

Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.								
Signed:	Officer:	AR	Date:	29/07/2026	Manager:	LH	Date:	31/7/26

Application Ref:	3/2026/0340			 Ribble Valley Borough Council www.ribblevalley.gov.uk
Date Inspected:	19/06/26	Site Notice:	19/06/2026	
Officer:	AR			
DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:				REFUSAL

Development Description:	Proposed first floor extension over existing single storey extension.
Site Address/Location:	53 Riverside Clitheroe BB7 2NS

CONSULTATIONS:	Parish/Town Council
Clitheroe Town Council: wishes to object to the proposal on the basis of potential over-development of the site and the potential adverse effect on the provision of light to a neighbouring property.	

CONSULTATIONS:	Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies
LCC Highways:	No objections. The Highway Development Control Section is of the opinion that the proposed development will not have a significant impact on highway safety and capacity in the immediate vicinity of the site.

CONSULTATIONS:	Additional Representations.
The council has received objections from two households, objecting to the proposal, citing concerns over: - The extension would be overbearing, oppressive and domineering - Not in keeping with the openness of the area - Would close the gap between properties - Direct conflict with the design principles of Policy DMG1 - Block sunlight and light from neighbouring properties - Right to light - Would fail the 45-degree light test both horizontally and vertically - The added extension is not set down from the main roof ridge - No visible distinction between the extension and the existing dwellinghouse - Not subservient to the dwelling - Applicant is using a common loophole called twin-tracking. The cumulative aspect of both applications combined creates an overwhelming dominant mass that would fail standard planning rules if submitted together	

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:

26/0339- Prior notification for proposed single storey rear extension 5m long, 3.5m high (max) and 2.4m high to eaves under Part 1 Class A of the GDPO (Approved).

12/0581 - Proposed extension of single storey design to form dining room, extended hallway and ground floor W.C (Approved). Resubmission of 08/0252 and 03/0474.

08/0252 - Application for renewal of planning consent 3/2003/0474P, for an extension to form dining room, extended hallway and ground floor W.C (Approved). Resubmission of 03/0474.

03/0474 – Extension to form dining room, extended hallway and ground floor W.C. (Approved).

97/0785 – works involving earth bunding and walling for flood defence scheme (Decided)

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:

Site Description and Surrounding Area:

The application relates to a semi-detached dwelling house known as No. 53 Riverside, located within the defined settlement area of Clitheroe. The dwellinghouse comprises natural random stone and off-white render on the external elevations, with blue slate roof tiles. The application site is constrained by contaminated land, is adjacent to council-owned land, is at risk of surface water flooding within Flood Zone 2 and is in proximity to the River Ribble Biological Heritage Site.

Proposed Development for which consent is sought:

Consent is sought for the erection of a proposed first-floor extension to the front elevation of the dwellinghouse. The proposed extension would be situated on top of the existing ground-floor extension to the front elevation, approved under application 3/2012/0581.

The proposed first-floor extension would have a width of 5.55m and a length of 4.44m, with eaves and ridge heights of 5.05m and 6.73m, respectively. Two windows would be featured on the proposed extension, one to the south elevation and one to the north elevation.

In regard to materiality, the proposed first-floor extension would feature render to the elevations, blue slate roof tiles, and agate grey PVC windows.

Amendments

It is important to note that the planning officer requested several amendments prior to determining this application to ensure the proposal's acceptability. The key amendment sought was a reduction in the width of the proposed extension, which would also achieve a lower ridge height. Additionally, the officer requested changes to fenestration details, including removing the window on the northern elevation to address concerns about overlooking and potentially enlarging the window on the southern elevation to increase natural light.

These amendments were requested on two occasions, with the planning officer stating that without these amendments, the scheme would not be considered acceptable.

The applicant was only prepared to make the following changes:

- * Reduce the roof slope pitch to lower the ridge line
- * Alter fenestration details

However, as the applicant declined to reduce the width of the proposed development, the amendments they proposed are not reflected in the submitted plans, as these changes alone would not render the scheme acceptable.

Principle of Development:

The proposal is a domestic extension to a dwelling and is acceptable in principle subject to an assessment of the material planning considerations.

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 development involves a first-floor extension to the front elevation, over an existing single-storey front extension. The proposed development would feature a width of 5.55m and a length of 4.44m, with eaves and ridge heights of 5.05m and 6.73m, respectively. The proposed extension would feature a No. 1 window to the north elevation and a No. 1 window to the south elevation.

While there is precedent for two-storey front extensions within the Riverside housing estate, the dwellinghouse is sited on a corner plot, with its immediate context being characterised by tightly developed plots with two-storey houses on narrow parcels of land. As such, this proposal is considered to have a greater impact on residential amenity than previous extensions, particularly due to its potential for both overlooking and an overbearing presence on neighbouring properties.

With respect to the potential impact on adjacent neighbours, the proposed window to the extension's north elevation would look over the existing boundary treatment, directly into the residential amenity space of No. 61 Riverside. As there are currently no first-floor windows on the northern elevation of No. 53 Riverside, the introduction of this window would result overlooking and an undue loss of privacy and for occupants of No. 61.

Furthermore, with regard to potential overbearing impact, the proposal is considered to have a significant overbearing and intrusive effect on the adjoining neighbouring property at No.52 Riverside and the adjacent property at No.54 Riverside. No.52 Riverside is situated just 2m from the proposed extension and would experience an oppressive and domineering effect, even if the direct sunlight is not entirely obstructed. The proximity and scale of the proposal would diminish the level of amenity that occupiers of adjoining properties could reasonably expect to enjoy. Furthermore, the proposed extension would be located 3.5m from the shared boundary with No.54 Riverside and approximately 6.3m from the side elevation. Given the limited garden space afforded to No.54 Riverside and the presence of ground-floor windows on the side elevation serving a habitable living room, the proposal would significantly harm the enjoyment of this property. Planning

approval typically requires a minimum separation distance of 12 to 15 metres between a window to a habitable room and a facing blank wall of a two-storey dwelling, a standard not met in this case.

As such, taking into account the above, the proposed development would result in significant undue impact upon the occupiers of No.61 Riverside by virtue of a sense of overlooking and a loss of privacy; and a significant undue impact upon the occupiers of No.52 and No.54 Riverside by virtue of the proposed extension having an overbearing and domineering effect. As such, the proposal does not comply with Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and Paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Visual Amenity/External Appearance:

Ribble Valley Core Strategy Policy DMG1 states that:

'All development must be sympathetic to existing and proposed land uses in terms of its size, intensity and nature as well as scale, massing, style [and] 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.'

In addition, Policy DMH5 states 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 application site is situated on a corner plot of the Riverside estate; the development would be visible from the adjacent public realm and from neighbouring properties to the front and sides of the residential curtilage. Therefore, emphasis is placed on the proposed development's visual appearance and the relationship to its surroundings.

Whilst the proposed development would feature a modest footprint of 5.55m in width and 4.44m in length, the extension would have a significant visual presence due to being situated on the dwellinghouse's front elevation. In addition, the proposed extension features a maximum height of 6.73m, being set down from the main ridge by only 0.13m. Whilst two-storey and single-storey front extensions are a somewhat common feature in the locality, it is considered the proposed development would have a significant impact upon visual amenity of the street scene and surrounding area, as the development would dominate the front elevation of the dwellinghouse, and not appear subservient with the scale of the main dwelling.

Furthermore, the proposed development is considered to be of poor design quality, with the front elevation featuring a blank façade that would result in a monotonous, unsympathetic appearance to the dwellinghouse.

In respect of materials, the proposed extension would be faced in render to match the existing dwelling. Render is a material found commonly in the vicinity, and whilst the design, scale and elevational language of the proposal is unacceptable, this choice of materials would integrate sufficiently into the streetscape.

With the above in mind, it is considered that the overall design, scale and elevational language of the proposed works would result in the introduction of an incongruous, unsympathetic form of development that would fail to respond positively to the inherent visual character of the application property or the surrounding area. The proposal is therefore in direct conflict with Policy DMG1 and DMH5 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and Paragraph 130 of the NPPF.

Highways and Parking:

Ribble Valley Core Strategy Policy DMG3 states that:

‘All development proposals will be required to provide adequate car parking and servicing space in line with currently approved standards’.

In addition, Policy DMG1 states that all development must:

- ‘1. consider the potential traffic and car parking implications.
2. ensure safe access can be provided which is suitable to accommodate the scale and type of traffic likely to be generated’.

This application has been subject to review by Lancashire County Council Highways. The Local Highways authority notes that the number of bedrooms increases from the existing 2 to 3 with this proposal; however, this does not result in a change to parking standard requirements, which remain 2. It is noted that the public right-of-way FP0301029 must not be obstructed during construction works.

Therefore, LCC Highways is of the opinion that the proposed development will not have a significant impact on highway safety and capacity in the immediate vicinity of the site; as such, it complies with NPPF Paragraph 115.

With regard to highways and parking, there are no objections to the proposal, and it complies with Policies DMG1 and DMG3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.

Landscape/Ecology:

Surface Water Flood Risk

The flood risk map for the application indicates that the development is classified by the NPPF as a ‘more vulnerable’ residential development, falling within Flood Zone 2 and at risk of surface water flooding. The applicant states in their flood risk assessment that the proposal represents modest domestic extensions to an existing dwelling and retains the existing drainage arrangements, with the property reportedly not experiencing internal flooding during approximately 40 years of occupation. Furthermore, the proposed first-floor extension would be situated atop existing built form and therefore would not displace floodwater storage.

Since the proposal involves the erection of a first-floor extension, the development is classified as a householder development. Therefore, it is not envisaged that the proposals will increase the surface water flood risk at the application site or adjacent areas, and no further sequential test is necessary.

Bat Survey

A preliminary bat roost assessment was undertaken at the application site on 28 April 2026. The survey identified evidence indicating previous bat roosting within the building, and as a result, the property is considered to have moderate potential for roosting bats. To further characterise the roost, additional survey work is required. It is recommended that two emergence surveys be conducted between May and August (inclusive).

Further emergence surveys were conducted at the application site in May and June 2026. These surveys recorded no bats emerging from the building; however, foraging activity by Common and Soprano Pipistrelle bats was observed immediately west of the property. Based on the observations from the survey report written 26 June 2026, the survey effort is considered sufficient to characterise the building’s roost potential, and the presence of a significant or low conservation value bat roost is deemed unlikely.

Nevertheless, due to the opportunistic nature of Pipistrellus bats, it is recommended that all proposed works are undertaken using reasonable avoidance measures to minimise any potential for disturbance. Accordingly, a 'Reasonable Avoidance and Mitigation Measures' Statement has been submitted with the application to ensure that bats and their roosts are fully protected, maintaining the species' favourable conservation status. These measures would be secured by condition, subject to approval of the application.

BNG

With regard to biodiversity net gain, the development is exempt from having to achieve the mandatory Biodiversity Net Gain requirement as it is a householder application.

Observations/Consideration of Matters Raised/Conclusion:

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

RECOMMENDATION:

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

01:	The proposed development, by virtue of its scale, fenestration details and proximity to shared boundaries, would result in a sense of enclosure and overbearing impact upon the adjacent properties of No.52 and No.54 Riverside and would result in a sense of overlooking and loss of privacy to the residential amenity space of No.61 Riverside. Accordingly, the proposal would be in direct conflict with Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy (2008-2028) and Paragraph 135 of the NPPF.
02:	The proposed development, by virtue of its overall design, scale and elevational language, would result in the introduction of an incongruous and unsympathetic form of development that would fail to respond positively to the inherent visual character of the application property or the surrounding area. Accordingly, the proposal would be in direct conflict with Policies DMG1 and DMH5 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy (2008-2028) and Paragraphs 135 and 139 of the NPPF.