


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

<b>Signed:</b>	<b>Officer:</b>	<b>MC</b>	<b>Date:</b>	<b>29/09/2025</b>	<b>Manager:</b>	<b>LH</b>	<b>Date:</b>	<b>30/9/25</b>
----------------	-----------------	-----------	--------------	-------------------	-----------------	-----------	--------------	----------------

<b>Application Ref:</b>	3/2025/0412			 <p>Ribble Valley Borough Council <a href="http://www.ribblevalley.gov.uk">www.ribblevalley.gov.uk</a></p>
<b>Date Inspected:</b>	08/07/2025	<b>Site Notice:</b>	08/07/2025	
<b>Officer:</b>	MC			
<b>DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:</b>				<b>APPROVAL</b>

<b>Development Description:</b>	Planning Permission for replacement of windows and lintels, enlargement of window openings, infill doorways and windows, demolition of existing lean-to and erection of stone porch, replacement of roof tiles with slates, replacement of cills and mullions, replacement of guttering and downpipes, removal of render and repointing with lime.
<b>Site Address/Location:</b>	Dene Cottage, 9 The Dene, Hurst Green, BB7 9QF

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

<b>CONSULTATIONS:</b>	<b>Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies</b>
-----------------------	--

<b>Growth Lancashire::</b>	No objection subject to a condition regarding the repair of the lead window.
----------------------------	--

<b>Historic Amenities Societies:</b>	<p>The new proposals are mostly welcomed, in particular the side casement windows. Queries are raised regarding the staircase and location of kitchen/bathroom and servicing.</p> <p>The point is raised regarding wood panelling and internal walls that have been removed.</p>
--------------------------------------	--

<b>RVBC Countryside Officer:</b>	As the recommendations within the bat survey are not appropriate for the proposed development, a condition is recommended for the trees to be assessed for their suitability for mitigation measures (bat boxes). Recommendations are also recommended for external lighting.
----------------------------------	---

<b>LCC Archaeology:</b>	The Historic Environment team recommend that an archaeological building record be made of the house, carried out in phases with the first phase comprising a record of the building as it exists now, with a watching brief being maintained during internal works to record any further evidence for changes to the building, the final report combining the results of the two phases (to be secured by condition).
-------------------------	---

<b>CONSULTATIONS:</b>	<b>Additional Representations.</b>
-----------------------	------------------------------------

No additional representations received.

**RELEVANT POLICIES AND SITE PLANNING HISTORY:**

**Ribble Valley Core Strategy:**

Key Statement DS1: Development Strategy  
 Key Statement DS2: Sustainable Development  
 Key Statement EN2: Landscape  
 Key Statement EN5: Heritage Assets

Policy DMG1: General Considerations  
Policy DMG2: Strategic Considerations  
Policy DMG3: Transport & Mobility  
Policy DMH5: Residential and Curtilage Extensions  
Policy DME1: Protecting Trees And Woodland  
Policy DME3: Site and Species Protection & Conservation  
Policy DME4: Protecting Heritage Assets  
Policy DME6: Water Management

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

**Relevant Planning History:**

**3/2025/0411**

Listed Building Consent for internal and external works. External works to include: replacement of windows and lintels, enlargement of window openings, infill doorways and windows, demolition of existing lean-to and erection of stone porch, replacement of roof tiles with slates, replacement of cills and mullions, replacement of guttering and downpipes, removal of render and repoint with lime. Repair of leaded window. Internal works to include: replacement of existing staircase, removal of partitions, excavation of internal floor to increase head height and replacement of internal floor with limecrete.

*Pending Consideration*

**3/2018/1061**

Removal of oak lintel above kitchen window and replacement with new oak lintel to match, involving associated propping and shoring to enable the works. Internal lime rendering to the reveals. Replacement of existing guttering with new to match including replacement of section of fascia board. Replacement of existing hardwood front door with new part-glazed hardwood front door.

*Approved with Conditions*

**ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:**

**Site Description and Surrounding Area:**

The application site relates to a late C17 Grade II Listed cottage within the village boundary of Hurst Green. The site is also located within the Forest of Bowland National Landscape, within the Hurst Green Conservation Area and within Flood Zone 3. The site is accessed off the road 'The Dene' and sits on much lower land, with steps down to the property. The garden to the rear also has a number of mature trees.

The Listing for Dene Cottage is as follows:

*SD 63 NE 8/9*

*AIGHTON, BAILEY & CHAIGLEY, THE DENE No. 9*

*(Formerly listed as No. 9 (Dene Cottage))*

*II*

*House, probably c.1700. Sandstone rubble with modern tile roof. 2 storeys. South wall has chamfered mullioned windows. To the left of the door are 2 of 3 lights, with a chamfered surround to the right of the door with one*

central mullion remaining. On the 1st floor a surround to a former 3-light window remains at the left. Towards the centre is a former 4-light window with one light blocked. At the right is a former 3-light window with one mullion remaining, the left-hand light having small diamond-lead panes. The door has a plain stone surround. The north wall, facing The Dene, has openings with plain reveals. The end stacks have brick caps.

Listing NGR: SD6832937871

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

The proposed development is for a number of internal and external alterations to the building. With regards to the works that require planning permission, the existing non-original door opening to the front elevation would be infilled as well as the window opening. These would be infilled with stonework to match the existing. In addition, the existing late C20th lean-to to the front elevation would also be replaced with a smaller, stone-built porch with chisel dressed quoin stones and reclaimed slate. The timber doors and windows would be narrow profile double glazing painted in an off-white colour. All gutters, down pipes, waste and SVP would be replaced with cast iron rainwater goods.

All existing windows (excluding the diamond leaded window to the rear elevation) would be replaced with timber side opening casement windows with narrow profile glazing, painted off-white.

With regards to the roof and external walls, the concrete roof tiles would be replaced with a breathable felt membrane, tanalised timber battens and slates with stone ridge tiles (reclaimed) and externally to the walls, the cementitious render would be removed and repointed with Calbux CX90 quick lime and washed grit sand.

#### **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. The proposed replacement porch would be smaller than the existing conservatory and would be sited approximately 2.2 metres from the boundary with no. 7 and 5.8 metres from no. 11.

#### **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'*

With regards to the impact on the character and appearance of the external changes to the building on the Forest of Bowland National Landscape and the street scene, it is considered that these would be an improvement. The replacement of the concrete roof tiles with reclaimed slates would be more in keeping with the neighbouring adjoining properties at no. 7 and no. 11 The Dene. In addition, the window colour would be in keeping with the character of the surrounding area and the replacement of the large conservatory porch structure with a smaller stone porch would match the external appearance of no. 7. Both of the adjoining properties are stone fronted and as such, notwithstanding any heritage concerns outlined below, it is not considered that the removal of the render and repointing of the stonework would be detrimental to the character of the street scene.

Overall, the proposal is considered to accord 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 proposed changes, the Heritage and Conservation Officer has provided comments on the scheme. They consider that the existing windows are in poor condition and are not historic. The replacement of the top hung casements with side hung casements would likely reflect the original arrangement. They also consider that the enlargement of the previously altered openings would have no discernible impact on character.

The removal of the concrete roof tile and replacement with slate is also considered an enhancement, along with the reinstatement of missing sections of stone mullions.

Whilst the Heritage and Conservation Officer does consider the removal of render somewhat detrimental to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, as they believe it was intended to be rendered, they consider the use of lime and removal of cement would be a heritage benefit. In addition, the removal of the porch is considered to be an enhancement to the listed building and the Hurst Green Conservation Area. The open timber porch has also been amended to a stone porch following ongoing discussions with the Heritage and Conservation Officer. This is considered to be more appropriate and would assimilate better with the historic surroundings and character of the listed building.

It would also be reasonable to secure samples of the external materials and sections of the proposed windows/doors to ensure they are appropriate to the listed building, should permission be acceptable (the latter can be secured under the parallel listed building consent application).

With regards to the heritage impact, the proposed development would result in a number of benefits to the Grade II Listed Building but the removal of the render would result in a low level of less than substantial harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

#### **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 site does not have any existing vehicular access other than a parking area on the opposite side of the road. The floorplans do not show any internal alterations to the first floor internal walls and as such, it is not considered that there is any increase in the number of bedrooms at the property which would increase the parking requirement.

An informative could be added to any grant of planning permission to advise the applicant that construction works must not obstruct the highway.

Having regard to the above, the proposal is considered to comply with Policies DMG3 and DMG1 with regards to the level of parking provision.

#### **Other matters:**

##### *Ecology*

With regards to protected species, a Preliminary Roost Assessment was submitted with the application which recommended further emergence surveys were undertaken. An updated Bat Activity Survey Results Report by Pennine Ecological has been submitted which concludes that bats were absent from the building. The report does note that bat activity was moderate at the site, with the majority of the foraging activity being around the property garden and mature trees north of the site. The activity included up to four Soprano Pipistrelles and the Common Pipistrelle. NO bat roosts were identified in the building but the site offers suitable habitats for foraging bats.

A number of recommendations are provided, including enhancements for bats such as low level and low intensity lighting, directing downwards away from boundaries. The details of any external lighting can be secured by way of planning condition. Other recommendations are suggested which includes integrated bat boxes to brick built buildings, soffit access and ridge access.

The Countryside Officer has provided comments on the scheme. It is noted that the recommendations within the bat survey are not appropriate to the listed building. As such, details of 2 no. bat boxes, including their specification, height and location within the site should be secured by way of planning condition to provide suitable biological enhancements.

##### *Flood Risk*

The site is also located within Flood Zone 3. A Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) has been submitted as part of the application which states that the front porch footprint would be reduced in size by approximately 75%. The FRA considers that due to the nature of the works and the scale of development (reduction on footprint size), the development would not increase the risk of flooding at the application site or adjacent areas.

Given that the existing porch is already enclosed and the proposed porch would have a smaller footprint and would also be enclosed, it is not likely that the development would displace floodwater beyond the existing levels, in accordance with Policy DME6 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.

##### *Archaeology*

Based on the information submitted within the application, the Historic Environment Team at Lancashire County Council request than an archaeological building record be made of the house, carried out in phases with the first phase comprising a record of the building as it exists now, with a watching brief being maintained

during internal works to record any further evidence for changes to the building, the final report combining the results of the two phases. It is considered that this could be secured by way of planning condition.

**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 whilst the removal of the render would result in less than substantial harm to the character of the listed building and the Hurst Green Conservation Area, there are heritage benefits to the scheme by way of the use of lime and removal of cement.

It is considered that the public benefits by way of upgrading works to the listed building through restoration outweigh the low level of harm resulting from the proposed scheme. Subject to conditions, the scheme is considered acceptable.

As such, the proposal complies with Key Statement EN5 and Policies DMG1 and DME4 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and the requirements of Section 16 and 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and Section 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework and would not result in harm to the designated heritage asset. Having regard to all material considerations and matters raised, the application is recommended for approval subject to conditions.

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