


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

<b>Signed:</b>	<b>Officer:</b>	<b>EP</b>	<b>Date:</b>	<b>12/05/2026</b>	<b>Manager:</b>	<b>LH</b>	<b>Date:</b>	<b>13/5/26</b>
----------------	-----------------	-----------	--------------	-------------------	-----------------	-----------	--------------	----------------

<b>Application Ref:</b>	2025/0954			 <b>Ribble Valley Borough Council</b> <small>www.ribblevalley.gov.uk</small>				
<b>Date Inspected:</b>	16/04/2026	<b>Site Notice:</b>	16/04/2026					
<b>Officer:</b>	EP							
<b>DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:</b>					<b>REFUSAL</b>			

<b>Development Description:</b>	Proposed demolition of garage, storage building and porch and erection of new single-storey extension to side and rear.
<b>Site Address/Location:</b>	4 Valley View Sawley Road Grindleton Clitheroe BB7 4RP.

<b>CONSULTATIONS:</b>	<b>Parish/Town Council</b>
Grindleton Parish Council raise no objection.	

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

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

**RELEVANT POLICIES AND SITE PLANNING HISTORY:**

**Ribble Valley Core Strategy:**

Key Statement DS1: Development Strategy  
Key Statement DS2: Sustainable Development  
Key Statement EN2: Landscape  
Key Statement EN5: Heritage Assets

Policy DMG1: General Considerations  
Policy DMG2: Strategic Considerations  
Policy DME2: Landscape & Townscape Protection  
Policy DME4: Protecting Heritage Assets  
Policy DMH5: Residential and Curtilage Extensions

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act  
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 semi-detached dwelling in Grindleton. The surrounding area is predominantly residential and typified by varying styles of dwelling. The application site is within the designated National Landscape and Grindleton Conservation Area.

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

Consent is sought for the construction of a single storey side and rear extension following demolition of the existing garage and storage building at the rear of the site.

**Impact upon Character/appearance of Conservation Area and Visual Amenity:**

The application property lies within the Grindleton Conservation Area. With reference to making decisions on applications for development in Conservation Areas, Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that: "...special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area."

This guidance is reiterated in Key Statement EN5 of the Ribble Borough Valley Core Strategy which stipulates that all development proposals should respect and safeguard the character, appearance and significance of Conservation Areas.

In addition, Policy DME4 of the Core Strategy states that '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'.

Conservation Areas - Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas.

Paragraphs 212 and 215 of the NPPF state:-

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 or less than substantial harm to its significance.

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.

In addition, the application site is located within the designated National Landscape. In relation to the National Landscape (formerly the AONB) Key Statement EN2 of the Core Strategy stipulates that 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.

The proposed extension is positioned along the side elevation of the existing dwelling and, although it projects predominantly into the rear curtilage, it would nonetheless remain visible from the public realm and within the Conservation Area. This visibility is intensified by the elevated siting of the host property above the public highway, increasing the proposed extension's visual prominence.

The extension, measuring approximately 16.3m in length and 7.75m at its widest point, adopts an 'L'-shaped configuration. Its substantial rearward projection would result in an anomalous and disproportionate addition that fails to read as a subservient addition to the host dwelling. If constructed, the cumulative built

form would extend roughly 21.5m from the principal elevation to the rear elevation of the proposed works, significantly exceeding the scale and depth of the existing, and immediately neighbouring, property.

Such an extensive projection would create a visually dominant mass that is at odds with the established proportions of the host building. Given its elevated position and subsequent visibility from the public highway, the proposal would introduce a conspicuous and intrusive element that would erode the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

It is acknowledged that an existing 'L'-shaped outbuilding occupies part of the site and would be removed to facilitate the proposed extension. While the configuration of the proposal loosely reflects the footprint of this existing structure, the comparison is limited. The existing outbuilding is detached, and this separation provides a degree of visual relief between it and the main dwelling, reducing its perceived mass and mitigating its impact on the surrounding area. The extension as proposed would eliminate this separation entirely along the north-eastern boundary. The continuous built form created by attaching the extension to the host dwelling would significantly increase the perceived bulk of development on this side of the plot. Without the visual break currently afforded by the detached outbuilding, the proposal would read as a single, enlarged mass, resulting in a form that appears bulky and disproportionate. This intensification would therefore exacerbate the extension's visual prominence and therefore the development fails to appear subservient.

As such, the proposed extension fails to adopt a subservient position to the host dwelling. Its elevated position, combined with the excessive bulk and massing of the built form, results in a development that competes visually with the host property. The proposal therefore conflicts with Policies DMG1, DMG2, DME4 and Key Statements EN2 and EN5 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy, which require development to be sympathetic to existing built form, preserve and enhance designated heritage assets and valued landscapes. It is also contrary to Paragraphs 135, 187, 212 and 215 of the NPPF, which emphasise the need for great weight to be given to the conservation of heritage assets and for development to respond sensitively to local character and protect valued landscapes.

#### **Impact Upon Residential Amenity:**

Ribble Valley Core Strategy Policy DMG1 provides specific guidance in relation to amenity and states that all development must:

1. not adversely affect the amenities of the surrounding area.
2. provide adequate day lighting and privacy distances.
3. have regard to public safety and secured by design principles.
4. consider air quality and mitigate adverse impacts where possible'

Paragraph 135 of the NPPF stipulates that development should 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.

The proposed extension would result in the creation of solid built form across the entirety of the northeastern boundary, where the neighbouring property No.5 Valley View is located. The proposed extension will have varying eaves and ridge heights measuring 2.45m and 4m respectively at its tallest point.

Although the neighbouring dwelling itself is set in from the shared boundary and is therefore unlikely to experience significant loss of light or an overbearing impact to habitable rooms, the proposal still raises concerns regarding the impact on residential amenity, particularly in relation to the neighbouring garden space. A large portion of the neighbouring garden would be subject to loss of light and overbearing impact insofar that the extension would result in solid built along the entire boundary. In addition, the neighbouring property is on lower ground level than the application site. This would intensify the perceived height and dominance of the structure when experienced from the neighbouring garden.

As such, the proposed extension, by virtue of its continuous and visually dominant built form along the full length of the north-eastern boundary, together with its height, massing, and the significantly lower ground level of the adjoining property at No. 5 Valley View, would result in unacceptable overshadowing and overbearing impact to the neighbouring garden, contrary to Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and Paragraph 135 of the NPPF.

**Highways and Parking:**

LCC Highways were consulted in relation to the proposal and raise no objection.

**Landscape/Ecology:**

Biodiversity.

The development is exempt from having to achieve the mandatory Biodiversity Net Gain requirement as it is a householder application.

Bats.

A preliminary bat roost assessment has been conducted at the application site on 06/03/2026. The survey concluded that no evidence of bats was recorded and the building offer negligible roosting potential. No further surveys are required.

**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 refusal.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

That planning consent be refused for the following reason(s).

- |            |   |
|------------|---|
| <b>01:</b> | The proposed extension, by virtue of its elevated position, scale, siting, bulk and massing fails to take a subservient position to the host dwelling resulting in an anomalous and disproportionate form of development of harm to the existing building, character and appearance of the Grindleton Conservation Area and the wider National Landscape. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies DMG1, DMG2 and DME4 and Key Statements EN2 and EN5 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and Paragraphs 135, 187 and 212 and 215 of the National Planning Policy Framework. |
| <b>02:</b> | The proposed extension, by virtue of its continuous and visually dominant built form along the full length of the north-eastern boundary, together with its height, massing, and the significantly lower ground level of the adjoining property at No. 5 Valley View, would result in unacceptable overshadowing and overbearing impacts for the occupants of No.5 Valley View in particular from their garden, contrary to Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and Paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework.   |