|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Signed:** | **Officer:** | **KH** | | | | **Date:** | | **20/09/24** | | **Manager:** | | **LH** | **Date:** | **24/9/24** |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Application Ref:** | | | | 2024/0339 | | | | | | |  | | | |
| **Date Inspected:** | | | | 06/06/24 | | | **Site Notice expires:** | | 27/06/24 | |
| **Officer:** | | | | KH | | | | | | |
| **DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:** | | | | | | | | | | | **APPROVAL** | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Development Description:** | | | | | Listed Building Consent for removal of existing roof trusses and replacement with new non-structural trusses. Re-roofing of existing roof with replacement slates. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Site Address/Location:** | | | | | Barn at Talbot Hotel 5 Talbot Street Chipping PR3 2QE | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | | **Parish/Town Council** | | | | | | | | | |
| No response. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | | **Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies** | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | |  | | | | | | | | | |
| N/A | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | | **Additional Representations.** | | | | | | | | | |
| LCC Archaeological Unit:  As described, the above application is for the replacement of the four existing wooden roof trusses and their replacement by a combination of steel purlins and three 'decorative false trusses'.  The historic building record for this structure (The Archaeology Co, October 2023) suggests that the original barn is of the same or similar 18th century date to the adjacent former public house but was extended at a later date. The extant roof trusses comprise (i) a pair of bolted king post trusses with diagonal bracing to the post and additional diagonal braces between the principal rafters and tie beam; and (ii) a pair of later king post trusses, lacking the diagonal bracing to the posts. The use of bolts to fasten the king posts in the earlier pair of trusses would suggest that they may not be the original roof supports but are replacements of mid or later 19th century date.  Whilst we would obviously prefer to see the original trusses repaired and retained, we would not formally object to the proposed works, if your Conservation Team are convinced that this is an appropriate way forward. No further formal recording of the building would appear to be necessary, although if, during the dismantling, historic graffiti, carpenter's, or other marks are noted, we would suggest that they are carefully photographed by the applicants and copies of those photographs submitted to the Historic Environment Record to enhance the 2023 record. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **RELEVANT POLICIES AND SITE PLANNING HISTORY:** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ribble Valley Core Strategy:**  Key Statement DS1 – Development Strategy  Key Statement DS2 – Sustainable Development  Key Statement EN1 – Green Belt  Key Statement EN3 – Sustainable Development and Climate Change  Key Statement EN5 – Heritage Assets  Policy DMG1 – General Considerations  Policy DMG3 – Transport & Mobility  Policy DME3 – Site and Species Protection and Conservation  Policy DMH3 – Dwellings in the Open Countryside & the AONB  Policy DMH4 – The Conversion of Barns and other Buildings to Dwellings  Policy DME4 – Protecting Heritage Assets  Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act  National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Relevant Planning History:**  2023/0726 – Approval of Details reserved by condition 3 (samples of materials) of listed building consent 3/2023/0086 – Approved.  2023/0709 – Approval of Details reserved by condition 5 (details of repairs/replacement), 12 (drainage), 13 (Construction Management Plan) and 17 (Tree Protection) of planning permission 3/2023/0085 – Approved.  2023/0710 – Approval of Details reserved by condition 5 (details of repairs/replacement), 8 (Construction Management Plan) and 11 (Building Recording and Analysis) of listed building consent 3/2023/0086 – Approved.  3/2023/0085 – Vary Conditions 5, 12, 13, 15, 19, 20 of planning permission 3/2022/0279. To allow the Talbot Pub and Barn to be developed separately by different parties - Approved  3/2023/0086 – Vary Conditions 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 of listed building consent 3/2022/0278. To allow the Talbot Pub and Barn to be developed separately by different parties - Approved  3/2023/0087 – Discharge of conditions 3, 4, 5, 6, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21 of planning permission 3/2023/0085 – Split Decision.  3/2023/0088 – Discharge of Conditions 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12 of listed building consent – Split Decision.  2022/0279 & 2022/0278 – Full and LBC: Partial demolition of a Grade II Listed Building; conversion of public house into one dwelling and one holiday let. Limited external alterations to Talbot Hotel. Conversion of adjacent barn into three new dwellings with associated works. Formation of parking and manoeuvring areas to rear. Hard and soft landscaping – Approved with conditions.  2012/0962 & 2012/0963 – Full and LBC: Refurbishment and extension to existing hotel to create 9no.ensuite bedrooms, function suite, bistro restaurant and bar area with ancillary hotel, kitchen and staff facilities; change of use of existing barn to form 11no. ensuite bedrooms ancillary to the hotel accommodation: extension and refurbishment of existing car parking facilities to create 46no. parking spaces including the repair and refurbishment of the existing cobbled forecourt (Resubmission of 3/2011/0821) (Listed Building Consent) and 3/2011/0822 (Full) – Approved with conditions.  2011/0822 & 2011/08821 – Full and LBC: Demolition of existing single storey extension and removal of render to front elevation; repair and repointing of stonework; refurbishment and extension to existing hotel to create 9no. ensuite bedrooms; function suite, bistro restaurant and bar area with ancillary hotel, kitchen and staff facilities; change of use of the existing barn to form 11no. ensuite bedrooms ancillary to the hotel accommodation; extension and refurbishment of existing car parking facilities to create 50no.car parking spaces including the repair and refurbishment of the existing cobbled forecourt – Refused 16th March 2012. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Site Description and Surrounding Area:**  The site consists of a Grade II Listed Building located within Chipping Conservation Area and the Forest of Bowland National Landscape (formerly Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty) and there are also protected trees within the site.  The building was last in use as a Barn and has permission to be converted into three holiday lets. Alterations to the Barn to implement the PP and LBC are underway.  The site is served by an established access off Talbot Street. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Proposed Development for which consent is sought:**  This proposal seeks to remove the existing roof and four trusses to the barn and replace these with modern steel purlins from spine wall to spine wall to support the weight from the main roof, with new roof trusses installed for aesthetic purposes only.  A structural engineers report and photographic evidence of the poor state of the roof trusses have been submitted. The majority of the existing slates had been removed at the time of the officers site visit in order to facilitate the new roof structure and it was evident that the majority of these were broken and not suitable for repair and re-use, as well as being a mix of roof stone and slate of different colours and textures. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Impact upon Listed Buildings and Setting:**  The Talbot Barn is Grade II listed alongside the adjacent Hotel in recognition of their national architectural and historic interest. The Barn and Hotel both date from the late 18th Century and derive significance from their relationship and also make an important contribution to the Chipping Conservation Area.  As such, 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.  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 2023):**  The National planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out further duties in respect of determining proposals that affect heritage assets stating that ‘i*n 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 205 – 214 reading as follows:  *205: 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.*  *206: 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:*   1. *grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional;* 2. *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.*   *207: 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.*  *208: 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.*  *209: 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*  *210: 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.*  *211: 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.*  *212: 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.*  *213: Not all elements of a Conservation Area or World Heritage Site will necessarily contribute to its significance. Loss of a building (or other element) which makes a positive contribution to the significance of the Conservation Area or World Heritage Site should be treated either as substantial harm under paragraph 207 or less than substantial harm under paragraph 208, as appropriate, taking into account the relative significance of the element affected and its contribution to the significance of the Conservation Area or World Heritage Site as a whole.*  ***Assessment of Impacts:***  The roof trusses are not thought to be original however are of historic value but in a state of disrepair as such the justification for their replacement is accepted provided that the original roof trusses are replicated within the barn as far as practical. This can be secured by condition.  There were numerous areas of the barn roof which appeared to have been patch repaired over the years with different materials. Those slates removed are largely broken and not fit for re-use. As such a scheme which seeks to re-use the existing original tiles to the road side elevation and sees the other roof pitches fitted with matching blue slate in principle is considered acceptable subject to appropriate detailing secured by condition.  The applicant’s heritage statement notes that the replacement roof would have no impact to the heritage significance of the building. However the introduction of new material and the alterations to the positions of the roof trusses is considered to result in a degree of harm which is considered less than significant (low level).  In which case paragraph 208 of the NPPF requires the harm to be considered against the public benefits. It is acknowledged that given the structural defects identified new elements are unavoidable, and a new roof structure would ensure the building is watertight and allow for the conversion to proceed. The replacement of the roof with appropriate slates would also improve the aesthetics of the structure and the new trusses would still be visible internally within the building whilst working with the approved layout. As the building sits in a prominent village location there are public benefits to ensuring the building can be converted and brought into use in a timely manner whilst still being respectful of its setting within a Conservation Area and National Landscape (formerly AONB).  As such, taking account of the above matters, it is not considered that the proposed development raises any significant direct conflict(s) with Key Statement EN5 or Policies DMG1 and DME4 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy, nor any significant measurable conflicts with the aims, objectives and requirements of Section 16 and 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 nor Paragraphs 205 and 208 of the National Planning Policy Framework. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Observations/Consideration of Matters Raised/Conclusion:**  Whilst the comments from LCC Archaeologist are noted as a specific condition has not been requested then a condition is not justified in this case.  In respect of Ecology, as building works to convert the Barn are well under way and the roof is no longer in situ then there is no requirement for updated ecology assessments to be undertaken.  As such and for the above reasons, having regard to all material considerations and matters raised, the application is recommended for approval. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **RECOMMENDATION**: | | | That listing building consent be granted subject to the imposition of conditions. | | | | | | | | | | | |