

Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.							
Signed:	Officer:	BT	Date:	17/9/26	Manager:	LH	Date: 18/9/26

Application Ref:	3/2026/0506			 Ribble Valley Borough Council www.ribblevalley.gov.uk
Date Inspected:	31/7/26	Site Notice:	31/7/26	
Officer:	BT			
DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:				APPROVAL

Development Description:	Listed Building Consent for repairs and maintenance of roof and rainwater goods on barn buildings.
Site Address/Location:	Spring House Farm (Barns), Pendleton, BB7 1PT.

CONSULTATIONS:	Parish/Town Council
Pendleton Parish Council:	Consulted 28/7/26 – no response received.

CONSULTATIONS:	Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies
None.	
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 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 1990 Section 16 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
Relevant Planning History: 3/2025/0903: Listed Building Consent for Roof Repairs and maintenance. Rain water goods repaired (Withdrawn) 3/2022/0051: To fell 3 Ash Trees due to severe ash die back and safety concerns (Approved) 3/1999/0646: Remove old footbridge previously at Pendleton but now at Standen hall and erect on common land. Plaque to be attached (Approved)

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:

Site Description and Surrounding Area:

The application relates to a farmstead located in Pendleton. Access to the application site is from Main Street with the farmstead comprising a farmhouse property, adjoining barn building and three additional stone barn buildings adjoined in an 'L' shape formation, with a dilapidated 20th Century timber post and panel lean to structure topped with a corrugated asbestos roof adjoining the South-eastern end of the three smaller barn buildings. The application site lies within in a predominantly residential setting within the Pendleton Conservation Area with the wider surrounding area comprising a mixture of woodland, agricultural land and open countryside. Spring House Farm and its adjoining barn building hold Grade II Listed Building status with the listing description for the farmhouse and barn reading as follows:

'House, early C17th. Sandstone rubble with roof of imitation stone slates. 2 storeys. North wall has 5-light double-chamfered mullioned window at left. At the right is a window with reconstructed double-chamfered surround, and hood. To its left is a blocked doorway with chamfered surround. On the 1st floor is a 2-light window with plain stone surround and square mullion. To its left are 2 one-light blocked chamfered windows. To its right are 2 similar windows, the left-hand one at a lower level. The south wall is of 3 bays, having windows with plain stone surrounds and square mullions, of 2 lights, 3 lights and 2 lights. The door, to the right of the first bay, has a plain stone surround. Interior. The room to the right of the present doorway has a massive firehood bressumer, chamfered with lambs-tongue stops. The two axial main ceiling joists are also chamfered and stopped. The east wall of the room is formed by a plank-and-muntin partition, the muntins having scribed mouldings. At each side of the partition are doorways into the 2 eastern rooms, each with a plank door and with a Tudor-arched head having an incised cross above the apex of the arch. The eastern rooms are separated by a similar partition. The barn, probably, of early C19th date, has a roof of stone slate, and a north wall which continues the line of the house. It has a wide entrance with a segmental arch of punched voussoirs, and a window to the right with a concrete surround.'

The above listing description does not make reference to the three smaller barn buildings within the farmstead however these buildings lie in close proximity to Spring House Farm and its adjoining barn with historic mapping showing the buildings to be of late 19th Century origins and with no evidence to suggest that these buildings have ever been in separate ownership from the farmhouse and adjoining barn. Accordingly, the additional barn buildings within the site are considered to hold curtilage listed structure status.

Proposed Development for which consent is sought:

Listed Building Consent is sought for repair works to the roof and rainwater goods on the barn adjoining Spring House Farm and the three additional stone barn buildings within the site.

Principle of Development:

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. LPAs should, in coming to decisions, consider the principle Act which states the following;

Listed Buildings – Section 66(1) (as amended by s.58B of Levelling-up and Regeneration Act 2023) In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the building or its setting. 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.

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 20 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2026) 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 Building:

Policy HE6 (1) of the NPPF (2026) states:

‘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.’

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.

Statements Of Heritage Significance, Historic England (2019) defines these as follows:

‘Archaeological Interest: There will be archaeological interest in a heritage asset if it holds, or potentially holds, evidence of past human activity worthy of expert investigation at some point.’

‘Architectural And Artistic Interest: Interests in the design and general aesthetics of a place. They can arise from conscious design or fortuitously from the way the heritage asset has evolved. More specifically, architectural interest is an interest in the art or science of the design, construction, craftsmanship and decoration of buildings and structures of all types. Artistic interest is an interest in other human creative skills, like sculpture’.

‘Historic Interest: An interest in past lives and events (including pre-historic). Heritage assets can illustrate or be associated with them. Heritage assets with historic interest not only provide a material

record of our nation's history but can also provide meaning for communities derived from their collective experience of a place and can symbolise wider values such as faith and cultural identity.'

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 which summarises the significance of the heritage asset as follows:

'The barn at Spring House Farm is considered to make significant contributions to the archaeological interest of the listed farmstead, in terms of the physical fabric of the building...Given its considerable age and unique design, the barn is considered to hold inherent historic interest as a contributor to its significance...More generally, the barn contributes to the broader historic narrative of the Huntroyde Estate and Pendleton village...The barn's architectural and artistic interest is particularly expressed along its principal, north facing elevation, where its unique design, exemplified by the arrangement of its original doorway and openings in addition to key decorative features such as attractive quoin stones can best be appreciated.'

Accordingly, the above observations indicate that the significance of the barn building adjoining Spring House Farm is underpinned through a combination of its archaeological interest (remnant historic fabric), historic interest (age and association with historic farming practices in the area) and architectural interest (sequence of openings and decorative features within principal elevation). Whilst the three additional stone barn buildings within the site were not assessed as part of the application's heritage appraisal and are considered to be of limited architectural merit, these buildings are nonetheless considered to hold a similar level of archaeological and historic interest to the site's main barn building by virtue of their remnant historic fabric and association with historic farming practices in the area.

Making changes to Heritage Assets, Historic England (2016) states:

'Good conservation of heritage assets is founded on appropriate routine management and maintenance. Such an approach will minimise the need for larger repairs or other interventions and will usually represent the most economical way of sustaining an asset...Original materials normally only need to be replaced when they have failed in their structural purpose.'

In addition, Guidance on Alterations to Listed Buildings (IHBC, 2021) states:

'A building derives much of its character and appearance from its roof. Roofs often contain the oldest and least altered parts of a building...alterations should respect what survives in its original form...existing slates can usually be reused...the shortfall should, if possible, be made up from new material of the same or closely similar geological type.'

The application's supporting information describes the roof of the main barn building as currently being in a demonstrably poor condition and this was evident during the case officer's site visit. The roof profiles of the three additional barn buildings within the site were also observed as being in similar condition. In this instance, the existing roof slates on each of the barn buildings are to be stripped and re-laid which would help to preserve the roof structure of each building through creating watertight roof profiles that would prevent any further occurrences of water ingress. In addition, the coursing and dimensions of all roof slates is to be recorded prior to their removal which would allow for an accurate reconstruction of each barn roof profile. Furthermore, whilst there may be a potential requirement to utilise replacement roof slates on some of the barn buildings these would be like-for-like replacements using reclaimed stone from elsewhere on the Huntroyde Estate which in turn would be respectful to the historic roof profiles of the buildings.

It is stated that existing rooflights within the barn buildings are to be replaced where necessary with conservation style rooflights however the existing rooflights in place on the main barn building and central barn of the three adjoining barns comprise of modestly sized agricultural style rooflights (one on each barn building) therefore their replacement with conservation style rooflights is not considered to be appropriate in this instance given that these would be overtly domestic features sited on buildings for agricultural use. As such, it is considered that like for like replacements would be more appropriate for any replacement rooflights and further details of these has been secured through the imposition of a condition.

Existing roof timbers within the barn buildings are to be inspected, cleaned and retained where possible with any replacement of roofing timber being restricted to those that threaten the structural soundness of the barn buildings. This approach would ensure a maximum retention of the barn's historic roofing fabric and as such is considered to be acceptable.

Existing rainwater goods on the barn buildings (which are currently in a less than desirable condition both structurally and visually) are to be repaired and replaced where necessary which in turn would deliver a minor enhancement to the character and appearance of the historic barn buildings. Accordingly, these works are considered to be acceptable, subject to the provision of further details in the form of samples or detailed specifications of any new rainwater goods to be installed along with method(s) of fixing and further details of proposed paint finishes.

Taking account of all of the above, the works proposed would be compliant with current heritage guidance and would preserve the heritage assets in this instance. Furthermore, it is not considered that these works would result in any measurable harm to the significance of the heritage assets. The works proposed are therefore considered to be acceptable and in accordance with the requirements of Section 16 of the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990, Policy HE6 (1) of the NPPF and Key Statement EN5 and Policy DME4 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.

Landscape/Ecology:

Protected Species

A preliminary roost assessment of the barn buildings subject to the proposed works was undertaken on 11/3/26. Additional dusk emergence surveys were undertaken in May and June 2026 which confirmed the presence of a bat roost within the central barn of the three adjoining barn buildings (denoted as 'barn 2' on the submitted proposed site plan).

In this instance, the proposed works of repair to barn building 2 (and potentially barns 1 and 4 as these adjoin barn 2) would result in the loss of a confirmed bat roost therefore the proposed development could only be carried out under a relevant Natural England Protected Species Mitigation license.

In order for the Natural England license to be granted, Natural England requires 3 tests for the development to be met: (a) Preserving public health or public safety or other imperative reasons of overriding public interest; (b) there is no satisfactory alternative; and (c) the action will not be detrimental to maintaining the population of the species concerned at a favourable conservation status in its natural range. As competent authority the Habitats Directive places a duty on local planning authorities to consider whether there is a reasonable prospect of a license being granted and apply the three tests.

With regard to the first test, the proposed repair works would prevent further deterioration of historic farm buildings which in turn would be in the public interest. As such, the proposal would meet the requirements of the first test.

In terms of the second test, leaving the barn buildings in their existing form would fail to safeguard the heritage assets therefore there is not considered to be any satisfactory alternative.

The final test is an ecological one, which the submitted ecology survey suggests could be met, subject to careful planning and appropriate mitigation measures.

Accordingly, the proposed development would meet the requirements of all three tests therefore there is considered to be a reasonable prospect that Natural England would grant a license for the proposed development.

Observations/Consideration of Matters Raised/Conclusion:

The proposed development amounts to repair and maintenance work which would preserve the heritage assets. Furthermore, whilst ecological constraints are present on site these could be effectively managed through appropriate mitigation.

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

RECOMMENDATION:	That Listed Building Consent be granted subject to the imposition of conditions.
------------------------	--