windows, a two storey rear reverse gable extension and an unauthorised single storey gabled / flat roof side extension which forms the subject of this application. The property's front garden area comprises a mixture of sandstone paving and grass with the paved area accommodating off-street parking for the property. Hedges border the front and rear perimeters of the property with panelled timber fencing bordering the North-eastern perimeter of the property. The property occupies a visually prominent corner plot location on the junction between Whalley Road and Springdale Road with the former providing access to the property. No. 24 Whalley Road adjoins the South-western side of the site and bears a similar visual appearance to the application property. The surrounding area predominantly comprises residential housing.

Proposed Development for which consent is sought:

Planning consent was previously granted for the construction of a reverse gabled side extension to the North-eastern elevation of the application property under application planning application 3/2012/0034. An alternative design for the approved side extension was subsequently approved under non-material amendment application 3/2025/0268 however a single storey gabled / flat roof side extension has since been constructed on the North-eastern elevation of the application property which does not accord with the design approved under application 3/2025/0268. As such, retrospective planning consent is sought to retain the aforementioned unauthorised side extension currently in place, with additional consent also being sought for alterations to the extension's front roof profile.

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 window openings within the unauthorised side extension solely provide views into the front and rear garden areas of the application property. In addition, the modified extension is screened from the adjoining neighbouring property of No. 24 Whalley Road by virtue of being sited on the North-eastern gable end of the application property. Furthermore, the modified extension is sited approximately 13 metres away for the adjacent neighbouring property of No. 28 Whalley Road and as such does not have an overbearing impact on this property by virtue of the separation distance in place. As such, no concerns are raised with respect to loss of privacy, outlook or natural light to neighbouring properties through retention of the unauthorised development.

Taking account of all of the above, it is not considered that retention of the unauthorised development would be harmful to the amenity of any neighbouring residents. The proposed development would therefore be compliant with the aims and objectives of Paragraph 135 (f) of the NPPF and Policy DMG1.

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.'

The extension approved under application 3/2025/0268 comprises a front roof slope with a discernible set down from the front roof slope of the application property. In addition, an amended scheme was negotiated under this consent with the front elevation of the extension incorporating a 0.5 metre set back from the principal elevation of the application property (increased from the 0.3 metres as was originally proposed). As such, the extension approved under non-material amendment application 3/2025/0268 comprises a largely subservient design in relation to its host property.

In contrast, the front roof slope of the unauthorised extension incorporates a minimal set down with its front roof slope and ridgeline being almost flush with the principal roof slope and ridgeline of the application property. In addition, whilst a 0.5 metre set back has been retained to the extension's front elevation, the front eaves and soffit of the extension overhang its front elevation which in turn diminishes its set back from the application property's principal elevation. As such, the unauthorised extension, by virtue of its roof symmetry and overall scale, bulk and massing reads as an over dominant, unsympathetic and incongruous addition to the application property and existing street scene.

Furthermore, the existing roof tiles in place on the front roof slope of the extension are currently at odds with both the design and colour of those in place on the principal roof slope of the application property. Whilst it is stated that reclaimed roof tiles are to be incorporated to the front roof slope of the extension to address this visual imbalance, it remains doubtful as to whether an exact match could be achieved between any reclaimed roof tiles sourced and those currently in place on the principal roof slope of the host property. Similarly, the existing roof tiles in place on the rear roof slope of the extension comprise a different colour detail to the existing roof tiles in place on the rear roof slope of the application property and whilst it is proposed to power wash the tiles on the host property to tone in with the tiles on the extension, it remains unclear as to whether this would provide an effective solution to the current visual imbalance in place.

Moreover, the application property occupies a visually prominent corner plot location with the unauthorised extension being clearly viewable in the public realm from both Whalley Road and Springdale

Road therefore retention of the unauthorised development and additional works proposed to the roof would carry a discernible visual impact.

Taking account of the above, it is considered that retention of the unauthorised development and implementation of the additional works proposed would be harmful to the visual amenities of the area and would therefore fail to satisfy the requirements of Paragraphs 135 (C) and Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.

Highways and Parking:

The unauthorised development has been subject to review from Lancashire County Council Highways who have raised no objections with regards to its retention in relation to access, vehicular parking or general highway safety, subject to the imposition of a condition with regards to vehicle parking provisions and surface materials. In light of the above, it is not considered that retention of the unauthorised development would have any undue impacts upon highway safety as such the proposal satisfies Policy DMG1 of the Core Strategy (highways).

Landscape/Ecology:

No ecological constraints were identified in relation to the proposal.

Other Matters:

Sewer infrastructure

Constraint analysis shows the presence of a sewer which runs directly beneath the ground floor area of the unauthorised single storey side extension. It is unclear whether construction of the unauthorised extension has compromised the sewer infrastructure on site and no response has been received from United Utilities who have been formally consulted on the application. However, this is considered to be a matter covered by separate legislation and the applicant is advised to make contact with United Utilities if they have not done so already to discuss the works implemented on site.

Observations/Consideration of Matters Raised/Conclusion:

The unauthorised development, by virtue of its roof symmetry and overall scale, bulk, massing and proposed use of roof materials is considered to be of poor design and would read as an unsympathetic, incongruous and over dominant addition to the application property if retained and fully implemented as proposed. Furthermore its prominent corner siting would mean that the resultant development would be clearly visible in the street scene and as such is considered harmful to the visual amenities of the area. Retention of the unauthorised development and the additional works proposed would therefore fail to satisfy the requirements of Paragraph 135 (c) and Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.

Furthermore, Paragraph 139 of the NPPF states:

'Development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design.'

Moreover, Paragraph 140 of the NPPF states that Local planning authorities should seek to ensure that the quality of approved developments is not materially diminished between permission and completion as a result of changes being made to approved schemes however in this instance the works proposed for retention under the current application are considered to be a substandard form of development

relative to developments previously secured for the application property, namely applications 3/2012/0034 and 3/2025/0268.

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

RECOMMENDATION: That planning consent be refused for the following reason:

01: The proposed development, by virtue of its roof symmetry and overall scale, bulk, massing and proposed use of roof materials is considered to be of poor design and would read as an unsympathetic, incongruous and over dominant addition to the application property. Furthermore its prominent corner siting would mean that the development would be clearly visible in the street scene and as such is considered harmful to the visual amenities of the area. The development would therefore fail to satisfy the requirements of Paragraphs 135 (c) and 140 of the NPPF and Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.