|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Signed:** | **Officer:** | **WH** | | | | **Date:** | | **12/04/23** | | **Manager:** | | **LH** | **Date:** | **19/4/23** |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Application Ref:** | | | | 2022/0750 | | | | | | |  | | | |
| **Date Inspected:** | | | | 13/03/23 | | | **Site Notice:** | | 13/03/23 | |
| **Officer:** | | | | Will Hopcroft | | | | | | |
| **DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:** | | | | | | | | | | | **APPROVAL** | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Development Description:** | | | | | Proposed works to take down and rebuild portions of barn walls and re-roof as the existing timber structure is rotten in places. All works to be carried out on a like-for-like basis. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Site Address/Location:** | | | | | Barn 2, Dinkling Green Farm, Little Bowland Road, Chipping BB7 3BN | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | | **Parish/Town Council** | | | | | | | | | |
| No objections. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | | **Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies** | | | | | | | | | |
| **LCC Archaeology:** | | | | | No objection subject to the imposition of a condition relating to the implementation of a programme of building recording. | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | | **Additional Representations.** | | | | | | | | | |
| None received. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **RELEVANT POLICIES AND SITE PLANNING HISTORY:** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ribble Valley Core Strategy:**  Key Statement DS1 – Development Strategy  Key Statement DS2 – Sustainable Development  Key Statement EN2 – Landscape  Key Statement EN4 – Biodiversity and Geodiversity  Key Statement EN5 – Heritage Assets  Policy DMG1 – General Considerations  Policy DMG2 – Strategic Considerations  Policy DME4 – Protecting Heritage Assets  Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act  National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Relevant Planning History:**  **2022/0407:**  Certificate of Lawfulness for proposed works to take down and rebuild portions of barn walls and re-roof as the existing timber structure is rotten in places. All works to be carried out on a like-for-like basis – Withdrawn | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Site Description and Surrounding Area:**  The site is comprised of an historic barn building at Dinkling Green Farm, incorporating a saltbox roof, traditional brick built elevations and complementary features to the farmstead in which it is situated. The 3no. farm buildings directly to the south of Barn 2 are Grade II Listed, and whilst Barn 2 is not itself listed, Officers consider that by virtue of it falling within the curtilage of the Listing, and it being constructed before 1948, it is likely to be curtilage listed. The building itself is ‘L’ shaped with the longer portion of the structure sited north-south and a small dog-leg off the western elevation.  For completeness, the listings of the adjacent barns read as below:  ***Building in farmyard, 10 metres west of Dinkling Green Farmhouse*** *- GV II Farm building, possibly once a house. Sandstone rubble with slate roof. Two storeys. East wall, facing the farmyard, of two bays. The left-hand window surround, now with its central mullion missing, has an inner hollow chamfer and outer chamfer. The right-hand window is of two lights, mullioned and chamfered. On the first floor are two former two-light chamfered window surrounds. Between the bays is a door with plain reveals, with a door with plain stone surround at the right. The rear wall has a blocked one-light window at the left with crude plain stone surround, and a three-light mullioned window to its right with outer chamfer and inner hollow chamfer Further right is a blocked door with plain stone surround. Said to contain a cruck truss.*  ***Dinkling Green Farmhouse -*** *GV II Farmhouse, 'J H 1822' over back door. Sandstone rubble with slate roof. Two storeys, three bays. Windows sashed with glazing bars in plain stone surrounds. Door has plain stone surround and is between the first and second bays. Chimney on left-hand gable and between second and third bays.*  ***Farm store to the south east of Dinkling Green Farmhouse -*** *GV II Farm store, formerly a house, late C17. Rubble, mainly sandstone, with slate roof. three-unit plan. Two storeys. Windows mullioned with chamfered heads and sills and double chamfered jambs. The left-hand unit has a four-light window to the left of the door and a three-light window on the first floor. The doorway has chamfered jambs and a triangular head. The right-hand units have a five-light window to the left of the door, a three-light window to the right and two three-light windows on the first floor. The doorway has chamfered jambs and a triangular head. To the left of the five-light window is a blocked fire window with plain stone surround. The right-hand gable has a three-light window, a two-light window to an outshut, and a blocked first floor window.*  *Interior: the left-hand unit has the remains of a chamfered stone fireplace against its internal wall. Backing onto it, in the middle unit, is a blocked shouldered stone fireplace, with a chamfered and stopped firehood bressumer with a mortise for a heck post.* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Proposed Development for which consent is sought:**  Listed Building Consent is sought for the taking down and rebuilding of portions of barn walls, as well as re-roofing, as the existing timber structure is rotten in places. All works are to be carried out on a like-for-like basis.  All works are to be carried out, reinstating existing materials where possible and on a like-for-like basis in terms of materials and aesthetics where new materials are required. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Principle of Development:**  The principle of development is acceptable, given the proposal seeks to reinstate features of original specification. This is compliant, in principle, with Key Statement EN5 and CS Policies DME4 and DMG1.  As the proposed works fall within the bounds of Listed Building Consent, it is only possible to assess the proposal on whether it would harm the significance of the Grade II Listed Building. As such it is not possible, under an LBC, to assess the impacts of the proposal on residential or visual amenity.  It is noted, however, that a Bat Survey submitted with the application indicated the presence of 4no. day roosts served by up to 11no. bats. A Natural England EPS License will be necessary in order to undertake the proposed works. In order for the NE license to be granted, NE 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 within a full planning application.  The Local Authority considers that:   * The 1st test is met, as the current structural state of the building represents an immediate risk to public safety. Preserving a heritage asset is also of overriding public interest. * The 2nd test is met, as there is no other way to make the building safe and protect the 4no. roosts. * The 3rd test is met, as appropriate compensation or mitigation is possible. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Impact upon Listed Building and the setting of adjacent Listed Buildings**  The principle statutory duty under the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 is to preserve the special character of heritage assets, including their setting. Local Planning Authority’s should when coming to decisions consider the principal Act, which states the following:  *Listed Buildings - Section 66(1)*  *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 the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.*  In determining planning applications LPAs should take account of;   1. The desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation; 2. The positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and 3. The desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.   Para 199 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that when considering the impact of proposals on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be applied. This is irrespective of whether any harm is identified as being substantial, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.  The key heritage issue is whether any of the proposed works would harm the character of the significance of the listed building.  It is difficult to pinpoint the significance of the Listed Building given it is not directly listed, but likely curtilage listed. Nevertheless, the proposal seeks to take down and re-build – using the same materials – in a way that is sensitive and complementary to the existing building. This is deemed necessary to protect the significance of the designated heritage asset which could be said to be at risk by way of significant structural defects, identified by a structural report submitted with the application. Specifically:   * Roof timbers have been subject to extensive decay to water ingress through defective roof covering. * The roof covering should be removed, then the rafters and purlins (it may be possible to retain and re-use some of these members). * Roof truss in the northern space shows signs of serious decay and may need to be removed and repaired. * Other trusses appear re-usable subject to a detailed inspection. * Loft floor shows signs of extensive decay and should be replaced. * West wall is on the point of structural collapse and should be taken down and re-built along with part of the north wall. * Remaining walls require re-pointing. Wide crack in the dividing wall should be repaired by stitching with stainless steel helical ties, drilled and epoxy grouted into the stonework.   The proposal seeks to remedy the above issues through careful removal and rebuilding using existing materials, utilising appropriate lime and aggregate where necessary. To the roof and timber, existing materials will be removed, treated and re-used where possible. Where this is not possible they are to be a matching size and species to the existing and all slipped and damaged slates and stone flags are to be re-instated if possible, or replaced with matching tiles if not.  It is noted that should this work not be undertaken, the structural report in addition to recent anecdotal evidence indicates that the structure is likely to collapse soon.  Paragraph 199 of the NPPF states that *‘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 this sense it is considered that inaction is likely to lead to total or significant loss of a designated heritage asset, and the details proposed indicate that the works undertaken to maintain and support the heritage asset would be done in a sensitive and appropriate manner, subject to appropriate condition. As such the proposal is considered compliant with CS Policy DME4, EN5, the guidance found within Chapter 16 of the NPPF and the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Observations/Consideration of Matters Raised/Conclusion:**  NPPF paragraph 202 requires that less than substantial harm be weighed against any public benefits of the proposal. Having regard to the duty at section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, in giving ‘great weight’ to the conservation of the designated heritage asset (NPPF paragraph 199) and in consideration to NPPF paragraph 197 (development sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and positively contributing to local character and distinctiveness) and Ribble Valley Core Strategy Key Statement EN5 and Policies DME4 and DMG1 the development is acceptable.  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. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |