|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Signed:** | **Officer:** | BT | | | | **Date:** | | 29/8/24 | | **Manager:** | | **LH** | **Date:** | **29/8/24** |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Application Ref:** | | | | 3/2024/0456 | | | | | | |  | | | |
| **Date Inspected:** | | | | 15/7/24 | | | **Site Notice:** | | 15/7/24 | |
| **Officer:** | | | | BT | | | | | | |
| **DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:** | | | | | | | | | | | **APPROVAL** | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Development Description:** | | | | | Application for planning permission for the installation of two removable flood doors to the external door frames on the front elevation. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Site Address/Location:** | | | | | 20-22 Talbot Street, Chipping, PR3 2QE. | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | | **Parish/Town Council** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Chipping Parish Council:** | | | | | Consulted 17/6/24 – 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 EN2: Landscape  Key Statement EN5: Heritage Assets  Policy DMG1: General Considerations  Policy DMG2: Strategic Considerations  Policy DME4: Protecting Heritage Assets  Policy DME6: Water Management  Policy DMB1: Supporting Business Growth And The Local Economy  Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act Section 16, 66 & 72  National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Relevant Planning History:**  **3/2024/0390:**  Application for listed building consent for the installation of two removable flood doors to the external door frames on the front elevation (LBC – ongoing)  **3/2022/0075:**  Discharge of condition 8 (wall covering) from Listed Building Consent 3/2020/0763. (Approved)  **3/2022/0073:**  Discharge of condition 6 (Recording of first floor structure), from Listed Building Consent 3/2020/0763 (Approved)  **3/2021/0805:**  Discharge of Condition 10 (Specifications of replacement windows) of Listed Building Consent 3/2020/0763 (Approved)  **3/2021/0705:**  Removal of Condition 9 (Photographic Recording) of Listed Building Consent application 3/2020/0763 (Approved)  **3/2021/0666:**  Discharge of conditions 4 (details of steel panels) and 5 (details of strengthening lintels) and part discharge of condition 7 (removal of render and plaster) from listed building consent 3/2020/0763 (Approved)  **3/2021/0590:**  Discharge of Condition 3 (Materials) of Listed Building Consent application 3/2020/0763 (Approved)  **3/2021/0578:**  Discharge of Condition 10 (Specifications of replacement windows) and Part Discharge of Condition 6 (Recording of First Floor) of Listed Building Consent 3/2020/0763 (Approved)  **3/2021/0474:**  Discharge of condition 9 (Written Scheme of Investigation) from Listed Building Consent 3/2020/0763 (Approved)  **3/2020/0763:**  Application for listed building consent to undertake structural and damp repair works to the building, insertion of replacement windows (like for like), replacement of roof coverings and the erection of new rainwater goods (Approved)  **3/2012/0189:**  Application for the discharge of condition no.1 (commencement) and condition no. 2 (materials) of planning permission 3/2011/0178P (Approved)  **3/2011/0179:**  Demolition of existing corrugated lean-to store and erection of flat roof single storey rear extension (Listed Building Consent) (Approved)  **3/2011/0178:**  Demolition of existing corrugated lean-to store and erection of flat roof single storey rear extension (Approved)  **3/2010/0726:**  Application for the discharge of condition no. 2 (plaque fixings) of planning consent 3/2010/0087P (Approved)  **3/2010/0087:**  Attachment of heritage 'blue plaques' to exterior of building (Listed Building Consent) (Approved)  **3/2007/0140:**  Erection of Octagonal Summerhouse in rear garden of Chipping Post Office (Approved)  **3/1981/0322 :**  Proposed extension to provide additional retail sales area, on the rear of the Post Office (approved)  **3/1976/0329:**  Extension to existing shop and post office (Approved) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Site Description and Surrounding Area:**  The application relates to a two storey end terraced mixed use property in Chipping comprising a café / shop, post office and residential dwelling within No. 20-22 Talbot Street. The property comprises mullioned windows, chamfered door and window surrounds and slated gabled roof with two stone faced chimney stacks. Two extensions to the rear elevation of the property are also present. The latest of these was built in the 1950s and is brick built with asbestos cement roof sheeting and is currently used as the café area with doors opening onto the back garden seating area. There is also a kitchen extension (presumably a C19th addition) constructed of sandstone with a pitched slate roof and stone ridge tiles. This also has an outdoor WC and has a bricked up chimney flue and fireplace. This extension is finished externally with a cement based render. A detached barn building lies immediately adjacent to the South-east of the application property within the grounds of the application site. The surrounding area is predominantly residential in character with the application property lying within the village centre of Chipping. Open countryside encompasses the village’s defined settlement boundary with this forming part of the wider Forest Of Bowland National Landscape.  The application property holds Grade II\* Listed Building status with the official Historic England listing description for the property reading as follows:  *‘House and shop, 1668. Sandstone rubble with slate roof. 2 storeys. No. 20 (to the right) has a sashed window with glazing bars. On the 1st floor is a 4-light mullioned window with inner hollow chamfer and outer chamfer, with hood. Studded plank door, to the left, has chamfered surround with triangular head. No. 22 has end stacks, and a studded plank door to the right with chamfered surround, triangular head and 'IB 1668' on the lintel. The ground floor has had a continuous drip course cut back. To the left of the door is a window surround with outer chamfer and inner hollow chamfer, with a central mullion remaining between 2 sashed windows with glazing bars. To the left is a C19th plain stone surround to a triple sash window. To the right on the 1st floor is a 3-light mullioned window with hood mould, having an outer chamfer and inner hollow chamfer. To the left is a one-light chamfered stair window at an intermediate level. Stone gutter brackets. The left-hand chimney cap has a moulded coping and weathered offset. The rear wall has double-chamfered mullioned windows. Interior said to be modernised, but contains an old stair and bread oven.’* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Proposed Development for which consent is sought:**  Planning consent is sought for the installation of two removable flood barriers to the external door frames of the front North-western elevation of the application property. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Impact upon Listed Building:**  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:  *‘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. 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.’*  In addition, Paragraph 205 of the NPPF states:  *‘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.’*  Furthermore, 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.’*  Moreover, 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 main historical value of John Brabins Post Office & House is associated with its reputation as one of the oldest continually running shops in the UK and its association with John Brabin…the continued use of the property as a shop for the past 350 years is very significant, as this is reportedly the longest continually trading shop in the UK. The property also has significant communal value for local people, as many would be able to associate the use of the shop with many previous generations of their families…the historical value of this remains in the form of the Brabins Charitable Trust, which have maintained the properties contributing significantly to the continued existence and use of this heritage asset…John Brabins Post Office & House offers physical evidence of vernacular construction in the Ribble Valley, specifically in Chipping due to the use of local sandstone…many of the original features such as the stone flagged floor, stone mullioned windows, fireplace, bread oven and staircase still remain…the main aesthetic value of John Brabins Shop & House lies within its architectural features such as the stone mullioned windows, chamfered door surrounds and it’s conformity with the other properties in the surrounding area.’*  Accordingly, the above observations indicate that the significance of the application property is largely underpinned by its historic interest (evidence of historical community amenities and their association with current and previous generations) and architectural interest (use of local sandstone, stone mullioned windows, chamfered door surrounds, stone flagged floor, fireplace, and staircase).  The works proposed under this application relate to the installation of two removable flood barriers to the external door frames of the front North-western elevation of the application property.  Historic England guidance *Flood Risk And Historic Buildings* (2015) states that owners of historic buildings need to be clear about the extent of flood risk to their home or business as doing so allows for the appropriate management of flood risk and in turn, the type of flood protection required. The guidance goes on to state that consideration should be given towards local topography, historic occurrences of flooding and flood mapping when establishing flood risk to historic buildings.  The above guidance further states:  *‘By planning ahead and taking sensible, cost-effective precautions, it is possible to minimise and sometimes prevent the worst of flood damage…protection works must be applied with sensitivity to a historic building so that they do not damage the special interest or integrity of the building or any associated archaeological remains. In particular, the aim must be to retain and respect the existing structure and materials. Appropriate flooding-adaptation measures, particularly for resistance, must be tailored to specific properties…barriers fitted to exterior doorways or window openings raise the threshold of the building against rising water. They can then be removed and stored once the risk of flooding has passed. Because they are used only during a flood these features are less intrusive than permanent flood barriers, but in order to keep their architectural impact to a minimum, any fixings must be discreet and compatible with an older property.’*  In this instance, the application’s supporting information further states that the application property has previously experienced several occurrences of flooding. No further information has been provided to support these claims however constraint analysis shows the application property as partially lying within Flood Zones 2 and 3 and also within an area susceptible to both surface water and groundwater flooding. Furthermore, occurrences of flooding within Chipping in recent years are documented in historic local news articles. Accordingly, there is considered to be a real prospect of flood risk to the heritage asset in this instance which in turn is considered to justify the introduction of appropriate flood risk mitigation measures.  The mitigation measures proposed in this instance involve the installation of flood barriers to each of the front door openings of the application property. The proposed flood barriers would be read in concert with the principal elevation of the application property when in situ however these would be temporary features comprising a relatively modest height and width that would only be put into place periodically during occurrences of flooding therefore there would be no permanent impact upon the heritage asset from the proposed development. Furthermore, the permanent components required to support the removable flood barriers would be solely limited to the installation of largely unobtrusive hardwood runners which would be modest in terms of their width, depth and height and these would be detailed in a paint finish to match the existing door and door frames of the property so as to further reduce their visual impact. It is understood that the removable flood barriers comprise a white detailing as manufactured however given the black detailing of the application property’s front doors it is considered that a similar detailing would be more appropriate for the external facing profiles of the flood barriers. A condition requiring further details to be provided with respect to the external detailing of the flood barriers has therefore been imposed on this consent.  Having regard to the practicalities of installing the removable flood barriers, disturbance to the historic building fabric of the heritage asset would be solely limited to the insertion of a small number of 3” masonry screws into the property’s stone door plinth which would be used to fix the barrier’s supporting hardwood runners into place. The nylon channels within the hardwood runners would be solely affixed to the aforementioned hardwood runners by way of 1” screws and as such would not result in any additional disturbance to historic fabric of the heritage asset. No other elements of the proposed works would result in disturbance to or the loss of any historic building fabric. The proposed development is therefore considered to be acceptable with respect to the methodologies proposed.  Taking account of all of the above, the proposed development is considered to be accordance with the Historic England guidance outlined above and given the unobtrusive and temporary nature of the works proposed it is not considered that the proposed development would be harmful to the historic or architectural significance of the heritage asset. Furthermore, the proposed development would contribute towards the preservation of the heritage asset through preventing future occurrences of flood damage.  The proposed development would therefore satisfy the requirements of Section 16 of the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, Paragraph 205 of the NPPF and Key Statement EN5 and Policy DME4 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Impact upon Character/appearance of Conservation Area:**  The application property is sited within the Chipping Conservation Area. With reference to making decisions on applications for development in Conservation Areas, Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that:  *“...special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.”*  This guidance is reiterated in Key Statement EN5 of the Ribble Borough Valley Core Strategy which stipulates that all development proposals should respect and safeguard the character, appearance and significance of all Conservation Areas.  The *Chipping* *Conservation Area Appraisal (2005)* identifies a number of features as contributing towards the area’s special interest which include the historic layout and street pattern of Talbot Street, open areas in front of the Talbot Hotel and the architectural and historic interest of the Conservation Area’s buildings, including 24 Listed Buildings.  In this instance, the proposed flood barriers would be read in concert with the principal elevation of the application property (and in turn the above elements of special interest) when in situ however as previously conveyed the flood barriers would be temporary features that would only be put into place during occurrences of flooding, with their supporting components reading as largely unobtrusive additions to the application building and immediate street scene. Consequently, it is not considered that the proposed development would result in any harm to the character and appearance of the Chipping Conservation Area.  The proposed development would therefore satisfy the requirements of Key Statement EN5 and Policy DME4 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Impact Upon Residential Amenity:**  The proposed development raises no concerns with respect to impacts upon neighbouring amenity. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Visual Amenity/External Appearance:**  Paragraph 135 (c) of the NPPF states:  *‘Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting’.*  With respect to development within Areas Of Outstanding Natural Beauty (now known as National Landscapes), Paragraph 182 of the NPPF states:  *‘Great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty.’*  The above is reiterated within Key Statement EN2 of the Core Strategy:  ‘*The landscape and character of the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty will be protected, conserved and enhanced. Any development will need to contribute to the conservation of the natural beauty of the area. As a principle the Council will expect development to be in keeping with the character of the landscape, reflecting local distinctiveness, vernacular style, scale, style, features and building materials.’*  Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy provides general design guidance as follows:  *‘All* *development must* *be sympathetic to existing and proposed land uses in terms of its size, intensity and nature as well as scale, massing and style…particular emphasis will be placed on visual appearance and the relationship to surroundings, including impact on landscape character.’*  In this instance, the flood barriers proposed for the application property would be visible within the existing street scene on Talbot Street however as previously conveyed these would be temporary removable features that would only be periodically in place during occurrences of flooding. In addition, the height of the flood barriers would be modest (600mm) relative to the height of the property’s doorway openings (1670mm). Furthermore, the flood barrier’s supporting hardwood runners would be modest features in terms of their depth, width and height and these would be detailed in a paint finish to match the existing door and door frames of the property and would therefore read as discreet additions to the application property. Accordingly, the overall visual impact of the proposed development would be predominantly understated.  As previously conveyed, given the black detailing of the application property’s front doors it is considered that a similar detailing would need to be incorporated into the external facing profiles of the flood barriers so as to reduce their visual impact and a condition requiring further details of this has therefore been imposed on this consent.  Taking account of the above, it is not considered that the proposed development would be harmful to the historic character of the application property or visual amenities of the immediate area or wider National Landscape. The proposal would therefore satisfy the requirements of Paragraph 135 (c) and 182 of the NPPF and Key Statement EN2 and Policy DMG1 of the Core Strategy. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Highways and Parking:**  The proposed works would not involve any change to the existing parking arrangement on site therefore it is not anticipated that the proposed development would have any undue impact upon highway safety. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Landscape/Ecology:**  No ecological constraints were identified in relation to the proposal. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Observations/Consideration of Matters Raised/Conclusion:**  The proposed development would contribute towards the preservation of a heritage asset through preventing future occurrences of flood damage to the application property and it is not considered that the proposed development would be harmful to the historic character of the application property, Chipping Conservation Area or visual amenities of the wider National Landscape.  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 planning consent be granted subject to the imposition of conditions. | | | | | | | | | | | |