


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

<b>Signed:</b>	<b>Officer:</b>	<b>MC</b>	<b>Date:</b>	<b>21/07/2025</b>	<b>Manager:</b>	<b>LH</b>	<b>Date:</b>	<b>22/7/25</b>
----------------	-----------------	-----------	--------------	-------------------	-----------------	-----------	--------------	----------------

<b>Application Ref:</b>	3/2025/0078			 <p>Ribble Valley Borough Council <a href="http://www.ribblevalley.gov.uk">www.ribblevalley.gov.uk</a></p>
<b>Date Inspected:</b>	25/03/2025	<b>Site Notice:</b>	25/03/2025	
<b>Officer:</b>	MC			
<b>DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:</b>				<b>APPROVAL</b>

<b>Development Description:</b>	Listed Building Consent for proposed demolition of existing extensions and erection of part single, part two storey extension and alterations.
<b>Site Address/Location:</b>	Top Lodge, Browsholme Hall, Clitheroe Road, Whitewell, BB7 3DE

<b>CONSULTATIONS:</b>	<b>Parish/Town Council</b>
-----------------------	----------------------------

<b>CONSULTATIONS:</b>	<b>Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies</b>
<b>RVBC Countryside Officer:</b>	Following the undertaking of further emergence surveys, concludes an EPS licence is required to undertake the works. Recommends the inclusion of a condition and that development is undertaken in accordance with the precautionary measures/method statement.
<b>Historic England:</b>	Comments provided which link to further guidance on Adapting Historic Buildings for Energy and Carbon Efficiency. No further comments made and advise the LPA seek views of specialist conservation adviser.
<b>LCC Highways:</b>	No objection subject to a condition requiring the submission of a Construction Management Plan due to the location of the site.
<b>Growth Lancashire:</b>	The development would result a low level of less than substantial harm, however the development would have heritage benefit through the removal of poor quality C20 extensions. Recommends a number of conditions be added to any granting of consent.

<b>CONSULTATIONS:</b>	<b>Additional Representations.</b>
No additional representations received.	

<b>RELEVANT POLICIES AND SITE PLANNING HISTORY:</b>
<p><b>Ribble Valley Core Strategy:</b></p> <p>Key Statement DS1: Development Strategy          Key Statement DS2: Sustainable Development          Key Statement EN2: Landscape          Key Statement EN5: Heritage Assets</p> <p>Policy DMG1: General Considerations          Policy DMG2: Strategic Considerations          Policy DMG3: Transport &amp; Mobility          Policy DMH5: Residential and Curtilage Extensions          Policy DME1: Protecting Trees And Woodland          Policy DME3: Site and Species Protection &amp; Conservation</p>

Policy DME4: Protecting Heritage Assets

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

**Relevant Planning History:**

No relevant planning history.

**ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:**

**Site Description and Surrounding Area:**

The site is occupied by a two storey, Grade II Listed Building, located within the grounds of Browsholme Hall. The building historically served as a lodge to the hall and is now a separate dwelling. The site is located within the Forest of Bowland National Landscape and accessed off a private driveway from Clitheroe Road. The site lies approximately 450m to the south-east of Browsholme Hall which is a Grade I Listed Building and there are a number of associated Grade II Listed Buildings within the grounds of the hall.

The Listing for Top Lodge is as follows:

*SOUTH (FRONT) LODGE, BROWSHOLME HALL AND WALL TO WEST CONTAINING 2 GATEWAYS WITH GATES*

*BASHALL EAVES SD 64 SE*

*9/22 South (Front) Lodge, Browsholme Hall and wall to west containing 2 gateways with gates. (formerly listed as Gate and Second Lodge to the south of Browsholme Hall in Bowland Forest Low Parish) 16.II.1954 GV II*

*Lodge, 1806, incorporating earlier fragments. Sandstone rubble with stone slate roof. The house is of 2 storeys, and 2 bays towards the south. The windows to the left-hand bay, possibly re-used, are of 2 lights with architraves, square channelled mullions and moulded hoods. The right-hand bay, probably a later C19th addition, has 2-light chamfered mullioned windows with hoods. The chimney, between the bays, has tapering round caps to each of the 2 flues. The gables have copings with ball finials. The west gable has a doorway with moulded surround and a reset shaped lintel with 'TP 1982' inscribed. Above are re-set the Parker arms, taken from Waddington Hall (q.v.). Under the gable are 2 corbels with carved 'Celtic' heads, and a central figure of a saint taken from Whalley Abbey. To the west are 2 gateways. The smaller one, to the right, has a plain stone surround, semi-circular head, and a moulded cornice. It is surmounted by a coat of arms with strapwork decoration. The wider gateway, to the left, has an arch taken from Ingleton Hall. It has moulded jambs and impostes and a moulded segmental arch with a hood. The keystone has a curved coat of arms, with a further coat of arms on each side of the arch. Above is a coping with 3 ball finials. Both gateways have gates of wrought iron.*

*Browsholme Hall and the West Lodge are in Bowland Forest Low Parish (q.v.).*

*Listing NGR: SD6859344800*

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

The proposed development is for removal of the existing two storey extension and the replacement with a part single, part two storey extension. The extension would follow the design of the main dwelling and would have a length of approximately 5.1 metres and a width of approximately 5.2 metres at first floor level. The single storey element would project beyond the existing single storey extension by approximately 3.2 metres and would have a flat roof. To the east elevation, double doors would be inserted at ground floor level and a

Juliet balcony at first floor level. The detailing of the Juliet balcony has been amended prior to the determination of the application to include more traditional metal railings.

The extension would include a modern glazed, narrow window at ground and first floor level to the south elevation and a rooflight inserted into the south roof slope. This has been amended prior to determination from a large rooflight/window following discussions with the Heritage and Conservation Officer.

#### **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'*

The proposed development would not result in any adverse harm to the amenity of neighbouring properties as the site is located approximately 190 metres from the application site.

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

Key Statement EN2 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy states:

*'The landscape and character of the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty will be protected, conserved and enhanced. Any development will need to contribute to the conservation of the natural beauty of the area.*

*As a principle the Council will expect development to be in keeping with the character of the landscape, reflecting local distinctiveness, vernacular style, scale, style, features and building materials'.*

Ribble Valley Core Strategy Policy DMG1 provides specific guidance in relation to design and states:

*'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, Ribble Valley Core Strategy Policy DMG2 states that:

*'In protecting the designated Area Of Outstanding Natural Beauty the council will have regard to the economic and social well being of the area. However the most important consideration in the assessment of any development proposals will be the protection, conservation and enhancement of the landscape and character of the area avoiding where possible habitat fragmentation. Where possible new development should be accommodated through the re-use of existing buildings, which in most cases is more appropriate than new build. development will be required to be in keeping with the character of the landscape and acknowledge the special qualities of the AONB by virtue of its size, design, use of material, landscaping and siting. The AONB management plan should be considered and will be used by the council in determining planning applications'*

The proposed extensions and alterations are considered to be subservient to the main dwellinghouse and would utilise similar materials, including timber windows which are considered to be appropriate to the designated heritage asset. The change to the Juliet balcony and window features is an improvement from the originally submitted scheme and from a visual amenity perspective, would be an improvement on the existing two storey extension which does not form a high standard of design due to its design and materials used. In

addition, due to the siting of the proposed extensions and alterations, they would not be highly visible from public views within the Forest of Bowland National Landscape.

Taking into account all of the above, the proposed development is considered to preserve the character and appearance of the Forest of Bowland National Landscape and the development accords with Key Statement EN2 and Policies DMG1, DMG2 and DMH5 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.

#### **Heritage Impact:**

With regards to heritage considerations, Key statement EN5 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy states that:

*'There will be a presumption in favour of the conservation and enhancement of the significance of heritage assets and their settings. The Historic Environment and its Heritage Assets and their settings will be conserved and enhanced in a manner appropriate to their significance for their heritage value; their important contribution to local character, distinctiveness and sense of place; and to wider social, cultural and environmental benefits'.*

In addition, Policy DME4 states:

*'In considering development proposals the council will make a presumption in favour of the conservation and enhancement of heritage assets and their settings.*

#### **2. Listed buildings and other buildings of significant heritage interest**

*Alterations or extensions to listed buildings or buildings of local heritage interest, or development proposals on sites within their setting which cause harm to the significance of the heritage asset will not be supported. Any proposals involving the demolition or loss of important historic fabric from listed buildings will be refused unless it can be demonstrated that exceptional circumstances exist.*

#### **Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990:**

Given the proposal relates to a Grade II Designated Heritage Asset, special regard must also be given to the statutory duties imposed on the authority, pursuant to national legislation, particularly in respect of the preservation and enhancement of such assets.

The principle statutory duty under the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended by s.58B (1) of Levelling-up and Regeneration Act 2023) is to preserve or enhance the special character of heritage assets, including their setting. As such, in determining applications that affect designated heritage assets, the authority must consider the duties contained within the principle Act which states the following;

#### **Listed buildings - Section 16 (2) (as amended by s.58B of Levelling-up and Regeneration Act 2023):**

In considering whether to grant listed building consent for any works to a listed building the local planning authority shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the building. Under s.58B (2) this includes preserving or enhancing any feature, quality or characteristic of the asset or setting that contributes to the significance of the asset.

#### **National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024):**

The National planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out further duties in respect of determining proposals that affect heritage assets stating that *'in determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic*

*environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation’.*

The Framework sets out further duties in respect of considering potential impacts upon designated heritage assets with Paragraphs 207 – 221 reading as follows:

*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.*

*213: Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of:*

- a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional;*
- b) assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, registered battlefields, grade I and II\* listed buildings, grade I and II\* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional.*

*214: Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to (or total loss of significance of) a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or total loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss, or all of the following apply:*

- a) the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site; and*
- b) no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation; and*
- c) conservation by grant-funding or some form of not for profit, charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and*
- d) the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use.*

*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.*

*216: The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.*

*217: Local planning authorities should not permit the loss of the whole or part of a heritage asset without taking all reasonable steps to ensure the new development will proceed after the loss has occurred.*

*218: Local planning authorities should require developers to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage assets to be lost (wholly or in part) in a manner proportionate to their importance and the impact, and to make this evidence (and any archive generated) publicly accessible. However, the ability to record evidence of our past should not be a factor in deciding whether such loss should be permitted*

#### **Assessment of Impacts:**

With regards to the impact on the Listed Building, the Heritage and Conservation Officer has provided comments on the scheme. In their original comments, concerns were raised regarding the amount of double

doors in the East Elevation which were considered to be excessive. A Juliet balcony is proposed and the steel handrail has now been amended to a more traditional railing which whilst has removed some of the harm, the amount of glazing is still considered to be harmful.

The Heritage and Conservation Officer also considers that the tall, narrow window on the proposed South Elevation is slightly discordant with the host building but notes that the window which adjoined the rooflight has been amended to a traditional rooflight. They recommend the glazing details, including the rooflight are secured by way of condition.

The Heritage and Conservation Office does not feel that the harm is completely removed and the development represents a very low level of less than substantial harm, caused by the proposed excessive openings and tall narrow light appearing discordant against the historic building, in a traditionally designed extension.

The site is located to the South of the Grade I Listed Browsholme Hall which also has a number of associated listed buildings. Top Lodge is located over 370 metres away from the surrounding listed buildings and is separated by woodland and grassland. It is not considered that the proposed development would harm the way the existing listed buildings at Browsholme Hall are appreciated to the size/scale of development and the separation between the designated heritage assets and therefore the proposal is considered to have a neutral impact on the setting of the adjacent designated heritage assets.

As such, the proposal is considered to accord with Key Statement EN5 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and Policies DMG1 and DME4 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.

#### **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'.*

The proposed development would result in a reduction of three bedrooms to two. As such, there would be no increase in parking provision requirement as a result of the works. Notwithstanding this, the Local Highway Authority have provided comments on the scheme and recommend the inclusion of a condition requiring the submission and approval of a Construction Management Plan due to the location of the site to reduce the possibility of deleterious material being deposited in the highway and becoming a hazard for road users.

As such, the proposal is considered to comply with Policies DMG3 and DMG1 with regards to the level of parking provision.

#### **Landscape/Ecology:**

There are a number of mature trees located within the site boundary to the south of the building. The submitted site plan indicates that these trees would be located outside of the Root Protection Area's by approximately 6m at the closest point. As such, it is not likely the proposal would impact on the mature trees within the site.

The preliminary ecology report recommend that further emergence surveys are undertaken. An updated bat survey and method statement has been submitted which states that an emergence survey on 1st July 2025 observed a small number of Common Pipistrelle bats emerging from the flat roofed extension. A total of 9 bats were counted. The report concludes that the proposed development will result in the loss of the roost feature for roosting bats, and will require a Natural England EPS Mitigation licence to proceed. It is recommended that compensatory roost features in the form of an integrated bat tube within the gable end and Greenwoods Ecohabitats two crevice box within the garden would offer mitigation measures in line with those expected by Natural England for the purposes of EPS Mitigation licencing.

The Council's Countryside Officer has provided comments on the scheme and recommends an appropriately worded condition to ensure that the development is e carried out in strict accordance with the Reasonable Avoidance Measures within the bat survey, Method Statement and report submitted with the application dated 14 July 2025 and that no works prior to commencement no work should commence until a Natural England Mitigation licence is in place to cover works and one Greenwoods Ecohabitats Two Crevice bat box is positioned within the garden, the location to be determined by the ecologist and the timings of the roof work should take place following a night temperature of 5c between October and April inclusive.

Subject to the above, the proposal is considered to accord with Policy DME3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.

With regards 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:**

Having regard to the above and the requirements of the NPPF, it is noted that the development would result in a low level of less than substantial harm. The Heritage and Conservation Officer recognises that the scheme represents heritage benefits through removal of the poor quality C20 extensions which should be weighed against the harm.

It is considered that the public benefits by way of removal of the poor quality C20 extension is considered to outweigh the harm resulting from the proposed scheme. Subject to conditions, the scheme is considered acceptable.

<b>RECOMMENDATION:</b>	That planning consent be granted subject to the imposition of conditions.
------------------------	---