


Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.

Signed:	Officer:	MC	Date:	07/04/2026	Manager:	LH	Date:	9/4/26
----------------	-----------------	-----------	--------------	-------------------	-----------------	-----------	--------------	---------------

Application Ref:	3/2026/0037			 Ribble Valley Borough Council www.ribblevalley.gov.uk				
Date Inspected:	25/02/2026	Site Notice:	25/02/2026					
Officer:	MC							
DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:					APPROVAL			

Development Description:	Planning Permission for removal of existing slates over the east wing. Replacement with sandstone tile roof covering to match those approved for the main house.
Site Address/Location:	Lovely Hall, Lovely Hall Lane, Copster Green BB1 9EQ

CONSULTATIONS:	Parish/Town Council
No response received.	

CONSULTATIONS:	Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies
Growth Lancashire:	The Heritage and Conservation Officer considers that proposed development described above will cause no discernible level of harm or loss of significance to the heritage asset. They recommend a condition for a Level 3 survey of the roof's interior of the historic sections of the building.
RVBC Countryside Officer:	Recommends the inclusion of a condition for no development to commence until confirmation has been sought from a licenced ecologist to confirmed whether or not these areas of the development will be affected/disturbed.
LCC Archaeology:	Any consent granted to the applications is made subject to the implementation of the recording of the roof timbers as set out in the existing approved Written Scheme of Investigation from Stephen Price and the method statement supplied with the current applications for the eastern wing (i.e. all that single-storey structure north and east of the main house), up to but not including the one-and-a-half storey garage building.

CONSULTATIONS:	Additional Representations.
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 EN4: Biodiversity and Geodiversity Key Statement EN5: Heritage Assets Policy DMG1: General Considerations Policy DMG2: Strategic Considerations Policy DME3: Site and Species Protection and Conservation

Policy DME4: Protecting Heritage Assets

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Relevant Planning History:

3/2026/0124

Approval of details reserved by conditions 5 (roof materials), 6 (roof vent), 7 (archaeological record) and 8 (mitigation measures for bats) of Listed Building Consent 3/2024/0767.

Approved with Conditions

3/2026/0038

Listed Building Consent for removal of existing slates over the east wing. Replacement with sandstone tile roof covering to match those approved for the main house.

Pending Consideration

3/2026/0070

Approval of details reserved by conditions 5 (roof materials), 6 (roof vent), 7 (archaeological record) and 8 (mitigation measures for bats) of planning permission 3/2024/0768.

Approved with Conditions

3/2024/0768

Planning Permission for re-roofing of existing house.

Approved with Conditions

3/2024/0767

Listed Building Consent for re-roofing of existing house.

Approved with Conditions

3/2022/0815

Discharge of Conditions 5 (Archaeological recording of the relevant historic fabric) of Listed Building Consent 3/2020/0853.

Approved No Conditions

3/2022/0348

Discharge of conditions 4 (Materials) and 6 (Protected Species) and part discharge of conditions 2 (Timber Repairs) and 5 (Archaeological Recording) of Listed Building Consent 3/2020/0853.

Approved No Conditions

3/2022/0349

Discharge of Conditions 2 (Materials) and 3 (Protected Species) of planning application 3/2020/0852.

Approved No Conditions

3/2020/0852

Re-roofing of existing building and installation of one en-suite shower room

Approved with Conditions

3/2020/0853

Re-roofing of existing building and installation of one en-suite shower room

Approved with Conditions

3/2007/0689

Replacement of existing garage/workshop/fitness room.

Approved with Conditions

3/2007/0690

Replacement of existing garage/workshop/fitness room. Re-submission.

Approved with Conditions

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:

Site Description and Surrounding Area:

Lovely Hall is a two storey Grade II listed dwellinghouse of c.1600, altered 1735 and 1874 located on Lovely Hall Lane, sited outside the settlement of Copster Green within open countryside designation.

The list entry states:

“Sandstone rubble with stone slate roof ... To each side of the porch is a lead downspout with hopper head inscribed: 'IWT 1735'. The right-hand cross-wing has a 2-storey mullioned and transomed canted bay window of 1874. To its right is a gabled addition of 1874 in a similar style, with a 10-light mullioned and transomed window on each floor. Chimneys on ridge of left-hand cross-wing, to right of porch, and to right of right-hand cross-wing. Inside, the door opens against a fireplace dated 1874, but retaining part of a stone arch dated 1712 or 1713. No other exposed features of architectural interest were visible at time of survey”.

The Hall is within the setting of ‘Sundial base south of Lovely Hall’ (1688; Grade II).

The building is not highly visible from public viewpoints or the highway and has a long vehicular and pedestrian drive fronting the property.

Apart from minor alterations, the Hall remains in the same layout and design as it was in 1874.

The Hall is mainly roofed in stone tiles, some secured by oak pins, with small sections remodelled in 1874 being roofed in conventional slates.

Proposed Development for which consent is sought:

Permission has been recently granted under planning and listed building consent ref: 3/2024/0768 and 0767 for the main part of the building to address roof leaks with all roof tiles and slates to be removed. A roof vent was also required within the tiles.

Planning permission is now sought to extend the work to include the roof over the east wing, so that all roof pitches match visually. The roof materials would be sandstone roof tiles to match those approved for the main roof.

Principle of Development:

Lovely Hall is Grade II listed and therefore the principle of the development is dependent upon the level of harm to the significance of the listed buildings together with compliance with the relevant policies in the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and the NPPF.

Impact upon Heritage Assets:

The building is Grade II listed and in assessing the proposal, regard must be given to the statutory duties imposed on the authority in respect of the preservation and enhancement of designated heritage 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:

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.

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.

Assessment of Impacts:

Lovely Hall has high evidential, historical and aesthetic significance with changes recorded in the fabric of the building, along with the still visible original building plan. In this context, as a listed building, it can be attributed as having a high significance.

The Heritage and Conservation Officer raise no objection to the scheme and considers that the proposed removal of the existing slates over the eastern wing and replacement with sandstone tile roof coverings would cause no discernible level of harm or loss of significance to the heritage asset identified above.

As outlined in the submitted method statement, they recommend a condition that requires a Level 3 survey of the roof's interior of the historic sections of the building. They note the presence of somewhat fragmentary sections of historic fabric in the photograph on the final page of the heritage statement and it is unclear whether this is in the section already approved for re-roofing or the later extension. Any historic fabric should be protected during the course of the works and identified in the survey which can be secured by way of condition. The Historic Environment Unit at Lancashire Country Council recommend that the works are implemented in accordance with the already approved Written Scheme of Investigation (which has now been submitted as part of this application) and the submitted method statement. Provided that a condition is added to any grant of permission so ensure the development is implemented in accordance with the recording of the historic roof timbers as outlined in December 2025 Written Scheme of Investigation, the proposal would be acceptable.

The proposals are considered to preserve the overall special interest of the listed building and whilst there is likely to be some limited low level, less than substantial harm caused by the re-roofing of the hall, this would be limited and has been fully justified in the submission in accordance with Para 213 of the NPPF.

Subject to appropriate conditions the proposal will be result in less than substantial harm which would be offset by the benefits of retaining and improving this residential building leading to its long-term conservation.

Due to the nature of the works, the proposal is considered to have a neutral impact on the setting of the Grade II listed sundial base.

Having regard to the above, the proposal would meet the objectives of Chapter 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework and is considered to accord with Policies DMG1 and DME4 and Key Statement EN5 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.

Visual Impact/External Appearance:

Paragraph 135 (c) of the NPPF states:

'Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments are sympathetic to local character and

history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting’.

Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy provides additional general design guidance as follows:

‘All development must be sympathetic to existing and proposed land uses in terms of its size, intensity and nature as well as scale, massing and style...particular emphasis will be placed on visual appearance and the relationship to surroundings, including impact on landscape character.’

Policy DMG2 states that:

“Within the open countryside development will be required to be in keeping with the character of the landscape and acknowledge the special qualities of the area by virtue of its size, design, use of materials, landscaping and siting. where possible new development should be accommodated through the re-use of existing buildings, which in most cases is more appropriate than new build”.

The proposed new roof tiles would be constructed of sandstone tiles to match the proposed roof to the main roof. Samples have not been provided of the specification of the tiles and as such, it would be reasonable to condition details of the tiles by way of condition to ensure they are appropriate to the surroundings.

Subject to the above, the proposal is considered to accord with Policies DMG1 and DMG2 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.

Ecology:

A previous bat survey carried out under the 2020 application process identified that bats were roosting within the building. Further surveys were carried out in July 2025 in support of the recently approved application which confirmed that an EPS licence would be required which was secured by way of planning condition. This report has been submitted again with this application and given that the bats were recorded emerging from the section of the building that relates to this application, the Countryside Officer recommends the inclusion of a condition to ensure no development commences until confirmation has been sought from a licenced ecologist to confirmed whether or not these areas of the development will be affected/disturbed.

In the event that an EPS license is required, as a responsible authority the LPA must consider the likelihood of an EPS license being secured from Natural England, and can identify no conflict with the three tests that would need to be satisfied (public interest, no reasonable alternative and opportunity for mitigation), as such the requirement for an EPS license would not be a reason to refuse planning permission.

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