


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

<b>Signed:</b>	<b>Officer:</b>	<b>MC</b>	<b>Date:</b>	<b>24/10/2025</b>	<b>Manager:</b>	<b>LH</b>	<b>Date:</b>	<b>24/10/25</b>
----------------	-----------------	-----------	--------------	-------------------	-----------------	-----------	--------------	-----------------

<b>Application Ref:</b>	3/2025/0508			 <p>Ribble Valley Borough Council <a href="http://www.ribblevalley.gov.uk">www.ribblevalley.gov.uk</a></p>
<b>Date Inspected:</b>	22/07/2025	<b>Site Notice:</b>	22/07/2025	
<b>Officer:</b>	MC			
<b>DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:</b>				<b>APPROVAL</b>

<b>Development Description:</b>	Listed Building Consent for conversion of an existing barn to create a dwelling. Internal and external alterations to include creation of first floor, insertion of rooflights, doors and windows.
<b>Site Address/Location:</b>	Lower Reaps Farm, Whinney Lane, Mellor BB2 7EL

<b>CONSULTATIONS:</b>	<b>Parish/Town Council</b>
No objection	

<b>CONSULTATIONS:</b>	<b>Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies</b>
<b>Council for British Archaeology:</b>	<p>The CBA support the conversion of the barn into a single dwelling with a reduced level of internal subdivision than the currently consented scheme. They raise concerns regarding the three sets of bifold doors proposed in the southern and advise openings are kept to a minimum.</p> <p>The CBA note the proposal to line the internal walls of the barn, although no details of a methodology or materials are given. The CBA object to strategies like tanking and internal dry lining of buildings of this construction type as all moisture present is forced into the historic stone walls which sacrificially decay without the ability to 'breathe'. Such interventions are contrary to the requirements of sections 16 and 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and the NPPF.</p>
<b>LCC Archaeology:</b>	Recommends the inclusion of an archaeology condition be added to any grant of permission.
<b>Growth Lancashire:</b>	Whilst there is some residual harm arising from the scheme, this has been reduced to very low to negligible, and this should be weighed against the significant benefits of repair and reuse.
<b>Historic England:</b>	Does not wish to provide comments

<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 EN5 – Heritage Assets</p> <p>Policy DMG1 – General Considerations</p>

Policy DME4 – Protecting Heritage Assets

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

**Relevant Planning History:**

**3/2025/0507**

Application for Planning Permission for conversion of barn to create new dwelling  
Pending

**3/2025/0271**

Approval of details reserved by conditions 3 (materials), 4 (window and door specifications), 5 (details of roof lights), 6 (sections), 7 (building recording and analysis), 8 (external meter boxes) of listed building consent 3/2022/1166.  
Split decision – conditions discharged in part

**3/2025/0270**

Approval of details reserved by conditions 3 (materials), 4 (window and door specifications), 5 (details of roof lights), 7 (building recording and analysis), 11 (electric vehicle charging point), 13 (landscaping) and 17 (drainage) of planning permission 3/2022/1165.  
Split decision – conditions discharged in part

**3/2025/0088**

Variation of condition 2 (approved plans) of planning permission 3/2022/1165 for proposed refurbishment of existing farm house, conversion of existing attached and detached barns to create three new dwellings, conversion of outbuildings for associated residential use and external works.  
Approved with Conditions

**3/2025/0089**

Variation of condition 2 (approved plans) of listed building consent 3/2022/1166 for proposed refurbishment of existing farmhouse, conversion of existing attached and detached barns to create three new dwellings, conversion of outbuildings for associated residential use and external works.  
Approved with Conditions

**3/2022/1166**

LBC for the proposed refurbishment of existing farm house, conversion of existing attached and detached barns to create three new dwellings, conversion of outbuildings for associated residential use and external works. Resubmission of 3/2022/0729.  
Approved with Conditions

**3/2022/1165**

Application for Planning Permission for proposed refurbishment of existing farm house, conversion of existing attached and detached barns to create three new dwellings, conversion of outbuildings for associated residential use and external works. Resubmission of 3/2022/0727.  
Approved with Conditions

**3/2022/0729**

Listed Building Consent for the proposed refurbishment of existing farm house, conversion of existing attached and detached barns to create three new dwellings, conversion of outbuildings for associated residential use and external works.  
Withdrawn

**3/2022/0727**

Proposed refurbishment of existing farm house, conversion of existing attached and detached barns to create three new dwellings, conversion of outbuildings for associated residential use and external works.  
Withdrawn

**ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:**

**Site Description and Surrounding Area:**

Lower Reaps Farmhouse is a Grade II listed building dating to the 17<sup>th</sup> century with the barn opposite considered to be a curtilage listed structure with nearby outbuildings sited within land.

The site is located within the Green Belt, in an isolated location outside the settlement boundary of Mellor. Public footpaths FP41, FP43, FP44 and FP48 all pass through the site and as such, the site is considered to be located in a prominent position from the public realm.

Part of the site is also at high risk of surface water flooding.

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

Planning permission and listed building consent has been granted already for the conversion of the farmhouse and barns to three residential dwellings and subsequently varied by way of a Section 73 application.

This application relates to the barn to the south of the listed building only and seeks planning permission for its conversion to 1 no. 4 no. bedroom dwelling. There is an existing single storey outbuilding located to the west of the barn which is proposed to be retained for a garden/bin store.

The proposal originally included the erection of a detached garage to the east of the application. However, following concerns raised by the Planning Officer, a number of amendments to the scheme have been made. These include:

- Remove detached garage from the scheme
- Reduce the width of openings to the south elevation
- Removed the parking areas associated with the listed farmhouse from the site plan as these do not relate to this application
- Removal of larger parking area to the west of the barn following comments received from LCC Footpath Officer.
- Alterations to rooflights

The site also has a detached outbuilding which would be used for domestic storage. No works are proposed to this building.

**Impact upon Curtilage Listed Building:**

In assessing the proposal, regard must be given to the statutory duties imposed on the authority in respect of the preservation and enhancement of such assets. In this respect, at a local level, Key Statement EN5 and Policy DME4 are primarily, but not solely, engaged for the purposes of assessing likely impacts upon designated heritage assets resultant from the proposed development.

Key Statement EN5 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.*

*This will be achieved through:*

- *Recognising that the best way of ensuring the long term protection of heritage assets is to ensure a viable use that optimises opportunities for sustaining and enhancing its significance.*
- *Keeping Conservation Area Appraisals under review to ensure that any development proposals respect and safeguard the character, appearance and significance of the area.*
- *Considering any development proposals which may impact on a heritage asset or their setting through seeking benefits that conserve and enhance their significance and avoids any substantial harm to the heritage asset.*
- *Requiring all development proposals to make a positive contribution to local distinctiveness/sense of place.*
- *The consideration of Article 4 Directions to restrict permitted development rights where the exercise of such rights would harm the historic environment.”*

With Policy DME4 stating, in respect of development within conservation areas or those affecting the listed buildings or their setting, that development will be assessed on the following basis:

*“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 212 – 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.*

*219: Local planning authorities should look for opportunities for new development within Conservation Areas and World Heritage Sites, and within the setting of heritage assets, to enhance or better reveal their significance. Proposals that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to the asset (or which better reveal its significance) should be treated favourably.*

*221: Local planning authorities should assess whether the benefits of a proposal for enabling development, which would otherwise conflict with planning policies but which would secure the future conservation of a heritage asset, outweigh the disbenefits of departing from those policies.*

The Conservation and Heritage Officer has provided updated comments on the amended scheme. Firstly, they note that the re-use of the barn provides a significant public heritage benefit in its repair and re-use which is more likely to result in its long-term conservation.

The western elevation would re-use existing openings to provide doors and windows. To the south elevation, 3 no. existing openings would be enlarged to form double doors. The level of glazing has been reduced from as originally submitted and the Conservation and Heritage Officer considers that as this has been reduced to align with the current window openings, the harm is reduced.

The northern elevation would re-use existing opening which would include large, glazed openings. However, the Conservation and Heritage Officer notes that the level of glazing proposed to the northern elevation is less than the approved scheme and as such, this would be an improvement. Any harm is considered to be negligible.

It is considered that details of all new windows/doors can be secured by condition which should show a method of opening and should be flush fitting/rebated in the frame.

Following ongoing discussions between the Planning Officer and agent for the application, the ridge lights have now been amended to conservation style rooflights to ensure that the historic character of the barn is retained.

The proposed extent of take-down and rebuild outlined in the structural appraisal appears appropriate given the current condition of the barn. The Conservation and Heritage Officer considers that a condition that controls the areas of rebuild, eg a 1m x 1m sample panel showing the coursing, stone used and pointing should be added to any grant of permission.

Internally, the proposed alterations retain some open space which helps to retain its character. As the barn is in a ruinous state there is little internal fabric of interest. The Heritage and Conservation Officer considers that the partially preserved cobbled floor covering in the barn should ideally be preserved in situ but if this is not possible it should be relaid elsewhere on site, which would cause low level harm.

Overall, the proposal would result in a low/negligible level of less than substantial harm which should be weighed against the benefits of the proposal.

The previous application included an archaeology condition. No details have been submitted as part of this application in relation to archaeology and it would therefore seem appropriate to include this condition again. The Heritage and Conservation Officer recommends that following the historic building recording, a method statement should be submitted identifying features of interest and how they will be incorporated into the scheme. It is considered that this could be incorporated into the planning condition.

**Observations/Consideration of Matters Raised/Conclusion:**

NPPF requires that less than substantial harm be weighed against any public benefits and any harm be clearly and convincingly justified. Based on the secured amendments and additional information and having regard to the duty at section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, in giving 'great weight' to the conservation of the designated heritage asset and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and positively contributing to local character and distinctiveness, the proposal accords with the relevant Policies Ribble Valley Core Strategy Key Statement and the NPPF.

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