|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Signed:** | **Officer:** | **MC** | | | | **Date:** | | **22/01/2025** | | **Manager:** | | **LH** | **Date:** | **23/1/25** |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Application Ref:** | | | | 3/2024/0928 | | | | | | |  | | | |
| **Date Inspected:** | | | | N/A | | | **Site Notice:** | | 26/11/2024 | |
| **Officer:** | | | | MC | | | | | | |
| **DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:** | | | | | | | | | | | **APPROVAL** | | | |
| **`** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Development Description:** | | | | | Listed Building Consent for the regularisation of replacement trusses and purlins. | | | | | | | | | |
| **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** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Historic England:** | | | | | Historic England does not wish to offer advise on the application. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Heritage and Conservation Officer at Growth Lancashire:** | | | | | Following the submission of further information, the Heritage Officer considers that the development has resulted in moderate to high level of less than substantial harm to the Grade II Listed Building. They consider the LPA should assess whether the public benefits outweigh the harm of the scheme. | | | | | | | | | |
| **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:**  **3/2022/0750**  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.  Approved with Conditions  **3/2022/0407:**  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 comprises a historic barn building at Dinkling Green Farm which has recently been granted listed building consent for re-roofing and the rebuilding of portions of the barn walls due to rotting of the existing timber structure.  The 3no. farm buildings directly to the south of Barn 2 are Grade II Listed, and whilst Barn 2 is not itself listed, it is considered 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. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Proposed Development for which consent is sought:**  Listed Building Consent is required for the regularisation of the replacement of roof trusses and purlins.  The existing Oak A frame roof trusses and oak purlins have been replaced. The submitting Heritage Statement indicates that the timbers appeared to be original to the structure but were heavily affected by wood rot and wood beetle infestation. The replacement of the trusses and purlins is on a like for like basis. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Impact upon Listed Building and the Setting:**  The listings for the adjacent listed buildings are as follows:  ***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.*  **Ribble Valley Core Strategy**  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.*   Policy DME4 states:  ‘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’.*  In addition, Policy DMG1 states that:  *In determining planning applications, all development must:*  ***DESIGN***   1. *Be of a high standard of building design which considers the 8 building in context principles (from the CABE/English Heritage building on context toolkit.* 2. *Be sympathetic to existing and proposed land uses in terms of its size, intensity and nature as well as scale, massing, style, features and building materials.* 3. *Consider the density, layout and relationship between buildings, which is of major importance. particular emphasis will be placed on visual appearance and the relationship to surroundings, including impact on landscape character, as well as the effects of development on existing amenities.*   Policy DMG1 also states that *'All development must protect and enhance heritage assets and their settings’.*  **Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990:**  Given the development 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 2024):**  The National planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out further duties in respect of determining proposals that affect heritage assets stating that *‘In 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 212 – 221 reading as follows:  *212: 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.*  *213: 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.*   *214: 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.*  *215: 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.*  *216: 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 to the scale of any harm of loss and the significance of the heritage asset.*  *217: 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.*  *218: 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.*  *219: 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.*  *221: Local planning authorities should assess whether the benefits of a proposal for enabling development, which would otherwise conflict with planning policies but which would secure the future conservation of a heritage asset, outweigh the disbenefits of departing from those policies.*  The key heritage issue is whether the works have resulted in harm to the significance of the listed building.  ***Assessment of Impacts:***  The development has resulted in the replacement of the existing roof timbers with new trusses and purlins.  Historic England does not wish to offer advice on the application.  The Heritage and Conservation Officer at Growth Lancashire has provided comments on the application and considered that further information was required to fully justify the works. They noted that the application was not accompanied by a structural report outlining the strength of the timbers or evidence that the applicant has explored all options starting with the most conservative approach e.g. spliced repairs rather than wholesale removal of the trusses and purlins nor had an assessment of the significance of the barn been included with an estimated age of the barn.  The agent for the application has since provided further supporting documents including an email from the Structural Engineer from April 2024 outlining the defects of the roof trusses and an additional photograph showing their condition. The Heritage and Conservation Officer notes that substantial parts of the original structure have been replaced with sawn softwood rafters and note that the photograph evidence shows that the entire structure was in extremely poor condition and has been subject to rot and beetle infestation.  They consider that the develop has caused a moderate to high level of less than substantial harm to the Listed Building as the works have resulted in a removal of historic fabric that made a major contribution to its significance. The Heritage Advisor also notes that the works were necessary to safeguard the asset and considers this a public benefit but recommends the Local Planning Authority requests all photographs before and during the works of the original roof structure are provided and deposited with the Historic Environmental Record. This could be added as an informative if listed building consent were to be granted. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Observations/Consideration of Matters Raised/Conclusion:**  NPPF paragraph 215 requires that less than substantial harm be weighed against any public benefits of the development. 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, the requirements of Section 16 of the NPPF and Ribble Valley Core Strategy Key Statement EN5 and Policies DME4 and DMG1, it is considered that the public benefit of ensuring the long term conservation of the barn is given significant weight. The benefit of ensuring the designated heritage asset has a long-term use is considered to outweigh the less than substantial harm caused by the removal of the historic roof and replacement of new trusses and purlins and whilst it is regrettable that the original trusses and purlins were not salvageable for reuse, this harm does not outweigh the benefit highlighted above.  As such, the development complies with Key Statement EN5 and Policies DMG1 and DME4 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and the requirements of Section 16 and 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and Section 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Having regard to all material considerations and matters raised, the application is recommended for approval subject to conditions. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **RECOMMENDATION**: | | | That listing building consent be granted subject to the imposition of conditions. | | | | | | | | | | | |