


Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.

Signed:	Officer:	MC	Date:	10/06/2026	Manager:	LH	Date:	10/6/26
----------------	-----------------	-----------	--------------	-------------------	-----------------	-----------	--------------	----------------

Application Ref:	3/2026/0210			 Ribble Valley Borough Council <small>www.ribblevalley.gov.uk</small>				
Date Inspected:	19/05/2026	Site Notice:	19/05/2026					
Officer:	MC							
DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:					APPROVAL			

Development Description:	Listed building consent for installation of 2no security cameras on the front elevation.
Site Address/Location:	St Peter and Paul Presbytery, Stydd Lane, Ribchester, PR3 3YQ

CONSULTATIONS:	Parish/Town Council
No response received.	

CONSULTATIONS:	Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies
Growth Lancashire:	The Heritage and Conservation Officer considers that subject to the scheme not requiring the additional camera solar panels, the proposal would cause no discernible level of harm or loss of significance to the listed building.

CONSULTATIONS:	Additional Representations.
No additional representations received.	

RELEVANT POLICIES AND SITE PLANNING HISTORY:

Ribble Valley Core Strategy:

Relevant Core Strategy Policies:

- Key Statement EN5: Heritage Assets
- Policy DMG1: General considerations
- Policy DME4: Protecting Heritage Assets

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act, Section 66 & 72

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Relevant Planning History:

3/2022/0846

Observation of application 1160 under the ecclesiastical exemption from listed building control. Viewable at <https://catholic-historic-churches.org.uk/applications/north-west-1160>
No objections

3/2005/0683

Installation of 60 centimetre satellite dish located on rear elevation gable/side of left hand building at link-building ridge height.

Approved with Conditions

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:

Site Description and Surrounding Area:

The application site comprises a Grade II listed building – Stydd Lodge which is the Presbytery to the Church of St Peter and St Paul. The site is also located within the Ribchester Conservation Area and within the setting of a number of listed buildings, including the Grade II listed Church of St Peter and St Paul, the Grade II* listed Almshouses 1-4 Stydd and the Grade II listed Wellhead in Garden East of Almshouses.

Proposed Development for which consent is sought:

The proposed development relates to the installation of 2 no. security cameras on the front elevation of the former presbytery to help manage long term problems with anti-social behaviour. The submitted information states that the cameras are small in scale, measuring approximately 68mm wide, 67mm high and 138mm long. They would be solar powered and Wi-Fi enabled, meaning that no external cabling would be required across the building. The supporting documents also indicate that the cameras are intended to be fixed through mortar joints rather than drilled into the stone blocks.

Impact upon 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 (that being the Grade I West Fronts roof and the Grade II* South Front.

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.

Assessment

The Heritage and Conservation Officer has been consulted on the application and they note the two proposed cameras appear modest in scale and as shown on the submitted details and they do not consider that the proposal would result in any discernible harm to the special architectural or historic interest of the host listed building. Their limited size, absence of associated external cabling is a minor alteration and owing to the security issues highlight, are adequately justified.

They do note that within the supporting information for the EufyCam E40, it refers to the possible use of a separate backup solar panel in conjunction with the camera's built-in solar panel and clarification is sought as to whether this element is proposed (as this would likely be more visually intrusive and could result in a greater impact to the significance of the listed building).

The applicant has clarified that the built-in solar panels are sufficient for their needs and no backup solar panel is proposed to be installed.

Observations/Consideration of Matters Raised/Conclusion:

As such, taking into consideration the comments made by the Heritage and Conservation Officer and from the applicant with regards to any additional solar panels, it is not considered that the proposed development would result in any harm to the Grade II Listed Building, subject to the development being implemented in accordance with the approved details.

As such, the proposal is considered to accord with the relevant Policies Ribble Valley Core Strategy Key Statement and the NPPF.

RECOMMENDATION:	That listed building consent be granted subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions.
------------------------	--