


Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.

Signed:	Officer:		Date:		Manager:		Date:	
Site Notice displayed		Photos uploaded						

Application Ref:	3/2020/0852 (PP)	 <div>Ribble Valley Borough Council</div> <div>www.ribblevalley.gov.uk</div>	
Date Inspected:	Pre-application enquiry		
Officer:	AD		
DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:		Decision	Approval

Development Description:	Reroofing of existing building and installation of one en suite shower room
Site Address/Location:	Lovely Hall Lovely Hall Lane Salesbury Lancashire BB1 9EQ

CONSULTATIONS:	Parish/Town Council
No objection.	

CONSULTATIONS:	Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies
SPAB:	

Water ingress – repairs welcomed. However, insufficient information - existing roof, its make-up and significance, and details of the proposed works and their impact on it.

En-suite - floor plans suggest use may be acceptable and possible with minimum harm to the building. However, insufficient information for full assessment of impact - plumbing and drainage (and any loss/impact on historic fabric, and elevations) should be provided, together with details of what will happen to the existing door and steps to the store.

Proposed treatment for woodworm - report states that evidence of common furniture beetle infestation - no assurance that inactive. Therefore, remain to be convinced of the need for any chemical treatment. Guidance on SPAB website (including advice to monitor for a year where signs of beetle activity are ambiguous, and steps to prevent/deter further infestation).

(19/4/2021) response of 14th April 2021 from the agent with photographs of the stairs included - no further comment and content to defer to the RVBC specialist conservation advisor.

LCC Archaeology:

Principle of works acceptable, but little information as to the full extent of the works, the methodology and materials to be adopted and the consequential impact on the heritage value and significance of the site. Echo SPAB and recommend that further information is obtained. Concern at potential damage to or loss of early timbers from the roof during the re-roofing or woodworm treatments; as well as impacts to historic fabric by the insertion of the new soil pipe and other services.

If woodworm treatment is undertaken then any 'preparation' should NOT include any de-frassing, unless this is shown to be absolutely essential. If rot or other damage to historic (i.e. not modern softwood) roof timbers is found, it is preferable that as far as possible this is repaired with matching timber splices, etc. rather than complete timbers being replaced. Also consider, if consent is granted, if a photographic record

of the roof structure should be required before and during the works and the need for any dendrochronology.

(22/4/2021) Happy with the reasoning for doorway and no objection. 'Rolling programme' of survey and approval would appear to be sensible and, if a suitable specification for that (such as drawings of trusses, purlins, wall-plates, etc., photos to illustrate and description to HE 2016 level 3), no objection.

CBA:

More information necessary - specific areas directly impacted; both the extant roof structure and potential impacts of introducing plumbing and drainage into the part of the building where a new bathroom is proposed.

The significance of the roof should be focused on within the heritage assessment. Information needed to understand the significance, condition and impact of the proposed works on the roof before any permissions.

Woodworm report - historic roof structure largely intact. Scant detail. NPPF 193 - a scheme of works should be submitted which demonstrates a conservation led methodology for any works to the roof structure - seek to repair and strengthen the extant timbers rather than replace them. Contractors with experience of historic roof structures and expertise in their conservation - interventions can be minimised to those which are necessary and preserve as much of the existing structure, including the extant slates as possible.

Information also necessary to understand potential impact of introducing plumbing and drainage runs to the proposed bathroom on the building's historic fabric – NPPF 193 and 194.

Recommend - greater understanding of the potential impacts of introducing plumbing to the proposed en suite is necessary. Survey of the extant roof structure, evidencing its condition and informing its conservative repair required (may be achieved through conditions).

(4/5/2021) Photographs of existing roof structure - considerable significant historic timbers. Support conservative approach to repairing the roof advocated by both the SPAB and county archaeologist. Reiterate the importance that roofing contractors with suitable experience of preferential repair, as opposed to replacement, of historic fabric carry out any permitted works. This will minimise any collateral harm to the roof's archaeological interest.

Further information of fabric impact of en suite bathroom - satisfied that these works will not impact upon Lovely Hall's heritage significance.

RVBC Countryside:

Condition suggested in respect to the timing of works and a bat license.

CONSULTATIONS:

Additional Representations.

None received.

RELEVANT POLICIES:

Ribble Valley Core Strategy:
Key Statement EN5 – Heritage Assets
Policy DMG1 – General Considerations
Policy DME4 – Protecting Heritage Assets

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. 'Preservation' in the duties at sections 16 and 66 of the Act means "doing no harm to" (*South Lakeland DC v. Secretary of State for the Environment* [1992]).

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG)

Relevant Planning History:

Pre-application advice provided 2 March 2020:

"welcomes attention to the leaking roof ... In the absence of a detailed significance assessment of existing planform and fabric ... The recent Historic England advice on 'Statements of Heritage Significance' considers this matter further ... confirm my initial concerns that removal of ceilings and first floor walling is likely to be harmful to the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building (loss of important fabric and planform) ... The provision of an en-suite is likely to be supported by officers if this has no harmful impact on planform, fabric or external appearance (e.g. is the door opening proposed to be blocked of historic interest?) ... 'Making changes to heritage assets' (Historic England, 2016) identifies:

"Although some works of up-grading, such as new kitchens and bathroom units, are unlikely to need consent, new services, both internal and external, can have a considerable, and often cumulative, impact on the significance of a building and can affect significance if added thoughtlessly. The impact of necessary services can be minimised by avoiding damage to decorative features, by carefully routeing and finishing and by use of materials appropriate to the relevant period, such as cast iron for gutters and down-pipes for many Georgian and Victorian buildings".

3/2007/0689 & 0690- Replacement of existing garage/workshop/fitness room. LBC & PP granted 31/8/07.

3/2007/0063 - Replacement of existing garage/workshop/fitness room. LBC & PP refused 20/3/07.

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:

Site Description and Surrounding Area:

'Lovely Hall' is a Grade II listed (27/8/52) house of c.1600, altered 1735 and 1874 in open countryside. The list description identifies:

"Sandstone rubble with stone slate roof ... To each side of the porch is a lead downspout with hopper head inscribed: 'IWT 1735'. The right-hand cross-wing has a 2-storey mullioned and transomed canted bay window of 1874. To its right is a gabled addition of 1874 in a similar style, with a 10-light mullioned and transomed window on each floor. Chimneys on ridge of left-hand cross-wing, to right of porch, and to right of right-hand cross-wing. Inside, the door opens against a fireplace dated 1874, but retaining part of a stone arch dated 1712 or 1713. No other exposed features of architectural interest were visible at time of survey".

The CBA identify "The national importance of Lovely Hall is established by its designation as a Grade II Listed building. It is a multi-phased high status building, dating from c.1600, or earlier, with high historical and evidential values associated with its built fabric. This will make a substantial contribution towards Lovely Hall's significance".

The Hall is within the setting of 'Sundial base south of Lovely Hall' (1688; Grade II).

The submitted Heritage Statement identifies:

1735 – ornamental rainwater pipes standing at the front of the house.

1874 – porch and gabled extension.

1981 – conversion of staff cottages; remodelling of outbuildings to garage and gymnasium.

Apart from these minor alterations, the Hall remains in the same layout and design as it was in 1874.

The Hall is mainly roofed in stone tiles, some secured by oak pins, with small sections remodelled in 1874 being roofed in conventional slates.

Lovely Hall has High Evidential, Historical and Aesthetic significance – changes are recorded in the fabric of the building, along with the still visible original building plan.

Conclusion – the heritage value of the building comes from its long history, as well as how this is recorded in the building fabric and building style ... evidence of how the wings and hall relate to one other ... various blocked windows and inserted doorways which record the changing use and style of the building.

Proposed Development for which consent is sought:

It is proposed to re-roof the building to address roof leaks (roof repairs were initially discussed with the applicant in March 2019). 'All roof tiles and slates are to be removed'.

It is proposed to install an en-suite (removing modern plywood cupboards) with associated modifications to the first floor planform including the blocking of an existing doorway (in the wall between original build and 1735 cross-wing; having an early C20 door not considered to have much significance in the Heritage Statement). This includes "New foul drain to be routed between existing floor joists and through existing ceiling void to new soil and vent pipe".

The submitted survey for woodboring insects identifies:

Exposed beams/framing timbers – evidence of infestation by Common Furniture Beetle – slight to moderate – to existing original timbers especially larger (purlins, trusses, ridge plates). Much old but no assurance that inactive as inspection not in the 'active' season.

No fungal decay noted but limited inspection to lower eaves areas.

The revised Heritage Statement (14/2/21) provides further information on proposed works:

50% of the underside of roof coverings are bare tiles with a deteriorating lime mortar application, the remainder a traditional bitumen underfelt.

A roof vent is required.

60cm of new upvc waste pipe visible.

Mindful of SPAB comments will monitor beetle activity for a year before considering chemical treatments.

No work will be carried out to the historic timbers, other than any necessary repairs uncovered during the process of the work.

Bat surveys identify:

"Lovely Hall is being used by up to six Common Pipistrelle bats and one Myotis bat for roosting purposes. Based upon the evidence, the building is host to a 'Day roost' for the named species in singular/small numbers, with the majority of bats observed emerging from the west-facing elevation at roof verge and from under tiles, and further emergence from the southern elevation at chimney flashing, with re-entry at the aforementioned features on the west-facing elevation and further re-entry in the south-facing elevation of the North-East wing ... The modification of a bat roost will therefore need to be addressed from both a conservation and legal perspective along with the application of appropriate mitigation. A European Protected Species Mitigation Licence (EPSML) will be required to legally destroy a place that is actively used for breeding, rest or shelter (roost) by bats, however, before a licence can be applied for all planning issues need to be resolved".

The case officer advised 9 April 2021:

"I have reviewed the latest comments of Lancashire County Council Archaeology and reconsidered the comments of SPAB and the CBA.

I would be grateful for further information/comment in respect to when the door opening (proposed to be blocked) between Bedroom 2 Store and the wing was created and what is its significance to historic planform? Are the adjoining steps and flooring historic?

In respect to roof works, it is my intention to recommend the grant of listed building consent with conditions requesting (once the roof cover has been removed) a roof timber structure condition survey, full details of proposed repair works, justification for and full details of any woodworm treatment and the recording of any features subject to significant repair proposals. I would be grateful for your comment in this regard.

Please advise as to why a planning application has been submitted".

The agent responded 14 April 2021:

"Regarding the door opening we have already asked Steven Price (The Archaeology Company) his impression of the significance of the doorway. He considers the door itself to be early 1900's being lightweight construction with a modern ball catch, and to have little significance.

We have no reference points as to when the actual opening was formed requiring two steps between the store of bedroom 2 and the east wing. Examining the door casing there are no signs of earlier ironmongery having been fitted, suggesting the casing is also early 1900's. Having removed the carpet covering the steps (see attached photographs) both risers are coated with a cream paint which has faded. The upper tread is surfaced using hardboard with a modern softwood nosing. Both treads and risers have gripper rods nailed into them. The lower tread is timber, painted at each side and the central part unfinished where a carpet would have been its covering. Where the tread meets the wall is also unfinished suggesting beading has been removed and the plaster poorly repaired allowing 'wall to wall' carpeting. If the steps had been original I suggest the skirting board would have continued alongside each riser and tread. The use of cover strips instead suggests the steps have been retrofitted, probably during the early 1900's along with the door and frame, and the opening itself.

Once the roof has been removed is a sensible time, and an opportunity to examine the condition of the roof timbers. Adding this as a Condition though would logistically be extremely onerous, as the time taken to discharge a condition would entail leaving the roof tiles off the roof and the building exposed to the elements until approved. Although the intention is to roof over the works with a tent structure, due to the size of the building and the number of roof pitches it may be necessary to deal with separate sections in a phased manner. If a rolling programme of surveys, approval of our proposals for each phase leading to an overall discharge of conditions, that would be helpful.

A planning application has been submitted for two reasons. Additions are to be made to the roof by adding a vent into the roof tiles, and adding a connection of the WC to the existing soil and vent pipe. You will also note that there is no mechanism on the Planning Portal drop down menu to apply purely for listed building consent. The only option is Planning Application and Listed Building Consent combined”.

Impact upon the special architectural and historic interest and setting of the listed building:

The proposed works are now acceptable subject to condition and follow extensive discussion with the applicant and submission of additional information. The early C20 door has some significance and its loss is of (limited, ‘less than substantial’) harm. This harm is outweighed by the overall public benefit of the applicant’s scheme for building repairs.

Conditions appear reasonable and necessary in respect to the external impacts of the proposed works.

Impact upon protected species:

The condition suggested by RVBC Countryside appears necessary to ensure the protection of bats.

Observations/Consideration of Matters Raised/Conclusion:

Therefore, in giving considerable importance and weight to the duty at section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and in consideration to NPPF and Key Statement EN5 and Policy DME4 and DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy it is recommended that planning permission be granted.

RECOMMENDATION:

That planning permission be granted subject to condition.