

Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.

Signed:	Officer:	MC	Date:	23/09/2026	Manager:	LH	Date:	23/9/26
----------------	-----------------	-----------	--------------	-------------------	-----------------	-----------	--------------	----------------

Application Ref:	3/2026/0421			 Ribble Valley Borough Council www.ribblevalley.gov.uk
Date Inspected:	Heritage and Conservation Officer visit on 07/08/2026	Site Notice:	29/07/2026	
Officer:	MC			
DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:				
				APPROVAL

Development Description:	Listed Building Consent for proposed new stair and first floor within a portion of the main hall, insertion of glazing in wall to create viewing gallery and insertion of secondary glazing to three existing windows.
Site Address/Location:	Chipping Congregational Church Garstang Road Chipping PR3 2QH

CONSULTATIONS:	Parish/Town Council
No response received.	

CONSULTATIONS:	Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies
Growth Lancashire:	Following further discussions with the agent for the application, the Heritage Officer considers that the proposal would result in less than substantial harm to the designated heritage asset which would need to be outweighed by public benefit. If the LPA were to approve the scheme, they recommend a condition that requires details of the secondary glazing to be provided and a section of the floor/platform build up to indicate how visible this will be externally.
Historic Buildings and Places:	Comments have been made in relation to the following: - Is the applicant satisfied that the present shell can bear the extra loading of the gallery? - Is the gallery to be trenched into the shell? - Note that the gallery would cut across the windows and a view on the external appearance should be made - Comments made on secondary glazing and whether it would be detachable to allow ease of access for painting and maintenance of the main window and ventilation in hot weather

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 EN5: Heritage Assets

Policy DMG1: General Considerations
Policy DME4: Protecting Heritage Assets

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Relevant Planning History:

3/2021/0461

Proposal to attach an uplit timber cross to the front (NW) facing elevation of the church and replacement of two timber external doors with plain hardwood timber doors in wood frames. Resubmission of 3/2020/1056.
Approved with Conditions

3/2020/1056

Proposal to attach an uplit timber cross to the front (NW) facing elevation of the church and replacement of two timber external doors with plain double-glazed doors in timber frames.
Refused

3/2013/0232

Removal of existing pews to form one large open space. Alteration and relocation of existing pulpit to side wall.
Approved with Conditions

3/2012/0015

Application for the discharge of condition no. 3 (coursing and jointing), condition no. 4 (walling), condition no. 5 (doors and windows) and condition no. 6 (landscaping) of planning consent 3/2010/0688P
Approved

3/2010/0688

Proposed single storey front extension to form disabled facilities. meeting room, kitchen and disabled ramp from the existing car park. Re-submission.
Approved with Conditions

3/2010/0689

Proposed single storey front extension to form disabled facilities, meeting room, kitchen and disabled ramp from existing car park. Re-submission.
Approved with Conditions

3/2009/0657

Single storey front extension to form disabled facilities, meeting room, kitchen and disabled ramp from the existing car park.
Refused

3/2009/0658

Single storey front extension to form disabled facilities, meeting room, kitchen and disabled ramp from the existing car park.
Refused

3/2008/0581

Proposed new folding sliding screen, supporting structure, timber cladding and new doors.

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:

Site Description and Surrounding Area:

The site is occupied by a Grade II Listed Church located within the Chipping Conservation Area, within the Forest of Bowland National Landscape.

The Listing is as follows:

'SD 64 SW CHIPPING CLUB LANE

4/64 Congregational Church II

Chapel, 1838. Squared watershot sandstone with sandstone plinth, quoins and square gutter. Each wall is of 2 bays, having windows with glazing bars, plain stone surrounds with semi-circular heads, keystones and radiating glazing bars. The south-west wall has a door with plain stone surround beneath each window. Between the windows is a plaque: 'PROVIDENCE CHAPEL ERECTED BY SUBSCRIPTION MDCCCXXXVIII'. The north-west (gable) wall has a one-storey porch at its left-hand side, now extended. Its right-hand return wall has a door with plain stone surround and a small window with plain stone surround, semi-circular head and keystone to its left.

Listing NGR: SD6212643200'

Proposed Development for which consent is sought:

The proposed development is for the construction of a new first floor platform consisting of an enclosed internal hardwood staircase located to the left-hand side of the entrance, fixed secondary glazing to the windows adjacent to the proposed platform, and a viewing screen consisting of glazing installed into the C20 dividing wall.

Heritage Impact:

With regards to heritage considerations, Key statement EN5 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy 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'.

In addition, Policy DME4 states:

'In considering development proposals the council will make a presumption in favour of the conservation and enhancement of heritage assets and their settings.

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 66 (2) (as amended by s.58B of Levelling-up and Regeneration Act 2023):

In considering whether to grant planning permission 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 2026):

Policy HE4 of the NPPF relates to securing the conservation of heritage assets and states that:

1. *Heritage assets, as an irreplaceable resource, should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance. To achieve this, development proposals which would affect the significance of heritage assets, including any contribution made by their setting should:*
 - a) *Maintain or secure a use consistent with their conservation, taking into account the importance of maintaining the assets, the positive contribution they can make to sustainable communities including local economies, and the positive contribution they can make to local character and distinctiveness; and*
 - b) *Avoid (or if that is not possible, minimise) harm to the significance of heritage assets, and instead conserve this significance.*
2. *Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (including from development within its setting) should have a clear and convincing justification in accordance with the policies in this chapter.*
3. *Where there is evidence of deliberate neglect of, or damage to, a heritage asset, the deteriorated state of the asset should not be taken into account in any decision relating to the asset.*
4. *Proposals for enabling development, which would otherwise conflict with other policies in this Framework and/or those in the development plan, but which would secure the future conservation of a heritage asset, should be considered on the basis of whether the conservation benefits outweigh the disbenefits of departing from the policies concerned.*

Policy HE5 also states that:

1. *Development proposals affecting heritage assets should be accompanied by an assessment of the significance of the assets affected (including any contribution made by their setting) and of the potential effect of the proposal on their significance. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is necessary to understand the potential effect of the proposal on their significance. The relevant historic environment record should be referred to in making this assessment, and appropriate expertise employed where necessary.*

2. *Assessments of the potential effects of development proposals on the significance of heritage assets (including through effects on their setting) should identify whether proposals would be likely to:*
 - a) *Have a positive effect, which is where the significance of a heritage asset would be enhanced, or better revealed; or*
 - b) *Have no effect on the significance of a heritage asset; or*
 - c) *Result in harm to the significance of a heritage asset, either from work affecting the asset itself or from development within its setting. The degree of harm should be identified: substantial harm would occur where the development proposal would seriously affect a key element of the asset's significance; or*
 - d) *Cause the total loss of the significance of a heritage asset.*
3. *In making this assessment it is the effect on a heritage asset's significance rather than the scale of the development which should be considered.*
4. *Decision-makers should be satisfied that assessments accurately reflect the effects on heritage assets caused by development proposals.*
5. *Where a development proposal involves, or has the potential to involve, a heritage asset with archaeological interest, an appropriate desk-based assessment should be undertaken and, where necessary, a field evaluation. These should be used to help understand the asset's significance and the potential effect of the proposal on this, which should inform the design, mitigation and implementation of the development.*

Policy HE6 of the NPPF is also of relevance and states:

1. *When considering the potential effect of a development proposal on the significance of a designated heritage asset, substantial 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 effect amounts to a positive effect, harm, substantial harm, or total loss of its significance.*
2. *Development proposals which would have a positive effect on a designated heritage asset should be supported.*
3. *Any harm to a designated heritage asset will be a matter of considerable importance and weight, which should be dealt with in accordance with paragraphs 4 to 6 of this policy.*
4. *Where a development proposal would harm the significance of a designated heritage asset the effect on the asset and its significance should be weighed against any public benefits resulting from the proposal. Important public benefits can include securing the long-term reuse of a vacant or underused listed building, and enabling energy efficiency and low carbon heating measures to be employed.*
5. *Where a development proposal would cause substantial harm to, or the total loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset, consent should be refused unless it can be demonstrated that the harm is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh the harm or loss, or if all of the following apply:*
 - a) *The nature of the heritage asset would otherwise prevent all reasonable uses of the site;*
 - b) *No suitable use for the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation;*
 - c) *Conservation by grant-funding or some form of not for profit, charitable or public ownership is not possible; and*
 - d) *The harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the asset back into use.*

6. *Within this context, development which would cause substantial harm to, or the total loss of, the significance of grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional; while development which would cause substantial harm to, or the total loss of, 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.*

Assessment of Impacts:

The Heritage and Conservation Officer has provided comments on the scheme. They note that the building is of special architectural and historic interest as a purpose-built congregational chapel dating to 1838. It is simple in plan and design, with a relatively square footprint and gabled roof, typical of chapel architecture in the mid C19. It has a series of tall, regularly placed round headed, multipane windows with two doors placed directly below two windows on the west elevation. It has replacement fenestration throughout.

As a Grade II listed building, it is of special interest, and is therefore considered to be of high significance, warranting every effort to preserve it.

Internally the space is divided by a modern screen at ground floor, though this appears as a lightweight structure with openable doors creating a single space. They note that little historic fabric remains and it has been subject to modernisation. The screen would form the outer wall of the first-floor platform and would have the glazed window.

Whilst there is little fabric remaining, the space remains relatively open and they consider that there would be some low-level harm in dividing the space, as this would obscure its open plan form and block views to the window opposite the door on the east elevation, and reduce the light, open character somewhat. The Heritage and Conservation Officer acknowledges that the window along the frontage of the screen at first floor would provide some, albeit limited, sense of openness, views toward the windows on the east elevation are positive and this would be obscured. These comments are also re-iterated by the Historic Buildings and Places consultee.

However, the Heritage and Conservation Officer at Growth Lancashire does not think this would amount to any more than negligible harm when viewed externally given the depth of the walling and position of the proposed platform/floor. A section drawing showing the floor levels in relation to the windows can be secured by way of planning condition.

The proposal for secondary glazing is considered acceptable, but the Heritage and Conservation Officer considers the transom might be obvious internally. They consider a fixed frame would be better as the windows don't open, so there is no need to provide opening secondary glazing. Secondary glazing fixed into place in a frame which can be lifted out of the frame for cleaning and access to the window would be preferred. An alternative can be secured by way of planning condition.

The need for additional space has been clearly articulated in the Design and Access Statement and the Heritage and Conservation Officer notes that during their site visit, it was evident there is insufficient room for the current congregation. They consider this satisfies Policy HE4: 2 of the NPPF (clear and convincing justification).

As such, the low and negligible harm identified would need to be weighed against the public benefits of the scheme, as required by Policy HE6:4 of the NPPF.

Other comments have been made by the Historic Buildings and Places consultee in relation to the structural loading of the first floor and how this would be trenched. However, this is something that would fall within the scope of Building Control. The application has been supported by a method statement which outlines that the first-floor installation will be guided by a structural engineer.

Observations/Consideration of Matters Raised/Conclusion:

Having regard to the above and the requirements of the NPPF, it is noted that the development would result in a low level of less than substantial harm to the significance of the heritage asset. However, in accordance with the above policies, an assessment of the harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset against the public benefits of the scheme shall be made.

It is considered that there are public benefits in the form of providing much needed additional accommodation for the congregational church. The supporting statement indicates that the congregation has grown and the building is used for community gatherings involving adults and children. Children are presently accommodated within the limited utility and kitchen area in the northern extension which is not a long-term solution. The proposal creates additional usable internal floor space without extending the listed building and would enable activities to be better organised while retaining the principal hall and supporting the continued use of the building as a place of worship and community facility.

As such, it is considered that the public benefits of the scheme would outweigh the identified less than substantial harm.

Subject to conditions, the scheme is considered acceptable and would comply with the relevant policies in the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and the NPPF.

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