

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 14 February 2026 17:15
To: Planning
Subject: Re: Retrospective Planning Application –3/2026/0017

⚠ External Email

This email originated from outside Ribble Valley Borough Council. Do **NOT** click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and are sure the content within this email is safe.

To whom it may concern,

I write to formally object to the above retrospective planning application.

Planning permission was originally granted for the construction of a garage. However, what has been built is a large open-sided carport (though it is referred to in the application as a garage), which is materially different in both design and function from the approved scheme.

The structure has also been constructed at a 90-degree angle to the orientation shown on the approved plans. This significant alteration changes the visual relationship between the building, the host dwelling and neighbouring properties. The development as built is considerably more prominent and visually intrusive than the approved garage would have been.

In addition, the carport has been erected within two metres of the neighbouring boundaries, and its height appears to exceed the maximum permitted development allowance applicable in such circumstances. As such, the structure does not comply with standard height limitations and cannot reasonably be considered comparable to the previously approved garage.

The scale, bulk and open-sided design of the carport make it appear oversized and out of keeping with the character of the surrounding area. It lacks the visual solidity and subservient appearance typically associated with a domestic garage, instead presenting as a dominant and incongruous addition.

The property also borders a Conservation Area. While the site itself may lie outside the designation, national and local planning policy requires that development must preserve or enhance the setting of a conservation area. In my view, the scale, siting and appearance of this carport fail to preserve that setting and instead detract from the character and visual amenity of the adjoining conservation area.

Furthermore, granting retrospective consent for a structure that departs so significantly from the approved plans risks undermining confidence in the planning process and setting an undesirable precedent.

For the reasons outlined above, the development as constructed does not accord with the approved permission, appears to conflict with height limitations, and causes harm to the character of the area and the setting of the adjacent conservation area. I therefore respectfully request that the Local Planning Authority refuse this retrospective application.

Yours faithfully,