


Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.

| | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|-----------------|-----------|--------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------|--------------|----------------|
| Signed: | Officer: | KH | Date: | 19/09/25 | Manager: | LH | Date: | 22/9/25 |
|----------------|-----------------|-----------|--------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------|--------------|----------------|

| | | | | |
|------------------------------------|-----------|---------------------------|----------|---|
| Application Ref: | 2025/0538 | | |  Ribble Valley Borough Council <hr/> www.ribblevalley.gov.uk |
| Date Inspected: | 02/05/25 | Publicity expires: | 23/05/25 | |
| Officer: | KH | | | |
| DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT: | | | | REFUSAL |

| | |
|---------------------------------|--|
| Development Description: | Listed Building Consent: Insertion of 3 rooflights to southern roof slope. |
| Site Address/Location: | Barn at Talbot Hotel 5 Talbot Street Chipping PR3 2QE |

| | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|
| CONSULTATIONS: | Parish/Town Council |
| No response. | |

| | |
|-----------------------|--|
| CONSULTATIONS: | Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies |
| N/A | |
| CONSULTATIONS: | Additional Representations. |
| None. | |

RELEVANT POLICIES AND SITE PLANNING HISTORY:

Ribble Valley Core Strategy:

Key Statement DS1 – Development Strategy
Key Statement DS2 – Sustainable Development
Key Statement EN1 – Green Belt
Key Statement EN2 – Landscape
Key Statement EN3 – Sustainable Development and Climate Change
Key Statement EN5 – Heritage Assets

Policy DMG1 – General Considerations
Policy DMG3 – Transport & Mobility
Policy DME3 – Site and Species Protection and Conservation
Policy DMH3 – Dwellings in the Open Countryside & the AONB
Policy DMH4 – The Conversion of Barns and other Buildings to Dwellings
Policy DME4 – Protecting Heritage Assets

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Relevant Planning History:

3/2025/0208 - Listed Building Consent for addition of new antique black iron air extract bricks to the external facade and new aco drain around garden fencing – Approved.

25/0084 - Listed Building Consent for formation of additional living accommodation in roof spaces of 3b and 3c with introduction of new staircase from first to second floor – Granted.

24/0458 – Listed Building Consent: Application to regularise the works undertaken to raise cills by one stone course, new stone surrounds installed to windows and doors, raising of property door heights and rotation of first floor windows on front elevation and new first floor window on rear (street-scene) elevation. New ground floor window to the front elevation – Granted.

24/0459 – Planning Permission: Application to regularise the works undertaken to raise cills by one stone course, new stone surrounds installed to windows and doors, raising of property door heights and rotation of first floor windows on front elevation and new first floor window on rear (street-scene) elevation. New ground floor window to the front elevation. Replacement Roof – Approved.

2024/0458 - LBC: Application to regularise the works undertaken to raise cills by one stone course, new stone surrounds installed to windows and doors, raising of property door heights and rotation of first floor windows on front elevation and new first floor window on rear (street-scene) elevation. New ground floor window to the front elevation. Granted

2024/0339 – LBC: Removal of existing roof trusses and replacement with new non-structural trusses. Re roofing of existing roof with replacement slates – Approved with conditions.

2023/0726 – Approval of Details reserved by condition 3 (samples of materials) of listed building consent 3/2023/0086 – Approved.

2023/0709 – Approval of Details reserved by condition 5 (details of repairs/replacement), 12 (drainage), 13 (Construction Management Plan) and 17 (Tree Protection) of planning permission 3/2023/0085 – Approved.

2023/0710 – Approval of Details reserved by condition 5 (details of repairs/replacement), 8 (Construction Management Plan) and 11 (Building Recording and Analysis) of listed building consent 3/2023/0086 – Approved.

3/2023/0085 – Vary Conditions 5, 12, 13, 15, 19, 20 of planning permission 3/2022/0279. To allow the Talbot Pub and Barn to be developed separately by different parties - Approved

3/2023/0086 – Vary Conditions 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 of listed building consent 3/2022/0278. To allow the Talbot Pub and Barn to be developed separately by different parties - Approved

3/2023/0087 – Discharge of conditions 3, 4, 5, 6, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21 of planning permission 3/2023/0085 – Split Decision.

3/2023/0088 – Discharge of Conditions 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12 of listed building consent – Split Decision.

2022/0279 & 2022/0278 – Full and LBC: Partial demolition of a Grade II Listed Building; conversion of public house into one dwelling and one holiday let. Limited external alterations to Talbot Hotel. Conversion of adjacent barn into three new dwellings with associated works. Formation of parking and manoeuvring areas to rear. Hard and soft landscaping – Approved with conditions.

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:

Site Description and Surrounding Area:

The site consists of a Grade II Listed Barn located within Chipping Parish. The site is within Chipping Conservation Area and the Forest of Bowland National Landscape (formerly Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty), there are also protected trees within the site.

The building was last in use as a Barn and has permission to be converted into three dwellinghouses, with these works ongoing.

The site is served by an established access off Talbot Street.

Proposed Development for which consent is sought:

This proposal seeks consent to insert three rooflights into the southern (front) roof slope.

Principle of Development:

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 is to preserve or enhance the special character of heritage assets, including their setting. LPAs should, in coming to decisions, consider the principal 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.

Chapter 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework sets out expectations with regards to conserving and enhancing the historic environment. Applicants are required to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting.

Local Planning Authorities should consider any loss of historic fabric to constitute harm, but to make an assessment as to the significance of the asset and apply weight to its conservation accordingly.

Accordingly, the proposed works to the Listed Building will be carefully assessed with respect to the duties above.

Impact upon Listed Buildings and Setting:

The Talbot Barn and adjacent Hotel are both Grade II listed in recognition of their national architectural and historic interest. The Barn and Hotel both date from the late 18th Century and derive significance from their relationship and make an important contribution to the Chipping Conservation Area.

The 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’.

Paragraph 212 of the NPPF states:

‘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.’

In addition, Key Statement EN5 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy states:

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:

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.

Heritage impact is considered to be the potential level of harm upon the significance of a heritage asset caused by development proposals. The NPPF defines significance as ‘the value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest’. Such interest can be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic.

National Planning guidance requires applicants to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting in order to allow the LPA to come to a judgment about the level of impact on that significance and therefore on the merits of the proposal.

A heritage statement has been provided in support of the application.

In terms of justification for the proposed works, the application's Heritage Statement Addendum states that "the windows in question are not modern additions and that they were present in the original structure prior to the commencement of work."

"We now seek to reinstate them in line with the building's historic form and character, using conservation-style heritage rooflights. This approach is consistent with the recommendations of the heritage consultant and is actively supported by the appointed project archaeologist."

Photographic evidence shows three modest sized agricultural glass 'slates' or similar were present in the southern elevation. Limited information on how long they were in situ for has been provided. However, the majority of the historic fabric of the roof including these slates were removed and replaced as part of listed building consent 3/2024/0339 which sought consent to remove the existing trusses and re-roof the existing roof with replacement slates. This work has been completed.

Therefore, this proposal is not a consideration of replacing existing rooflights but results in the insertion of three new rooflights on this prominent roof slope which is considered to be unduly harmful to the building's character and result in a less than substantial (low level) of harm to the heritage asset.

Paragraph 215 of the NPPF states:

'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.'

In this instance, installation of the proposed three roof lights into the southern roof slope would offer very limited small scale public benefits in the form of short-term contractor employment. This would not outweigh the harm identified.

It is stated that as rooflights were present prior to any intervention that their omission from the final approved plans was an error of process and not a deliberate alteration to the buildings character. However, this is not the case. The original listed building consent for works to the Talbot Public House and Barn was approved under 3/2022/0278 with a condition (No. 7) attached which stated:

Notwithstanding the details shown upon the approved plans, no approval is given for the three roof lights on the Barn to be converted. The development shall be carried out in strict accordance with the approved details.

REASON: In order that the detailed design of the proposal does not undermine the character and appearance of the Listed Buildings.

This condition was not disputed and this was required in order to control the number of new openings proposed to ensure a more sympathetic conversion scheme.

The statement goes on to claim that as the Barn and the Talbot Hotel were originally part of a single functional and architectural entity consistency between the two structures support the visual coherence of the conservation area.

Whilst this statement does have some merit it is considered that these changes would be detrimental both to the listed Barn and the Conservation Area and go beyond that already approved to allow the building to be reused as residential accommodation which set is already considered to be the optimum viable use. The proposal would not result in any enhancement of the building or its use and therefore is considered to be unnecessary and harmful.

As such, the limited public benefits identified are not considered to outweigh the harm that would occur to the heritage asset from the proposed development. In addition, the heritage asset provides an

existing residential use that would not cease in the event of the proposal failing to be implemented therefore the heritage asset is already considered to be in its optimum viable use.

It is also worth highlighting that the LPA has previously expressed its concern about the introduction of rooflights into the building, indeed the applicant was asked to remove them from applications 3/2024/458 and 459 before they were approved.

The proposed rooflights, by virtue of their size and position, would result in a harmful impact upon the Grade II Listed Building Talbot Barn. As such the proposal fails to accord with Section 16 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, Key Statement EN5 and Policy DME4 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Impact upon Character/appearance of Conservations Area:

The Talbot Barn and adjacent Hotel are both Grade II listed in recognition of their national architectural and historic interest. The Barn and Hotel both date from the late 18th Century and derive significance from their relationship and make an important contribution to the Chipping Conservation Area.

Proposals within a Conservation Area are required to conserve and where appropriate enhance its character and appearance and those elements which contribute towards its significance.

Paragraph 212 of the NPPF states:

‘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.’

In addition, Key Statement EN5 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy states:

‘There will be a presumption in favour of the conservation and enhancement of the significance of heritage assets and their settings.’

Furthermore, Policy DME4 of the Core Strategy states:

‘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.’

Heritage impact is considered to be the potential level of harm upon the significance of a heritage asset caused by development proposals. The NPPF defines significance as ‘the value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest’. Such interest can be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic.

National Planning guidance requires applicants to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting in order to allow the LPA to come to a judgment about the level of impact on that significance and therefore on the merits of the proposal.

A heritage statement has been provided in support of the application.

In terms of justification for the proposed works, the application’s Heritage Statement Addendum states that “the windows in question are not modern additions and that they were present in the original structure prior to the commencement of work.”

“We now seek to reinstate them in line with the building’s historic form and character, using conservation-style heritage rooflights. This approach is consistent with the recommendations of the heritage consultant and is actively supported by the appointed project archaeologist.”

Photographic evidence shows three modest sized agricultural glass ‘slates’ or similar were present in the southern elevation. Limited information on how long they were in situ for has been provided. However, the majority of the historic fabric of the roof including the original agricultural rooflights was removed the majority of the historic fabric of the roof including these slates were removed and replaced as part of listed building consent 3/2024/0339 which sought consent to remove the existing trusses and re-roof the existing roof with replacement slates. This work has been completed.

Therefore, this proposal is not a consideration of replacing existing rooflights but results in the insertion of three new rooflights on this prominent roof slope which is considered to be unduly harmful to the building’s character and result in a less than substantial (low level) of harm to the heritage asset.

Paragraph 215 of the NPPF states:

‘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.’

In this instance, installation of the proposed three roof lights into the southern roof slope would offer very limited small scale public benefits in the form of short-term contractor employment. This would not outweigh the harm identified.

The Heritage Statement claims that as the Barn and the Talbot Hotel were originally part of a single functional and architectural entity consistency between the two structures support the visual coherence of the conservation area.

Whilst this statement does have some merit it is considered that these changes would be detrimental both to the listed Barn and the Conservation Area and go beyond that already approved to allow the building to be reused as residential accommodation which set is already considered to be the optimum viable use. The proposal would not result in any enhancement of the building or its use and therefore is considered to be unnecessary and harmful.

As such, the limited public benefits identified are not considered to outweigh the harm that would occur to the heritage asset from the proposed development. In addition, the heritage asset provides an existing residential use that would not cease in the event of the proposal failing to be implemented therefore the heritage asset is already considered to be in its optimum viable use.

The proposed changes would result in a detrimental impact to the barn itself and its prominent setting within the village as well as the wider setting within the Conservation Area.

The proposed rooflights, by virtue of their size and position, would result in a harmful impact upon Chipping Conservation Area. As such the proposal fails to accord with Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, Key Statement EN5 and Policy DME4 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Impact Upon Residential Amenity:

Whilst there are residential properties in close proximity to the site, the proposal would not result in any further impact than the schemes already approved and would not result in any undue amenity issues.

Visual Amenity/External Appearance:

The site is within the Forest of Bowland National Landscape (formerly Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty) and has a prominent setting within the centre of this village location.

The addition of three rooflights into the prominent southern roof slope would result in the introduction of additional glazed openings within the roof slope which fronts the public highway which would be unacceptable in terms of its visual appearance.

The supporting statement claims that although the planning officer raised concerns about visibility from the public highway, it has been demonstrated during a site visit that the front roof slope is largely not visible from Talbot Street due to its angle. This is not the case.

The site, especially its southern roof slope, is visible from vantage points along Talbot Street and in particularly from the higher ground at the corner of Windy Street with Talbot Street opposite the Grade II* Listed Church.

The proposed changes result in an unacceptable visual impact within the Forest of Bowland National Landscape contrary to Key Statement EN2 and Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy. Nonetheless as this is a LBC application it is not considered that refusal reason on this basis is justified.

Observations/Consideration of Matters Raised/Conclusion:

Installation of the proposed rooflights would have a harmful impact upon designated heritage assets (Talbot Barn and Chipping Conservation Area). The degree of harm to the designated heritage asset would be less than substantial and, in this instance, there are no public benefits identified that would outweigh the harm caused.

As such, the proposal fails to meet the requirements of Key Statements EN2 and EN5 and Policies DMG1 and DME4 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy, Sections 16 and 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and Paragraphs 210, 212 and 215 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

As such and for the above reasons, having regard to all material considerations and matters raised, the application is recommended for refusal.

RECOMMENDATION:

That listing building consent be refused on the following grounds:

01.

The proposed rooflights, by virtue of their size and position, would result in a harmful impact upon a Grade II Listed Building (Talbot Barn) and Chipping Conservation Area. As such the proposal fails to accord with Section 16 and 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, Key Statement EN5 and Policy DME4 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and Paragraphs 210,212 and 215 of the National Planning Policy Framework.