

This report needs to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.

DATE INSPECTED:

Ribble Valley Borough Council

DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT - APPROVAL

Ref: AD/CMS

Application No:	3/2015/0438/P (LBC)
Development Proposed:	Rewiring, replumbing replacement of ceilings, repair and replastering ground floor walls, clean and restore original fireplace, fit log burner and chimney liner, fit new kitchen and bathroom suite at 12 Talbot Street, Chipping

CONSULTATIONS: Parish/Town Council

Parish Council - No comments or observations received.

CONSULTATIONS: Highway/Water Authority/Other Bodies

Historic amenity societies consulted:

SPAB – No objections to proposed works but suggest the following:

1. That an alternative specification for cleaning the fireplace be sought.
 2. That whilst unable to see the attic window and its condition from the photograph submitted would strongly encourage that the fabric be repaired rather than replaced.
-

CONSULTATIONS: Additional Representations.

No representations have been received.

RELEVANT POLICIES:

Planning (Listed Buildings in Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

NPPF.

NPPG.

HEPPG (under review).

Ribble Valley Core Strategy (Adopted Version)

Policy DME4 – Protecting Heritage Assets.

Policy DMG1 – General Considerations.

Chipping Conservation Area Appraisal.

COMMENTS/ENVIRONMENTAL/AONB/HUMAN RIGHTS ISSUES/RECOMMENDATION:

12 and 14 Talbot Street is a Grade II listed building (13 February 1967) prominently sited within Chipping Conservation Area. The list description identifies: '2 cottages, probably formerly one house, late C17th, altered ... A change in stonework suggests that the eaves of both houses have been raised'. Typically, no reference is made to the interior or the rear elevation.

12 Talbot Street is within the setting of a number of other listed buildings (including on Talbot Street; 8 and 10, Talbot Hotel, Stable and Barn South-West of Talbot Hotel, 7 and 2, Post Office and John Brabin's House).

The Chipping Conservation Area Appraisal (The Conservation Studio consultants; adopted by the Borough Council following public consultation 3 April 2007) identifies:

- (i) Important Views along Talbot Street; Talbot Hotel as a Focal Building; Significant Open Space to the front of the Talbot Hotel (Townscape Appraisal Map);
 - (ii) *'Historic layout and street pattern of Talbot Street and Windy Street; Open areas in front of The Sun Inn and the Talbot Hotel; Prevalent use of local stone as a building material; Architectural and historic interest of the conservation area's buildings, including 24 listed buildings'* (Summary of special interest);
 - (iii) *'The settlement has evolved along the two main thoroughfares through the village with, generally speaking, buildings fronting directly onto the street with rear gardens ... Two further exceptions to the linear pattern of development are Stanley Court, off Talbot Street'* (General character and plan form);
 - (iv) *'A popular view in photograph and postcard is down Talbot Street'* (Key Views and vistas);
 - (v) *'The settlement is tightly packed alongside Windy Street and Talbot Street with few gaps between buildings ... In the heart of the village is a private open area formed by the rear gardens of properties on the south side of Talbot Street and the east side of Windy Street'* (The character of spaces within the area);
 - (vi) *'Chipping Conservation Area is characterised by stone historic buildings of traditional construction dating mainly from the late 17th century to the early 19th century'* (Architectural and historic character);
 - (vii) *'In contrast to the rubble stone walls of, for example, nos. 12 & 14 Talbot Street, The Sun Inn and nos. 1 & 3 Windy Street are built with squared coursed sandstone and St Mary's Roman Catholic Church is built with fine ashlar stone. The prevalent use of stone as a building material provides a cohesive and attractive townscape which is part of the village's local identity ... Stone roofing slates would once have been more prevalent but Welsh slate is now the most characteristic roofing material. John Brabin's Almshouses are roofed entirely with stone slate and have stone slate canopies above the doors. Nos. 12-14 Talbot Street and nos. 17 & 19 Windy Street are roofed with a combination of stone and slate ... Stone mullioned windows are characteristic of 17th century buildings. On the first floor of nos. 20 & 22 Talbot Street are a 3-light and a 4-light mullioned window with inner hollow chamfer and outer chamfer, with hood. Similar distinctively 17th century windows can be found at nos. 12 & 14 Talbot Street'* (Building methods, materials and local details);
 - (viii) *'Insensitive alterations to historic buildings spoiling the conservation area's strong historic character and appearance'* (Weaknesses: the principle negative features of Chipping Conservation Area);
 - (ix) *'Continuing loss of original architectural details and use of inappropriate modern materials or details'* (Threats to the Chipping Conservation Area).
-

Relevant Planning History

The listed building application follows the investigation of a complaint concerning unauthorised works and subsequent pre-application advice.

Legislation, policy, guidance and information

Section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that when considering applications for listed building consent, special regard shall be had to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, the 'General duty as respects listed buildings in exercise of planning functions', states that in considering whether to grant planning permission for development that affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

Section 72 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, the 'General duty as respects conservation areas in exercise of planning functions', states that in the exercise of planning functions special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area.

Sections 16, 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 - the Governance and Legal Director of English Heritage ('Legal Developments' Conservation Bulletin Issue 71: Winter 2013) states that the courts have said that these statutory requirements operate as 'a paramount consideration' and 'the first consideration for a decision maker'.

The Governance and Legal Director of English Heritage ('Legal Developments: The Big Issue of Little Harm' Conservation Bulletin Issue 73: Winter 2014) states in respect to (any level of) harm to a listed building:

"The Lyveden case reaffirmed that this means the conservation of a listed building should be afforded 'considerable weight and importance' ... with the 'great weight' of paragraph 132 and you should appreciate that minor harm does not mean merely a minor concern ... Any harm is to be given 'great weight' whether it is serious, substantial, moderate, minor or less than substantial ... every decision should acknowledge the general priority afforded to heritage conservation in comparison to other planning objectives or public benefits ... Minor harm to a heritage asset can add up to major and irreversible damage. It is obviously right that planning decisions reflect on this threat each and every time".

In respect to the Lyveden Court of Appeal decision, Gordon Nardell QC and Justine Thornton. ('Turbines, heritage assets and merits', Local Government Lawyer, 24 April 2014) state:

"the key point is that once a decision-maker finds harm (to setting), there must be some express acknowledgement of the 'considerable' weight to be given, in the balance, to the desirability of avoiding that harm. It is not enough to ask in a general sense whether benefits outweigh harm, but whether they do so sufficiently to rebut the strong presumption against permission".

Consideration of 'less than substantial harm' is made in the Secretary of State's decision on Lane Head Farm, Cumbria (recovered appeal; decision 16 April 2014; paragraph 11) and

Bythorn and Molesworth, Cambridgeshire (recovered appeal; decision 3 December 2014; paragraph 29): *"having regard to the judgment in the Barnwell Manor case, the Secretary of State takes the view that it does not follow that if the harm to heritage assets is found to be less than substantial, then the subsequent balancing exercise undertaken by the decision taker should ignore the overarching statutory duty imposed by section 66(1). He therefore sees a need to give considerable weight to the desirability of preserving the setting of all listed buildings"*.

Robin Purchas' QC recent judgement in **North Norfolk** is also noted *"inspector's approach seems to me at this level to have balanced the relative harm and benefit as a matter of straightforward planning judgement without that special regard required under the statute"* (paragraph 73).

J. Lindblom's recent judgment in **Forge Field** (12 June 2014) is also noted where it was held that having "special regard" or paying "special attention" involved more than merely giving weight to those matters in the planning balance: "preserving" in the context of s.66(1) and s.72(1) meant doing no harm. There was a strong statutory presumption against granting planning permission for any development which would fail to preserve a listed building's setting or a conservation area's character or appearance. A local authority was not allowed to treat the desirability of preserving those elements as mere material considerations to which it could simply attach such weight as it saw fit; when a local authority found that a proposed development would harm a listed building's setting or a conservation area's character and appearance, it had to give that harm considerable importance and weight.

Paragraph 49 of the **Forge Field** judgment states *"an authority can only properly strike the balance between harm to a heritage asset on the one hand and planning benefits on the other if it is conscious of the statutory presumption in favour of preservation and if it demonstrably applies that presumption to the proposal it is considering"*. The **South Lakeland (2014)** judgment also states "paragraph 134 is something of a trap for the unwary if read – and applied – in isolation" (paragraph 53).

The Ribble Valley Core Strategy is particularly relevant at Policy DME4.

The NPPF is particularly relevant at paragraph 6, 7, 8, 9, 14, 17,126, 128 -134, 186 – 192 and Annex 2.

The NPPG is particularly relevant in stating:

"Heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and effective conservation delivers wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits."

Distinctiveness is what often makes a place special and valued. It relies on physical aspects such as:

*building forms;
details and materials;
style and vernacular.*

The risks of neglect and decay of heritage assets are best addressed through ensuring that they remain in active use that is consistent with their conservation.

Local building forms and details contribute to the distinctive qualities of a place. These can be successfully interpreted in new development without necessarily restricting the scope of the designer.

Plans, policies and decisions can effectively manage physical form at a variety of scales. This is how planning can help achieve good design and connected objectives. Where appropriate the following should be considered:

- *detailing – the important smaller elements of building and spaces*
- *materials – what a building is made from*

Materials should be practical, durable, affordable and attractive. Choosing the right materials can greatly help new development to fit harmoniously with its surroundings. They may not have to match, but colour, texture, grain and reflectivity can all support harmony”.

HEPPG - this is under review and in large respect has been replaced by Heritage England Advice PN2 and PN3. However, replacement advice for Part 6: Making Changes to Heritage Assets has not yet been published or consulted upon in draft:
HEPPG paragraph 142 states:

“Each heritage asset and group of heritage assets has its own characteristics that are usually related to an original or subsequent function. These can include orientation, layout, plan-form, setting, materials, the disposition of openings, external detailing (with larger assets or groups of assets this might include street furniture) and internal fittings”.

HEPPG paragraph 149 states :

“Original materials normally only need to be replaced when they have failed in their structural purpose. Repairing by re-using materials to match the original in substance, texture, quality and colour, helps maintain authenticity, ensures the repair is technically and visually compatible, minimises the use of new resources and reduces waste ... One would expect that the loss of historic fabric following repairs, and alteration, would be proportionate to the nature of the works”.

HEPPG paragraph 150 states:

“Even when undertaking repair, care is needed to maintain the integrity of the asset”.

HEPPG paragraph 151 states:

“Features such as tool marks, carpenters’ marks, smoke blackening, decorative painting, pargetting or sgraffito work are always damaged by sand-blasting and sometimes by painting or other cleaning, as is exposed timber”.

HEPPG paragraph 152 states:

“doors and windows are frequently key to the significance of a building”.

HEPPG paragraph 169 states:

“Restoration is likely to be acceptable if:

- 1.The significance of the elements that would be restored decisively outweigh the significance of those that would be lost.*
 - 2.The work proposed is justified by compelling evidence of the evolution of the heritage asset, and is executed in accordance with that evidence.*
-

3. *The form in which the heritage asset currently exists is not the result of a historically-significant event.*
4. *The work proposed respects previous forms of the heritage asset.*
5. *No archaeological interest is lost if the restoration work could later be confused with the original fabric.*
6. *The maintenance implications of the proposed restoration are considered to be sustainable”.*

HEPPG paragraph 161 states:

“additions and changes in response to the changing needs of owners and occupants over time may themselves be a key part of the asset’s significance”.

HEPPG paragraph 179 states:

“the fabric will always be an important part of the asset’s significance. Retention of as much historic fabric as possible is therefore a fundamental part of any good alteration or conversion, together with the use of appropriate materials and methods of repair. It is not appropriate to sacrifice old work simply to accommodate the new”.

HEPPG paragraph 180 states:

“The junction between new work and the existing fabric needs particular attention, both for its impact on the significance of the existing asset and the impact on the contribution of its setting. Where possible it is preferable for new work to be reversible, so that changes can be undone without harm to historic fabric. However, reversibility alone does not justify alteration. If alteration is justified on other grounds then reversible alteration is preferable to non-reversible. New openings need to be considered in the context of the architectural and historic significance of that part of the asset. Where new work or additions make elements with significance redundant, such as doors or decorative features, there is likely to be less impact on the asset’s aesthetic, historic or evidential value if they are left in place”.

HEPPG paragraph 182 states:

“the plan form of a building is frequently one of its most important characteristics and internal partitions, staircases (whether decorated or plain, principal or secondary) and other features are likely to form part of its significance. Indeed they may be its most significant feature. Proposals to remove or modify internal arrangements, including the insertion of new openings or extension underground, will be subject to the same considerations of impact on significance (particularly architectural interest) as for externally visible alterations”.

HEPPG paragraph 187 states:

“Small-scale features, inside and out, such as historic painting schemes, ornamental plasterwork, carpenters’ and masons’ marks, chimney breasts and stacks, inscriptions and signs, will frequently contribute strongly to a building’s significance and removing or obscuring them is likely to affect the asset’s significance”.

HEPPG paragraph 189 states:

“although some works of up-grading, such as new kitchens and bathroom units, are unlikely to need consent, new services, both internal and external can have a considerable, and often cumulative, effect on the appearance of a building and can affect significance. The impact of

necessary services can be minimised by avoiding damage to decorative features by carefully routing and finishing and by use of materials appropriate to the relevant period, such as cast iron for gutters and down-pipes for many Georgian and Victorian buildings”.

‘Constructive Conservation in Practice’ (English Heritage, 2008) states:

“Constructive Conservation is the broad term adopted by English Heritage for a positive and collaborative approach to conservation that focuses on actively managing change.

The aim is to recognise and reinforce the historic significance of places, while accommodating the changes necessary to ensure their continued use and enjoyment ...

... The Principles also underline the importance of a systematic and consistent approach to conservation. In order to provide this consistency, we are guided by a values-based approach to assessing heritage significance”.

‘Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance for the Sustainable Management of the Historic Environment’ (English Heritage, 2008) identifies four groups of heritage values: Evidential, Historical, Aesthetic and Communal.

“Evidential value, historical values and some aesthetic values, especially artistic ones, are dependent upon a place retaining (to varying degrees) the actual fabric that has been handed down from the past; but authenticity lies in whatever most truthfully reflects and embodies the values attached to the place (Principle 4.3). It can therefore relate to, for example, design or function, as well as fabric. Design values, particularly those associated with landscapes or buildings, may be harmed by losses resulting from disaster or physical decay, or through ill-considered alteration or accretion” (Paragraph 91).

“Repair necessary to sustain the heritage values of a significant place is normally desirable if:

- a. there is sufficient information comprehensively to understand the impacts of the proposals on the significance of the place;*
- b. the long term consequences of the proposals can, from experience, be demonstrated to be benign, or the proposals are designed not to prejudice alternative solutions in the future and*
- c. the proposals are designed to avoid or minimise harm, if actions necessary to sustain particular heritage values tend to conflict” (Paragraph 117).*

“It is important to look beyond the immediate need for action, to understand the reasons for the need for repair and plan for the long-term consequences of inevitable change and decay. While sufficient work should be undertaken to achieve a lasting repair, the extent of the repair should normally be limited to what is reasonably necessary to make failing elements sound and capable of continuing to fulfil their intended functions” (Paragraph 118).

“The use of materials or techniques with a lifespan that is predictable from past performance, and which are close matches for those being repaired or replaced, tends to carry a low risk of future harm or premature failure. By contrast, the longer term effects of using materials or techniques that are innovative and relatively untested are much less certain” (Paragraph 119).

“Any restoration inevitably removes or obscures part of the record of past change to a significant place, and so reduces its evidential value, as well as potentially affecting its historical and aesthetic values. Restoration may, however, bring gains by revealing other

heritage values, such as the integrity and quality of an earlier and more important phase in the evolution of a place, which makes a particular contribution to its significance. Careful assessment of the values of the elements affected is essential. Where the significance of a place is the result of centuries of change, restoration to some earlier stage in its evolution is most unlikely to meet this criterion" (paragraph 130).

The Chipping Conservation Area Management Guidance (The Conservation Studio consultants) states:

"Stone cleaning: All stone cleaning techniques have an inherent risk of damaging the stone and must be selected and executed with care.

Cleaning may sometimes be desirable to prevent the harm caused by corrosive dirt or to reveal where problems are hidden by encrustations. However, cleaning is less justifiable for aesthetic reasons alone, and consideration must be given to its impact on the historic character of the building (e.g. loss of 'the patina of age') especially if located in a terrace. Cleaning with water and bristle brushes is the simplest method, although water cleaning can lead to saturation of the walls.

Abrasive cleaning methods, including blasting of any kind, are likely to cause damage and should only be used where the necessary skills are available to carry out the work without harming the stonework. Techniques that use hand-held and mechanical tools with carborundum heads, rotary brushes and abrasive blocks should be considered as a resurfacing technique rather than a cleaning method.

Prior to cleaning, a sample panel(s) in an unobtrusive location should be prepared to ascertain the suitability of the technique and the effect on the fabric, character and appearance of the building.

'Masonry Decay: Dealing with the Erosion of Sandstone' (Historic Scotland, 2005) states "stone cleaning should be generally avoided or, if it is thought necessary, it should be carried out to the most stringent standards and in the least damaging manner".

The Conservation, Repair and Management of War Memorials (English Heritage/War Memorials Trust, 2014) states:

"Reasons for cleaning - Cleaning is a complex issue. It involves both aesthetic and technical considerations and should be viewed as a major intervention ... As a general rule, memorials should be cleaned primarily for technical reasons – for example to remove soiling which is causing damage to the historic material or to allow further treatment to be carried out. The aim of cleaning is not to return the memorial to a 'like new' appearance, but to safely remove particulate deposits, staining and biological growths ... An appropriate cleaning strategy is one that uses the mildest and least damaging methods to achieve the desired cleaning effect, while minimising any alteration of the underlying material. The method should be controllable (both in practical and health and safety terms) and must not deposit by-products (for example detergents) that cannot be completely removed ... However, even quite gentle regular cleaning of stonework can result in increased exposure of the surface pores of the stone; this provides a suitable location for pollutants to collect and biological growth to take root. As a result, the memorial gets dirtier more quickly and a more frequent cycle of cleaning can become established.

... Appropriate cleaning requires correct evaluation of:
the nature of the material, eg the mineralogy of the stone, the type of metal

the condition of the material

the nature and extent of soiling

the biodiversity and importance of biological growth including lichens, mosses and algae, some of which are protected by law

Initial cleaning trials, carried out in a discreet part of the memorial, are essential, not only to demonstrate the effectiveness of the options but to manage expectations by showing what result cleaning can achieve. The least abrasive and invasive methods should be trialled first before resorting to more aggressive methods. In practice, more than one method may be appropriate for different types of soiling and substrate ... In all cases, operatives must have experience of using the methods, equipment or chemicals on weathered historic surfaces because inappropriate cleaning can cause irreversible damage.

Sandstone ... differences in appearance and behaviour derive from the way in which different grains (mainly quartz but also clay, feldspar, mica and glauconite) are bound together by the natural cement of the stone (mostly quartz but also calcite and iron compounds). The mineral content and the type of cement give rise to the geological terminology such as argillaceous sandstone (containing significant amounts of clay) or calcareous sandstone (quartz bound together by calcite)".

"Masonry Cleaning: Nebulous Spray" (Ian Constantinides and Lynne Humphries in *Building Conservation*, 2003) states:

*"it appeals to building owners since their investment is readily seen. However, focusing on the aesthetic benefits of cleaning does risk overlooking the cause of the soiling and ignoring the history of the building. Cleaning has become one of the most controversial aspects of conservation, raising fundamental questions. Is it always necessary or even beneficial? Are we too ready to clean? Many buildings have been damaged by cleaning in the past, and even the most appropriate cleaning techniques can be harmful. Arguably the most beneficial aspects of cleaning are to reveal the condition of the building where the dirt may have concealed cracks or structural faults and to slow down deterioration by removing damaging materials ... It may be that the soiling causes stone deterioration or decay, or reduces the permeability of the substrate; or it may simply appear as an unsightly surface discoloration. **Over time architectural surfaces build up a patina that is due in part to airborne particles, weathering cycles and the mineralogy of the stone itself. Unlike surface dirt, the patina does not simply lie across the surface of the stone but is combined to varying depths within the masonry, be it stone, brick or terracotta. Although not necessarily damaging in itself, removing this layer detracts from the historic interest of the original and may expose a weaker substrate to decay. Another consequence of removing the build-up of patinas or encrustations is the potential mobilisation of minerals beneath the stone surface, leading to discolouration"**.*

"Air/Water Abrasive Cleaning of Stone and Brickwork" (Nicola Ashurst, in *Building Conservation*, 1996) states:

"The decision to clean an historic building is not one which should be made lightly, as cleaning can have significant physical and visual results. A period of detailed investigation must be undertaken to determine whether cleaning should be undertaken and, if so, the details of how this should be done. The nature and condition of all substrates must be understood, not forgetting pointing materials, as must the soiling to be removed. The latter may include atmospheric soiling, paint, limewash, metallic staining, anti-pigeon gel and graffiti. Each can require a different cleaning approach or at least modifications to the system selected for use elsewhere

... The design of a cleaning regime for an historic building is often deceptively complex, requiring specialist professional input

... This can be difficult to achieve due to the intimate relationship between the stone and its soiling, as the soiling can be embedded deeply in between the surface particles

... Air abrasive cleaning techniques are most successful on surfaces of even profile and consistent surface texture and hardness. An air abrasive stream cannot on its own differentiate between the removal of soiling and the removal of masonry. Nor can it distinguish portions of masonry which are closer to the nozzle from those further away or areas of masonry which are softer. Damage to the masonry can only be avoided through the skill and ability of the operator to make the necessary adjustments in technique".

Historic England 'Listing Selection Guide: Domestic I: Vernacular Houses' (April 2011) states:

" Roofs ... Roof structures are important not only as evidence for traditional technologies but also for the social meanings they embody ... as more houses became storeyed throughout, and the upper rooms were ceiled there was no longer any need to decorate roofs since they were now hidden behind plaster ceilings ... The insertion of full lath and plaster ceilings ('underdrawing'), concealing the beams and joists, remained rare in vernacular houses throughout the seventeenth century, and even in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries it is often restricted to the parlour or to a handful of better rooms".

"Fixtures, fittings and decoration ... Medieval vernacular houses were simply fitted out with exposed beams, joists and unceiled roofs".

Hall L, 2005, "Period House Fixtures and Fittings 1300 – 1900", page 163 states:

"All these moulded and chamfered joists were, of course, intended to be seen and any plaster was confined to the spaces between them. Sometimes the upstairs floorboards were left exposed below ... Many houses now have the joists as well as the floorboards concealed by later plaster ceilings, although it is impossible to know how many are original and how many have been added later".

Submitted Information

The Heritage Statement describes 'the poor condition' of the attic window proposed for replacement. A request for further information has resulted in the submission (22 July 2015) of a joiner's statement identifying "apart from the missing glazing, it is in reasonable condition".

Following request (6 July 2015), an explanation for the cleaning of the fire surround and the choice of methods proposed has been submitted (15 July 2015).

The information submitted 15 July 2015 confirms "no further removal of any original plasterwork is proposed just to make good where needed and to re-skim using traditional lime plaster".

The submitted Method Statement identifies the new fixing of lath to the C17 joists and beams (exposed by unauthorized works). In respect to concerns that replacement ceilings might result in further damage to historic fabric the information submitted 15 July 2015 identifies "options available the preferred option would be nails. With regard to further damage to

historic fabric this should be minimal with replacement ceilings the only other option would be to leave them exposed and plaster the floor boards but this would then require all power and plumbing to then be set in to the walls and would require more removal of historic plasterwork".

The implication of the log burner/chimney liner for the special interest of the listed building is now indicated in the submitted information of 15 July 2015 "the flue should have no visual impact ... not have any effect on historic fabric".

Conclusions

In my opinion, the proposed scheme is now acceptable. Whilst SPAB has concerns/suggestions in respect to the proposals, it also has "no objection" and I would suggest the imposition of conditions in this regard.

Therefore, in attaching considerable importance and weight to the statutory duties at section 16, 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (keeping the special interest of the listed building, its setting and the setting of nearby listed buildings and the character and appearance of Chipping Conservation Area free from harm) and in giving great weight to conservation (NPPF paragraph 132) and with regard to Core Strategy Policy DME4, I would recommend that listed building consent be granted.

RECOMMENDATION: That listed building consent be granted subject to conditions.

