


Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.

Signed:	Officer:	EP	Date:	09/04/2026	Manager:	LH	Date:	10/4/26
----------------	-----------------	-----------	--------------	-------------------	-----------------	-----------	--------------	----------------

Application Ref:	2026/0024			 Ribble Valley Borough Council www.ribblevalley.gov.uk					
Date Inspected:	13/03/2026	Site Notice:	N/A						
Officer:	EP								
DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:					REFUSAL				

Development Description:	Proposed first floor extension above existing attached garage.
Site Address/Location:	Casa Mia 8 Beasley Avenue Simonstone BB12 7HU

CONSULTATIONS:	Parish/Town Council
Simonstone Parish Council raised no objection.	

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

CONSULTATIONS:	Additional Representations.
No comments received.	

RELEVANT POLICIES AND SITE PLANNING HISTORY:

Ribble Valley Core Strategy:

Key Statement DS1: Development Strategy
Key Statement DS2: Sustainable Development

Policy DMG1: General Considerations
Policy DMG2: Strategic Considerations
Policy DMH5: Residential and Curtilage Extensions

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Relevant Planning History:

3/2002/1033: Domestic garage extension.
3/2000/0629: Extensions and alterations.

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:

Site Description and Surrounding Area:

The application relates to a detached bungalow property in Simonstone. The application site does not benefit from any special designations and the surrounding area is predominately residential in nature.

Proposed Development for which consent is sought:

Consent is sought for the construction of a first-floor extension above the existing garage building to accommodate extended living space.

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 first floor extension is location to the southwestern side of the application dwelling where No.4 and No.4a Beauley Avenue are located. The existing attached garage structure is approximately 3m from the shared boundary with the neighbours to the southwest, subsequently the proposed first floor extension has the potential to adversely impact receptors in respect of light lost and overbearing impact.

The proposed extension will comprise a maximum height of 6.8m at its tallest point, this is substantially taller than the existing single-storey garage which measures approximately 3m in height. The application dwelling sits on a higher ground level when compared with the neighbours to the southwest as a result of the sloping topography and therefore there is already a slight sense of overbearing amongst the existing arrangement. However, the introduction of a substantially taller structure adjacent to the southern boundary would exacerbate this overbearing impact to an unacceptable degree. There are a number of windows within the northern side elevation of the neighbouring property, along with a conservatory featuring an entirely glazed roof. In addition, there is a section of residential curtilage to the north of the neighbouring dwelling immediately adjacent to the proposed development. Given the proximity of the proposed extension to the neighbouring dwelling itself, which desktop analysis shows to be approximately 8.5m, and paired with the change in ground level, there is potential for a degree of light to be lost along with an overbearing impact to neighbouring habitable windows, and to residential curtilage, resultant of the proposed development.

Furthermore, there are three window openings proposed in the southwest side elevation of the proposed extension at first floor level. Given the proximity of these windows to neighbouring habitable windows and residential curtilage, there would be new opportunity for overlooking created and subsequently a loss of privacy resultant. It would be possible for these windows to be obscurely glazed which could be achieved via planning condition. However, given the close proximity to the boundary and number of windows proposed, there would still be an increased perception of overlooking which would be of harm to the residential amenities of neighbouring receptors.

It is recognised that there is an existing first floor balcony above the existing garage structure, however, this is set away from the adjoining shared boundary and therefore does not afford the same levels of overlooking as the proposed windows.

As such, the proposed extension would result in unacceptable harm to neighbouring amenity by virtue of the proposed scale of the extension which would inflict unacceptable overbearing impact and loss of light to habitable windows and residential curtilage. In addition, the creation of new window openings at first floor level immediately adjacent to the shared boundary would create new opportunity for overlooking and

subsequently loss of privacy. The development therefore fails to accord with Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and Paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

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.*

In consort with DMG1 Policy DMH5 stipulates that *proposals to extend or alter existing residential properties must accord with policy DMG1 and any relevant designations within which the site is located.*

At a national level 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'.*

The proposed first floor extension would be highly visible from within the public realm, as such careful consideration must be given into respect the impact of the development on the character of streetscene.

The proposed extension will be sited above the existing attached garage structure. The development will sit forward of the principal and rear building lines of the application dwelling with the proposed ridge height exceeding that of the main dwelling. When viewed from the public highway the height increase is approximately 3.5m when compared to the existing single-story garage, with the proposed ridge being 6.5m above ground level. As a result, the proposed extension would exceed the scale of the main dwelling and would therefore fail to remain subservient, taking an over dominant position within the street scene. The proposed extension would arguably read as the main dwelling, with the existing dwelling appearing as extensions. Furthermore, by virtue of the sloping topography of Bealey Avenue, the height of the proposed extension would be exacerbated significantly.

In respect of materials, the proposed extensions will be faced in render to match the existing dwelling. Render is a material found commonly on the vicinity, and whilst the design is unacceptable, this choice of materials would therefore integrate sufficiently into the streetscape.

Whilst there is no defined sense of uniformity within the streetscene, an extension of this nature would appear significantly out of character in as much that the proposal fails to remain subservient to the host dwelling by virtue of its scale and design. As a result, the development would result in the creation of an anomalous and disproportionate addition to the dwelling which would be of harm to the character and visual amenities of the area contrary to Policies DMG1 and DMH5 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and Paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Highways and Parking:

No highways safety implications identified.

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 02/02/2026. The submitted statement concluded that a full report is not necessary given the very low risk associated with the proposed work, and the building offers to evident roosting potential.

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).

- | | |
|------------|---|
| 01: | The proposed extension would result in unacceptable harm to neighbouring amenity by virtue of its proposed scale and siting, which would result in unacceptable overbearing impact and loss of light to neighbouring habitable windows and residential curtilage. In addition, the creation of new window openings at first floor level immediately adjacent to the shared boundary would create new opportunity for overlooking and subsequent loss of privacy. The development therefore fails to accord with Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and Paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework. |
| 02: | The development would result in the creation of an anomalous and disproportionate addition to the dwelling which would fail to take a subservient position by virtue of its height and scale, of harm to the character and visual amenities of the area and contrary to Polices DMG1 and DMH5 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and Paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework. |