

Appeal Statement

Appellant: Mr Paul Leung – Tri Star Developments (Kearsley) Limited

Date: 29/09/2025

Site: Barn adjacent to The Talbot Hotel, 5 Talbot Street, Chipping, PR3 2QE

Application Reference: 3/2025/0538

Proposal: Reinstatement of three rooflights (erroneously titled as “Insertion of three rooflights”)

Local Planning Authority: Ribble Valley Borough Council

1. Introduction

1.1 Background

This appeal is submitted in respect of the refusal of Listed Building Consent for the reinstatement of three rooflights on the front (south-east, roadside) elevation of the barn adjacent to the Talbot Hotel, Talbot Street, Chipping.

The barn is a Grade II listed building, historically associated with the adjacent Talbot Hotel (also Grade II listed). Both sit within the Chipping Conservation Area and the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

At the time of purchase, planning permission and listed building consent already existed for conversion of the barn into three dwellings. Historic rooflights on the front slope were omitted in error from the approved drawings, despite being original features of the building. The present application sought to correct that oversight.

1.2 Nature of Application

The proposal was to reinstate three previously existing rooflights. Unfortunately, when the application was first lodged, the description was incorrectly entered as “Insertion of three roof lights.” This was a clerical mistake and did not reflect the proposal.

Within seven days of submission, the appellant’s architect wrote to the planning case officer to request that the description be corrected to “Reinstatement of three roof lights.” The officer declined, responding: *“We have not agreed this change to the description as it does not accurately reflect the proposal.”*

That response is demonstrably incorrect. The application documents — including the Heritage Addendum, Archaeology Statement, and proposed plans — all clearly state that the proposal was reinstatement, not insertion. Photographic and documentary evidence was provided to prove this.

1.3 Decision

The application was refused on the basis that the rooflights would constitute harmful insertions visible from the public realm. The refusal is unsound, as it is based on a mischaracterisation of the works and incomplete consideration of the evidence.

2. Errors and Omissions in Published Application Documents

The appellant submitted a Heritage Addendum Statement which contained, among other evidence:

- Reference to the appointed archaeologist's advice at Part 7.7 confirming that reinstatement of the rooflights would cause no harm.
- Photographic evidence (Photo 5) of the Talbot Hotel's roadside rooflights, demonstrating their visibility from the public highway and their identical form to those historically in the barn.

However, the version of the Addendum published on the planning portal omitted these sections, stopping at Photo 4. The reasons for this omission are unclear, but the effect was to materially weaken the case presented to the decision-maker.

The Council's decision should therefore be regarded as having been taken on the basis of incomplete information.

For the avoidance of doubt, the complete original Addendum, including the omitted material, is submitted with this appeal. The appellant respectfully requests that the Inspector consider the application in light of the full supporting evidence.

3. Site and Heritage Context

The Talbot Hotel and adjacent barn together formed part of a historic estate. Both are Grade II listed buildings and important contributors to the character of the Chipping Conservation Area.

The Talbot Hotel has Listed Building Consent for the replacement of its roadside rooflights with heritage-style conservation rooflights. These are yet to be physically installed as works are ongoing, but approval has already been granted in the same context.

No. 3 Talbot Street, immediately adjacent to the barn, contains conservation rooflights on both the roadside (front slope) and the rear slope. These rooflights are significantly larger and more visually prominent than the modest reinstatement proposed for the barn.

The barn itself historically contained three roadside rooflights. Photographic evidence and internal inspection confirm their existence before renovation works commenced.

4. Response to Delegated Report

4.1 Acknowledgement of Existing Rooflights

The delegated report acknowledges that the barn did historically contain rooflights, referring to them as “modest sized agricultural slates.” This confirms their presence, aligning with the photographic evidence and internal framing visible pre-renovation.

4.2 Archaeologist’s Position

The report also acknowledges the archaeologist’s support at Part 7.7, confirming reinstatement would cause no harm. This expert opinion is consistent with best conservation practice and should be afforded substantial weight.

4.3 “New Roof = Not Reinstatement” Argument

The officer’s reasoning is that because the roof covering has been renewed, reinstating rooflights is a “new proposal.” This is illogical: the material roof covering may be new, but the historic apertures and evidence of rooflights remain part of the building’s significance. Reinstatement restores authenticity, irrespective of roof renewal.

4.4 Visibility

The officer disputes that the roof slope is “largely not visible.” Site context demonstrates that the roof slope is difficult to view from Talbot Street itself and is only clearly visible from a single elevated vantage point near the Sun Inn. Even from that location, conservation rooflights would be discreet and indistinguishable from those already approved for the Talbot Hotel.

4.5 Planning History

The officer notes that in the original joint application, the omission of the barn’s rooflights was not contested. This is factually true but irrelevant. If the Council had been consistent in applying their conservation duties, they should have insisted upon retention or reinstatement of these original features as part of that earlier application. To now resist reinstatement contradicts their stated commitment to authenticity and heritage protection.

5. Grounds of Appeal

5.1 Mischaracterisation of Proposal

The refusal decision is procedurally unsound because it rests on a mischaracterisation of the works. The correct description is reinstatement, not insertion.

5.2 Historic Evidence of Rooflights

The Heritage Addendum and photographs confirm the rooflights' historic presence. Their omission from earlier approved plans was an error, not an accurate reflection of the building's character.

5.3 Expert Support

The archaeologist's statement explicitly supports reinstatement. This professional heritage advice outweighs subjective officer opinion.

5.4 Inconsistency in Decision-Making

- The Talbot Hotel, part of the same historic estate, has roadside rooflights approved for replacement with conservation rooflights.
- No. 3 Talbot Street, immediately adjacent to the barn, contains conservation rooflights on both the roadside and rear slopes, which are larger and more visible than those proposed.
- The barn itself historically contained three roadside rooflights.
- To approve and accept rooflights for both neighbouring buildings while refusing reinstatement for the barn is inconsistent and unreasonable.

5.5 Policy Alignment

- **NPPF (2023), paras 194–202:** Reinstating lost historic features sustains and enhances significance.
 - **Ribble Valley Core Strategy Policy DME4:** Supports sympathetic reinstatement of original features.
 - **Policy EN5:** Requires safeguarding of heritage assets. Preventing reinstatement undermines authenticity.
-

6. Design and Technical Considerations

The proposed rooflights are Velux Heritage Conservation roof windows (55 × 98 cm), the smallest available size.

They are slim, flush-fitting, black-framed, and include a central glazing bar — designed specifically for heritage settings.

The Methodology Statement confirms works will be non-intrusive, use existing rafter spaces, and remain fully reversible.

7. Visual and Heritage Impact

Visibility of the barn's front roof slope is extremely limited from Talbot Street, due to the bottleneck in the road and the shallow roof angle.

The roof is only fully visible from a distant elevated position near the Sun Inn. From this location, the rooflights would appear as discreet conservation features, identical to those already approved for the Talbot Hotel.

The reinstatement therefore causes no harm to the significance of the listed building or the wider Conservation Area. On the contrary, it restores authenticity.

8. Conclusion

- The rooflights were original historic features, confirmed by photographs and internal evidence.
- Their omission from earlier approvals was an oversight.
- The application sought reinstatement, not insertion. The refusal was based on mischaracterisation and incomplete information.
- Expert evidence supports reinstatement.
- Both adjoining buildings (The Talbot Hotel and No. 3 Talbot Street) have conservation rooflights, creating clear precedent.
- The design is conservation-appropriate, technically sound, and causes no harm.

For these reasons, the appellant respectfully requests that the Inspector allow the appeal and grant Listed Building Consent for the reinstatement of the three rooflights.

Appendices:

1. Complete original Heritage Addendum (with Photo 5 and archaeologist reference)
2. Archaeology Statement
3. Heritage Statement
4. Methodology Statement
5. Proposed Plans and Elevations
6. Velux Datasheet
7. Site photographs of the barn roof (roadside visibility and Sun Inn vantage point)
8. Photographs of No. 3 Talbot Street (front and rear conservation rooflights)
9. Photographs of Talbot Hotel roadside rooflights