


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

<b>Signed:</b>	<b>Officer:</b>	<b>EP</b>	<b>Date:</b>	<b>20/03/2026</b>	<b>Manager:</b>	<b>LH</b>	<b>Date:</b>	<b>23.3.26</b>
----------------	-----------------	-----------	--------------	-------------------	-----------------	-----------	--------------	----------------

<b>Application Ref:</b>	2026/0017				Ribble Valley Borough Council <a href="http://www.ribblevalley.gov.uk">www.ribblevalley.gov.uk</a>
<b>Date Inspected:</b>	24/02/2026	<b>Site Notice:</b>	N/A		
<b>Officer:</b>	EP				
<b>DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:</b>					<b>REFUSAL</b>

<b>Development Description:</b>	Retrospective consent for proposed new double garage on the site of previously approved garage.
<b>Site Address/Location:</b>	2 George Street, Whalley BB7 9HT.

<b>CONSULTATIONS:</b>	<b>Parish/Town Council</b>
No comments received.	

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

<b>CONSULTATIONS:</b>	<b>Additional Representations.</b>
One letter of objection has been received raising the following concerns	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Difference in design and function compared to approved scheme</li><li>- Visually intrusive and prominent</li><li>- Out of character adjacent to Conservation Area</li><li>- Undermines Planning process</li></ul>	

**RELEVANT POLICIES AND SITE PLANNING HISTORY:**

<b>Ribble Valley Core Strategy:</b>
Key Statement DS1: Development Strategy
Key Statement DS2: Sustainable Development
Policy DMG1: General Considerations
Policy DMG2: Strategic Considerations
Policy DME4: Protecting Heritage Assets
Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act
National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

<b>Relevant Planning History:</b>
3/2024/0361: Demolition of utility room, garage and wall to front garden. Construction of two-storey extension to side and rear, single-storey extension to side, new double garage to rear and new vehicular accesses to front and rear, including parking spaces for two cars.
It is worth noting, having reviewed the plans submitted with this application, that the permission for the previously approved garage is unlikely to have been implemented because the clearance distances shown on the approved plans couldn't have been achieved and therefore it is assumed the site was inaccurately

measured. Therefore this previously approved scheme is not a fall-back position that should be afforded any weight in the assessment below.

#### **ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:**

##### **Site Description and Surrounding Area:**

The application relates to a semi-detached property fronting Geroge Street in Whalley. The application it itself is not on any designated land but does sit adjacent to Whalley Conservation Area boundary. The surrounding area is a combination of commercial and residential properties.

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

The application seeks retrospective consent for the construction of a timber framed garage structure within the rear curtilage of the application site. The application also involves the creation of a vehicular access and driveway following demolition of the previous detached garage.

##### **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 application structure is located in close proximity to the shared boundary with neighbouring dwelling, The Old Exchange. The approved garage structure had an orientation that resulted in the pitched roof sloping away from the shared boundary with The Old Exchange, together with a 1m separation distance, and that scheme was considered to have an acceptable impact in terms of loss of light and overbearing (as stated above it is not considered this scheme could be implemented in any event).

Whilst the separation distance is maintained, the change in orientation now means the amount of solid built form along the shared boundary appears greater, by virtue of the entire gable facing the neighbouring dwelling. This area of rear garden is narrow and therefore susceptible to any visual change along its boundaries. Additionally with a narrow garden this means that the proposed additional built form is also in close proximity to windows in the south elevation of this neighbouring property. The proposed change in built form adjacent to the boundary here results in an adverse level of overbearing impact and loss of light.

Whilst it is appreciated that a timber structure on the neighbouring property does mitigate the impact somewhat, on balance the proposed building is deemed unacceptable on neighbouring amenity grounds. The as-built garage results in loss of light to the residential curtilage of neighbouring receptors and an increased sense of overbearing contrary to Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and Paragraph 135 of the NPPF.

##### **Visual Amenity/External Appearance:**

Policy DMG1 of the RVCS states that development must

1. Be of a high standard of building design which considers the 8 building in context principles (from the CABE/English Heritage Building in 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.

Whilst the application site is not within the Whalley Conservation Area, it is sited immediately adjacent to it and therefore has the potential to impact the character of the Conservation Area.

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.

Ribble Valley Core Strategy DME4 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*'.

Under application 3/2024/0361 a replacement garage building was approved. This building was comparable in design to a previous building on the site which has been demolished and of the same orientation but sited further north. The building integrated into the existing boundary fence panels with a small set back from the access road and as such was considered to have an acceptable visual impact within the street scene. When viewed from the access road, the approved garage was set back from the rear curtilage by 1.14m and from the access road by 1.06m. As stated above it is not considered this scheme could be implemented in any event.

The garage structure that has been built, is sited almost immediately adjacent to the access road. The submitted plans suggest that there is a 400mm gap between the garage and the boundary fence, although when observed on site the gap appeared smaller, particularly when taking into regard the roof overhang. Whilst the proposal is sited to the rear of the dwelling, the road that runs adjacent provides access to a number of dwellings and as such the proposal is afforded public views. In addition, due to the change in orientation, the as-built garage structure does not integrate into the boundary fence, and the structure is afforded significant views from the new vehicular access point. As such, the as-built garage structure is far more visually prominent than the approved garage.

In respect of materials, the approved garage building was to be constructed in red brick, which is consistent with the vast majority of properties / built form in the immediate vicinity. There are also similar garage structures/storage buildings to the approved development adjacent to the application site. The as-built structure is of timber construction with a tiled roof profile. The choice of timber appears anomalous within the street scene by virtue of a lack of similar materials or structures in the vicinity. Furthermore, the timber structure appears stark in contrast with the red coloured roof tiles and other red brick structures in the

street scene. The choice of materials, being anomalous in this location, further exacerbates the visual prominence of the structure, particularly given there is no set back from the access road.

Whilst it is recognised fold back gates are proposed at the vehicular access (although these were not observed on the site visit), these would not sufficiently mitigate the development. Additionally, the council would have no control over the use of these gates as a means of screening, given they would be regularly used for vehicular movements.

A timber structure of this scale and design, with exacerbated visual prominence being adjacent to the access road, appears anomalous and out of character with the street scene and resulting in harm to the character of the adjacent Conservation Area, contrary to Policies DMG1 and DME4 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and paragraphs 212 and 215 of the NPPF.

**Highways and Parking:**

LCC Highways were consulted in relation to the proposal and raised no objection the scheme but recommended that the comments from the previous approval are noted.

Highways comments do not directly address the altered arrangement, particularly in relation to the new access and driveway. However, on the basis that there was a garage at the siting of the new vehicular access previously, which had the potential for vehicles to enter and exit, the new arrangement is not expected to result in adverse impacts from a highways amenity perspective.

**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.

<b>01:</b>	The proposed development results in the introduction of an anomalous and visually prominent addition to the street scene which is also harmful to the character of the adjacent Conservation Area, by virtue of its scale, siting, roof design and materials, contrary to Policies DMG1 and DME4 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and Paragraphs 212 and 215 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
------------	---

<b>02:</b>	The proposed garage results in unacceptable loss of light, sense of enclosure and overbearing impact for the occupiers of neighbouring property 'The Old Exchange' by virtue of its scale, siting and roof design, contrary to Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and Paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
------------	--