

COCKLICK END FARMHOUSE FOREST OF BOWLAND LANCASHIRE HERITAGE STATEMENT



September 2012

**PETER DE FIGUEIREDO
HISTORIC BUILDINGS ADVISER**

**1 Ingestre Road, Oxton, Wirral CH43 5TZ
T: 0151 652 1027 M: 0771 7291947
E: peter@defigueiredo.co.uk W: www.defigueiredo.co.uk**

CONTENTS:

1	INTRODUCTION	page 3
2	HISTORY OF COCKLICK END FARMHOUSE	page 3
3	ARCHITECTURAL ASSESSMENT	page 5
4	BUILDING CONDITION	page 9
5	STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE	page 10
6	HERITAGE PLANNING CONTEXT	page 13
7	CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT PRINCIPLES	page 17
8	THE PROPOSAL	page 19
9	HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT	page 19
10	CONCLUSIONS	page 22

1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 Cocklick End is situated just north of Gisburn Forest in an isolated rural location. It consists of a house and barn in a single range, and is typical of isolated upland farmhouses of West Yorkshire and North East Lancashire built in the 18th and early 19th centuries. The farmhouse has a stone lintel inscribed with the date 1727 and the barn has a datestone of 1827. The building has been vacant for many years and is currently in a state of disrepair.
- 1.2 The property was purchased in the years preceding World War I by Fylde Water Board which flooded the Upper Hodder Valley to create Stocks Reservoir. This supplied water to the expanding towns of Blackpool and the Fylde. The building is now owned by United Utilities which wishes to bring it back into residential use.
- 1.3 The property is within the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). While the building is not listed, it has been described by Lancashire County Council Archaeology as a 'non-designated heritage asset'. Ribble Valley Borough Council has provided pre-application advice relating to the change-of-use proposal, and has stated that a robust justification will be required in terms of the guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework, based on a thorough heritage appraisal.
- 1.4 This report carried out by Peter de Figueiredo accordingly provides an historic and architectural analysis of the building and its setting, and an understanding of its development based on research and building recording. A statement of significance identifying the principal features of interest and the values they represent is included, together with an assessment of potential impact on the significance and setting of the building in the context of the NPPF and local planning policy.

2 HISTORY OF COCKLICK END FARMHOUSE

- 2.1 The Forest of Bowland was a royal hunting preserve in the medieval period. Managing the land for hunting has remained an influence on the landscape and today the area remains largely rural. The landscape character of the higher areas is predominantly moorland, heath and rough grassland, while the lowland fringes have patches of pasture and meadows.¹ Agriculture is the dominant land use, with sheep and beef farming in the upland areas and dairy farming in the valleys.
- 2.2 Woodland consists of a combination of small deciduous and coniferous patches and linear strips along rivers and brooks. The only sizeable area of plantation is Gisburn Forest which adjoins Cocklick End, and was planted in the 1950s. It contains pockets of ancient semi-natural, deciduous woodland.

¹ *Landscape Character of the Forest of Bowland AONB*, Chris Blandford Associates, 2009

- 2.3 In the late 19th century, legislation gave powers to several local waterworks companies to acquire land within the Forest to provide a water supply to the developing industrial towns and coastal resorts of Lancashire, including Preston and Blackburn. The most dramatic change to the landscape was the construction of the Stocks Reservoir in 1922-32 by the Fylde Water Board to create a water supply for Blackpool and the coastal region. This involved flooding 344 acres of the Upper Hodder Valley, including the hamlets of Dalehead and Stocks.² In addition, the water board purchased land and farms in the townships of Easington, Bowland Forest Higher Division and Gisburn Forest to provide a water catchment area.
- 2.4 In the following years, the water catchment area was depopulated and many of the old farmsteads were demolished. A large amount of the remaining land was planted by the Forestry Commission to create Gisburn Forest.
- 2.5 Cocklick End is characteristic of the smaller isolated farms of the area, where the house and the main barn are combined in a single range, continuing the longhouse tradition which predates stone building. This arrangement, which is also typical of the upland farmsteads of West Yorkshire (where they are known as laithouses)³, began in the late 18th century, and was adopted as a convenient and compact small holding for tenant farmers on newly enclosed land.
- 2.6 The lintel over the doorway to the farmhouse at Cocklick End has a date of 1727, while the barn has a datestone of 1827. These dates relate to different stages of construction, though the building analysis described in Section 3 of this report shows that the process of development was more complex than the datestones alone suggest.
- 2.7 In 1840 the tenant farmer is recorded as being Ambrose Slinger. The census return of 1881 records that Joseph Taylor, aged 66 years, farmed 40 acres and lived in the house together with his wife Ann and four children aged from 5 to 14 years.⁴
- 2.8 The barn at Cocklick End continued in use for animal shelter and crop storage after the reservoir was completed in 1932, but the farmhouse appears to have been closed sometime in the post war period. The property is now owned by United Utilities, which is the major landowner in the Forest of Bowland, and manages a large area of the fells primarily for water catchment.

² www.dalehead.org

³ *Rural Houses of West Yorkshire 1400-1830*, Colum Giles, Ian Goodall, RCHME

⁴ *The Lost Village of Stocks-in-Bowland*, WR Mitchell, 1992, <http://www.rogerthomas.co.uk/>



Photograph of rear elevation taken before closure of the farmhouse, possibly 1950s, from the late May Jackson collection (www.dalehead.org/cocklick_end.htm)

3 ARCHITECTURAL ASSESSMENT OF COCKLICK END FARMHOUSE

- 3.1 The farmhouse and barn at Cocklick End form a single linear arrangement, with a common frontage line, and continuous ridge for the full length of the building. The barn projects out on the southeast side with an outshot or cat-slide roof covering the entrance. The entrance to the house is on the northwest side. The walls are built of gritstone rubble, roughly laid to courses, but using random sized stones, and the roof is of stone slates. Dressed stone is used for quoins, lintels, sills and for a prominent kneeler at the southeast corner of the barn.



Front and side elevation to barn

The Farmhouse

- 3.2 Close examination of the fabric reveals that the earliest part of the building is the central unit, which extends from the line of the party wall between the house and barn to the stack of massive quoin blocks immediately left of the present entrance to the house. This unit contains a single room open to the roof, where the first floor has collapsed. At what was upper floor level is a fireplace with a stone surround that projects into the room and a tapering chimney stack above. The roof retains its original purlins and rafters of oak, supported on a central truss, which has been modified by the insertion of a King Post.
- 3.3 The character of this central space suggests that it was originally a barn, for there is no sign of a fireplace on the ground floor, and the fireplace at first floor level must have been inserted later. There are blocked doorways at front and rear, and it is possible that the doorcase with the fine inscribed lintel dated 1727 was originally in one of these openings. If this was the case, it is more likely that it was situated on the other side, for the blocked doorway at the present front of the house has quoins, which are not compatible with the form of the moulded stone doorcase and lintel. Considered stylistically, the central unit could date from the early 18th century, and is compatible with the date 1727.



Front elevation, showing earliest phase to the left of present entrance to the house



Interior of central unit showing first floor fireplace and roof

- 3.4 The southwest end of the house is a later extension. It contains a kitchen with a Victorian cast iron range and a room to the rear. A staircase leading to the upper floor has two stone treads at the base with timber treads above, and plain square balusters and handrail. The roof and first floor of the rear part have collapsed, but a stone fireplace surround with an early 19th century cast iron grate with Gothick-arched fireback remains at first floor level.



Kitchen with range and meat hooks



Stone fireplace at first floor level



Inscribed lintel on house with date 1727



Inscribed lintel on barn with date 1827

- 3.5 The later extension probably dates from the early 19th century, and may be contemporary with the barn which is dated 1827. The doorcase and stone lintel with the inscription TGC and date 1727 was presumably incorporated into the extension when it was built.

The Barn

- 3.6 The barn is of the combination type, in which shelter for animals is combined with crop storage under one roof. Dating from 1827 with the initials WEC, the barn was built as an extension to the earlier house, continuing the same eaves line on the northwest side and a common ridge line, but taking advantage of the slope of the land to create a higher space within.

- 3.7 The large cart entry led into the threshing floor, with the area on the left and the area above the cow pens to the right used for storing hay, threshed straw and other crops grown on the farm. Threshing took place during the winter months and involved the use of a flail, generally carried out by a team of two men, the straw residue being lifted to one side and the ears being winnowed by natural draughts between the cart entry and the doorway opposite.
- 3.8 The entrance passageway gave protection in inclement weather, while the height of the threshing area provided light and air for the work of winnowing the husks from the ears of grain. Air vents are created by leaving out odd stones in the external walls to prevent the crops inside from becoming damp or mouldy. The threshing floor is paved with river cobbles and stone blocks. Originally, there would have been a separation from the storage bays with bracing to keep the loose crops or straw from falling onto the threshing floor.



Entrance facade to barn



Barn interior with cart entrance to right

- 3.9 From the mid 19th century threshing by hand was gradually replaced by mechanisation, and some barns were adapted to house threshing machines. Another type of machinery, known as barn machinery was introduced for preparing cattle feed, and involved cutting up hay and straw into short lengths, pulping swedes and turnips, breaking linseed cake into pieces, and grinding or bruising oats and pulses. Some provision for feed preparation was found on nearly all farms by the end of the 19th century, but the machinery has almost always been sold off as scrap. Whilst some machinery remains in the barn at Cocklick End, this does not ever appear to have been fixed.
- 3.10 The other function of the combination barn was to shelter cattle. Dairy farming was an important farming activity, with milk production also used for butter and cheese making. Breeding of calves was related to this, and meat and leather were by products. Cattle were also valuable for producing manure for crops. The number of cattle in Britain was greatly increased in the 19th century, encouraged by an increase in the demand for livestock products, and because prices for dairy produce outstripped that for corn.
- 3.11 Until the 19th century, it remained common to keep cattle in the open over winter, but with understanding that shelter and improved facilities produced greater yields, new buildings were erected and older ones replaced.

- 3.12 The external doorway to the right of the cart entry leads into a passageway giving access to a range of cattle pens, each divided by timber posts and rails with slate infill panels. Originally the cattle would have been tethered whilst they were in the building, tail on to the access and manure passage, and fed from timber feeding boxes filled from the threshing floor.



Cattle pens



Loose box or implement storage area

- 3.13 The cowhouse has few windows, for when built, light and ventilation were considered detrimental to the housing of cattle, and those which are original have shutters which could be closed in cold weather. Above the pens is a hay loft, supported on timber cross beams.
- 3.14 The roof of the barn consists of purlins and common rafters, carried on two king post trusses. The timber used is mostly softwood, which became generally available in the late 18th century, but some reused oak, including supporting timber to the loft over the main access was presumably salvaged from an earlier structure on site.
- 3.15 The doorway to the left of the cart entrance leads into a space which probably served as a loose box and also perhaps for implement storage. Looseboxes allowed an animal to move about, and were intended for calves, sick animals, a bull or a cow about to calve. Timber pegs on the walls within were probably for hanging halters, tack or ropes.

4. BUILDING CONDITION

- 4.1 Structural reports on the property were prepared by Booth King Partnership in March and June 2012. The conclusions were that the original building is solidly built and exhibits few faults relating to its original construction. There are problems, however, arising from the lack of occupancy, unchecked ingress of water at roof level and the general lack of maintenance. The primary stone walls of the property were found to be in generally sound condition with no significant signs of settlement, lean or cracking. Extensive weathering of stone was noted, with resulting loss of mortar, particularly in the upper reaches due to water run-off from the roof and at lower levels due to rising damp. Vertical cracking was noted in the wall between the earlier domestic accommodation and the extension, and in other internal walls.

- 4.2 The roof of the later extension to the house has completely failed with collapse of the eastern slope and partial collapse of the western slope. The timber roof to the earlier part of the house is intact, but has significant timber decay in the bottom tie of the roof truss and in a number of rafters. All timber lintels have beetle and timber rot decay.
- 4.3 The later structural report sets out a list of remedial works which would be needed to restore the building to a structurally sound, wind and waterproof condition. These could be done without significant alteration to the building.

5. STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

- 5.1 Cocklick End is not currently a listed building. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), however, makes provision for local authorities to identify non-designated heritage assets, based on an assessment of its significance.⁵
- 5.2 The site is within the Forest of Bowland AONB. This is the subject of a Landscape Character Assessment, commissioned by Lancashire County Council and published in 2009.⁶ The study describes the Forest of Bowland as a nationally protected landscape which is internationally important for its heather moorland, blanket bog, and rare birds. It is designated as a landscape of national significance for the grandeur and isolation of the upland core; the steep escarpments of the Moorland Hills; the undulating lowlands; visual contrasts between each element of the overall landscape; serenity and tranquillity of the area; distinctive pattern of settlements; wildlife; and the landscape's historical and cultural associations.
- 5.3 Following the methodology for assessment of cultural significance set out in the English Heritage *Conservation Principles*, Cocklick End can be identified to have the following heritage values which also contribute to the cultural heritage of the AONB:

Evidential Value:

- 5.4 While little written evidence survives to record the history of the property, two dates on the building identify periods in its construction. A part of what is now the house dates from 1727, and the attached barn is dated 1827. It is unlikely that any part of the present building is earlier than 18th century, though there is a reference to Cocklicke in the Lancashire Record Office dating to 1633, which may be the same site. The construction of the barn in 1827 indeed may have involved change to the 18th century house, as is suggested by the present arrangement of the incomplete central unit.

⁵ The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) defines a heritage asset as 'A building, monument, site, place, area or landscape identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions, because of its heritage interest. Heritage asset includes designated heritage assets and assets identified by the local planning authority (including local listing)'.

⁶ *Landscape Character of the Forest of Bowland AONB*, Chris Blandford Associates, 2009

Historic and Architectural Value:

- 5.5 The building was erected as part of the process of moorland reclamation that took place during the period of post-medieval enclosure. It follows the tradition of the upland longhouse, and the common typology of a farmhouse with combination barn, creating a compact and efficient agricultural unit in a moorland context.
- 5.6 It is built of local gritstone with a stone slate roof, and exhibits the vernacular features common within the area. These include the use of random rubble laid to irregular courses; massive dressed stones for quoins, arches and other architectural features; inscribed and dated lintels; small windows; and robust timber roofs. The design of the barn similarly displays vernacular forms and features adapted for their practicality and protection from the weather.
- 5.7 The main structural walls of the building are solidly built and sound, and the barn is generally in robust structural condition. The roof of the earlier part of the house is of considerable interest, well preserved, and basically sound. In spite of the collapse of a part of the roof of the later extension, a number of features of interest remain within the house, including the staircase, the cast iron range and two stone fireplaces.
- 5.8 The combination barn is of particular interest for its size, layout and design, as well as its good state of preservation. Few alterations have been made to its external or internal walls, and the roof survives in its original form. The survival of original cattle pens and hay loft are also rare.
- 5.9 Relatively few buildings dating from the 18th century survive within the area in their original setting, and the combination of the early house with its fine inscribed and dated lintel, and the early 19th century model barn gives the building considerable architectural and historic value.

Aesthetic Value:

- 5.10 Outlying farmsteads of the type are conspicuous buildings in the landscape and contribute to the rugged character of the area. Although it is not seen from any public rights of way at close quarters, and is close to Gisburn Forest on the southeast side, it stands in a landscape that is essentially open and expansive.
- 5.11 The building retains its simple orthogonal plan, with sheer walls and simple punched openings. The surrounding land is bounded by dry stone walls. A large single sycamore tree gives protection to the house from the prevailing wind. Unlike many larger farms Cocklick End has not been affected by 20th century additions such as large pre-fabricated steel and asbestos cement farm buildings, silage clamps and fencing, and therefore retains its 18th and 19th century setting to a much higher degree.

Communal Value:

- 5.12 The property was acquired by the Fylde Water Board in the early 20th century as part of a strategy for supplying water to Blackpool and the Fylde coastal towns. The construction of Stocks Reservoir caused the flooding of Stocks village which was the closest settlement to Cocklick End, the de-population of the area, and the closure and demolition of a number of farmsteads within the water collection area.
- 5.13 Cocklick End survived and the ownership passed to United Utilities in 1995 with the merger of North West Water and NORWEB. In partnership with Forest Enterprises, United Utilities share responsibility for providing clean water and protecting the environment and wildlife, and for promoting farming, forestry, outdoor activities and tourism in the area.
- 5.14 The Forest of Bowland is a popular destination for leisure and outdoor pursuits, and the cultural heritage of the area is important for both the local community and visitors. The preservation of Cocklick End will also have value in the collective memory of the community.

Aspects of Significance

- 5.15 The chief aspects of significance are therefore:
- Association with the upland farming traditions of the Forest of Bowland
 - An important unspoiled example of a traditional long house dating from the 18th and 19th centuries, comprising a farmhouse and a combination barn
 - Plan of the building and its working arrangement
 - Vernacular character and use of local materials
 - Dated stones with inscriptions
 - Internal features including roof timbers, stone fireplaces, staircase, stone floors, doorways and the sense of space in the barn
 - Stone boundary walls
 - Attractive landscape setting
 - Significant contribution made to the cultural heritage of the Forest of Bowland AONB
- 5.16 Although Cocklick End Farmhouse is not currently a listed building, it would warrant consideration for designation. The English Heritage *Designation Listing Selection Guide: Domestic 1: Vernacular Houses* (2011) provides the following selection criteria for considering vernacular houses for designation, which are all relevant to Cocklick End:
- *Regional and local characteristics*
How they differ from region to region, how clearly they represent local geology, farming and territorial practices, as well as local materials and building traditions.

- *Dates of Buildings and rates of survival*
Presumption to list all pre-1700 buildings that retain significant early fabric. Early survivals of house of lower ranks in society may be especially strong candidates for listing because of their rarity.
- *Lack of alteration*
Though evidence of change can itself be important.
- *Specialist functions*
Particularly farms which incorporate evidence of agricultural practice. Such features where they survive can add interest.
- *Proportion of survival*
The outcome of assessment can hinge on the extent and impact of alteration and the proportion of historic fabric that survives.
- *Plan form, room use and circulation*
How vernacular buildings were used and changed over time can be of interest. The use of rooms in different social levels, and the conversion of farm buildings to domestic use are significant factors.

5.17 The English Heritage *Designation Listing Selection Guide: Agricultural Buildings* (2011) contains further criteria that suggest Cocklick End may warrant listing, including the fact that where agricultural buildings 'are clearly dated (whether by datestone, documentation or tree-ring dating) this is likely to add to their interest'.

6 HERITAGE PLANNING CONTEXT

6.1 National Planning Policy and Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework

PPS5 Planning for the Historic Environment: Historic Environment Planning Practice Guide

- 6.1.1 Historic Environment Policies included in the National Planning Framework (March 2012) replace Planning Policy Statement 5 (PPS 5). The Historic Environment Planning Practice Guide, which accompanied PPS5, remains in place as national guidance until it is replaced, though it should be read in the light of the NPPF, and does not comprise policy.
- 6.1.2 The NPPF states that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. The Government sees three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental, and these roles should be regarded as mutually dependent. Economic growth can secure higher social and environmental standards, and well-designed buildings and places can improve the lives of people and communities. The planning system is therefore expected to play an active role in guiding development to sustainable solutions. Policies 126-141 are related to conserving and enhancing the historic environment.

- 6.1.3 The NPPF defines the significance of a heritage asset as its value *‘to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. That interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic. Significance derives not only from a heritage asset’s physical presence, but also from its setting.’* As with PPS5, the NPPF provides a unified approach to the historic environment and removes the previous distinctions between historic buildings, archaeology and designed landscapes. It defines the historic environment in terms of *“heritage assets.”* This term embraces all manner of features, including: buildings, parks and gardens, standing, buried and submerged remains, areas, sites and landscapes, whether designated or not and whether capable of designation or not.
- 6.1.4 Policies 128 and 129 of the NPPF require planning applicants and local planning authorities to assess the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be appropriate to the assets’ importance and no more than sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. Local planning authorities should take this assessment into account when the potential impact of proposed development to avoid or minimise conflict between the heritage asset’s conservation and any aspect of the proposal.
- 6.1.5 Policy 131 states that local planning authorities should take account of the desirability of new development sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets; the positive contribution that heritage assets can make to sustainable communities; and the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.
- 6.1.6 Policy 135 sets out the policy principle guiding the consideration of applications for consent relating to undesignated assets. It states that the effect of an application on non-designated heritage assets or their setting will require a balanced judgement having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.
- 6.1.7 Policy 137 states that local authorities should look for opportunities for new development within Conservation Areas 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 or better reveal the significance of the asset should be treated favourably.
- 6.1.8 Policy 141 states that local planning authorities should make information about the significance of the historic environment gathered as part of the development process publicly accessible, and should require developers to record and advance understanding of the heritage asset before it is lost.
- 6.1.9 Policy 115 states that great weight should be given to conserving landscape and natural beauty in Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty, and

that conservation of wildlife and cultural heritage are an important consideration in all these areas.

6.1.10 Policy 55 states that local authorities should avoid isolated homes in the countryside unless there are special circumstances, such as where such development would enable optimal viable use of a heritage asset, or where the development would re-use redundant or disused buildings and lead to an enhancement to the immediate setting.

6.1.11 Section 5 of the Historic Environment Planning Practice Guide provides generic guidance on decision making for changes that affect the historic environment. Paragraphs 55-57 state that understanding both the *nature of the significance* and the *level of importance* are fundamental to decision making, and set out the most common steps that a planning applicant may be expected to carry out assessing significance.

6.1.12 Paragraphs 76-78 give guidance to local authorities on weighing up proposals for development. These should take account of potential heritage benefits and any other material planning considerations that would arise as a result of development proceeding.

6.1.13 Paragraph 80 stresses the need to assess the extent to which the design of new development contributes positively to the character, distinctiveness and significance of the historic environment.

Conservation Principles: Policy and Guidance (English Heritage) 2008

6.1.14 The English Heritage document *Conservation Principles: Policies and Guidance for the Sustainable Management of the Historic Environment* is intended to guide conservation thinking and practice in England. It defines conservation as managing change in ways that will sustain the significance of places, for change in the historic environment is inevitable, whether caused by natural processes, through use or by people responding to social, economic and technological advances.

6.1.15 If the significance of a place is to be retained and its historic value sympathetically managed, further change will inevitably be needed. Development need not devalue the significance of the place, both its tangible values, such as historic fabric, or its associational values, such as its place within the landscape, provided the work is done with understanding.

6.1.16 The English Heritage *Principles* state that retaining the authenticity of a place is not always achieved by retaining as much of the existing fabric as is technically possible (paragraph 93). Where deliberate changes are made, however, the alteration should in some way be discernible. Integrity likewise depends on an understanding of the values of the heritage asset.

6.1.17 The *Principles* state that new work or alteration to a significant place should normally be acceptable if:

- There is sufficient information to comprehensively understand the impacts of the proposal on the significance of the place;
- The proposal would not materially harm the values of the place, which, where appropriate, would be reinforced or further revealed;
- The proposals aspire to a quality of design and execution which may be valued now and in the future;
- The long-term consequences of the proposals can, from experience, be demonstrated to be benign, or the proposals are designed not to prejudice alternative solutions in the future.

6.1.18 The *Principles* state that there are no simple rules for achieving quality of design in new work, which could involve either working in a traditional or contemporary manner. The important factor is to respect the values established through an assessment of the significance of the building and its setting.

6.1.19 It is also suggested that features of lesser significance offer opportunities to create heritage values of tomorrow, which can be achieved if the quality of the new work is of a high standard of design, materials, detailing and execution.

6.2 Local Planning Policy and Guidance

Ribble Valley District Wide Local Plan Historic Built Environment Policies

6.2.1 The Council has no policies in its development plan relating to locally listed buildings or undesignated heritage assets. There is no formal list of buildings of local interest.

6.2.2 The local plan sets out detailed policy criteria to help determine applications for the conversion of rural buildings. H15 relates to the location of the building to be converted. It states that planning permission will be granted for the conversion of buildings to dwellings in situations where there will be no unnecessary expenditure by public authorities and utilities on the provision of infrastructure; there would be no materially damaging effect on the landscape qualities of the area; there would be no unacceptable harm to nature conservation interests. The conversion of appropriate buildings within settlements or which form part of already defined groups is acceptable. This is linked to factors such as garden areas, car parking facilities, garages, sheds and even washing lines which are out of character with the rural setting.

6.2.3 Policy H16 relates to the building itself. Conversions will be granted provided that the building is structurally sound and capable of conversion for the proposed use without the need for extensive building or major alterations, which would adversely affect the character or appearance of the building.

- 6.2.4 Detailed design policy is contained within policy H17. This states that the design of the conversion should be of a high standard and is in keeping with local tradition, particularly in terms of materials, geometric form and window and door openings. The impact of the development or the effects of the creation of a garden area, together with any garaging or car parking facilities or other additions, will not harm the appearance or function of the area in which it is situated. The access to the site should be to a safe standard, or should be capable of being improved to a safe standard without harming the appearance of the area.

7 CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT PRINCIPLES

7.1 Heritage Planning Requirements

- 7.1.1 The NPPF requires local authorities to take into account:
- the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation
 - the wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits that conservation of the historic environment can bring
 - the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness
 - opportunities to draw on the contribution made by the historic environment to the character of a place
- 7.1.2 In order to ensure compliance with these policies, as well as the housing policies of the Ribble Valley Local Plan, the following conservation and development principles were established prior to commencement of design.

7.2 Design Principles

Demolition

- 7.2.1 The metal tank attached to the front elevation should be removed, and the original elevation made good.
- 7.2.2 Where alterations have been made to the original external walls, there is scope either for reinstatement or for further changes to facilitate beneficial reuse, possibly in a contemporary style.

External alterations

- 7.2.3 Interventions in the external walls to create new openings should be minimized as far as possible.
- 7.2.4 The introduction of rooflights should be restricted to locations where they are required to achieve satisfactory day-lighting within the building. They should be of conservation style, and possibly an industrial rather than domestic character.

- 7.2.5 New doors and windows should be simple and robust in character, not necessarily reproducing the original styles but sympathetic to the spirit of the building.

Internal alterations

- 7.2.6 New openings in existing internal masonry walls will be acceptable where required for efficient circulation, but wholesale removal of walls should be avoided.
- 7.2.7 Introduction of partitions to create independent spaces will be acceptable, but the barn should retain its open character and sense of space as far as practically possible, thus allowing the space to remain readable. Within this context, the introduction of a first floor or mezzanine levels within the barn should be possible and acceptable.
- 7.2.8 Stone floors could either be taken up and re-laid with the incorporation of thermal insulation and a damp proof membrane, or retained in situ and covered over.

Conservation and Refurbishment

- 7.2.9 The roofs should be stripped and re-laid using the existing and matching stone slates.
- 7.2.10 Stone walls should be repaired in matching stone and re-pointed as necessary in a hydraulic lime mortar.
- 7.2.11 Thermal upgrading will be of particular importance to achieve high energy efficiency ratings. This may be achieved by dry lining the external walls, comprehensive draught proofing, double or triple glazing, microgeneration, or CHP, provided that the special interest of the building is not compromised.
- 7.2.12 Rainwater goods should be replaced in cast iron, and external plumbing located internally wherever possible.
- 7.2.13 The surviving timber roofs to the house and barn should be repaired and strengthened as necessary.
- 7.2.14 Internal features such as the fireplaces and the staircase should be retained and repaired if practicable.

Setting

- 7.2.15 The landscape setting of the building should be simple and restrained. The immediate curtilage of the property should not be increased, and existing boundary walls should be retained and repaired. Any new walling should be of matching style and materials.

- 7.2.16 The driveway, parking and vehicular turning areas should be kept to a minimum, should be sensitively routed and surfaced in a sympathetic material. Simple design of soft landscaping may be used to screen areas of hard standing.
- 7.2.17 Should a garage or ancillary outbuildings be required, these should be carefully sited in relation to the house and views of the landscape and be sympathetic in character and appearance.
- 7.2.18 Planting should follow the natural character of the existing landscape, based on use of natural species, hedgerow planting and meadowland.

8 THE PROPOSAL

- 8.1 It is proposed to convert the farmhouse and barn into a single dwelling, including upgrading the access roadway and creation of a parking area.
- 8.2 The detailed design is set out in the Design and Access Statement.

9 HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT

9.1 NPPF requirements

- 9.1.1 Policy 135 of the NPPF states that 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 or loss and to the significance of the heritage asset affected.
- 9.1.2 A detailed analysis of the significance of Cocklick End is set out in this report. It demonstrates that the complex of buildings is significant for the following reasons:
- Association with the upland farming traditions of the Forest of Bowland
 - An unspoiled example of a traditional long house dating from the 18th and 19th centuries, comprising a farmhouse and combination barn
 - Plan of the building and its working arrangement
 - Vernacular character and use of local materials
 - Dated stones with inscriptions
 - Internal features including roof timbers, stone fireplaces, staircase, stone floors, doorways and the sense of space in the barn
 - Stone boundary walls
 - Attractive landscape setting
 - Contribution made to the cultural heritage of the Forest of Bowland AONB

- 9.1.3 Taking account of the Statement of Significance and Policy 132 of the NPPF, the impact of the proposal on the aspects of significance and setting of the heritage assets is considered below.

9.2 Impact on Significance of Cocklick End

Exterior

- 9.2.1 The external walls of the building are well-preserved, and have been subject to little change since the barn was erected in 1827. The proposals involve no alterations to external walls, apart from opening up existing blocked openings and the introduction of two small windows at first floor level on the gable elevation.
- 9.2.2 New casement windows are designed in a simple contemporary style without glazing bars, so as to achieve a high performance of thermal insulation.
- 9.2.3 The steel water tank will be removed and the stonework made good.
- 9.2.4 Roof lights will be introduced on the rear roof slope to provide adequate illumination to the interior of the building. The roof lighting to the barn adopts a functional style, characteristic of 19th century industrial buildings commonly seen in the countryside of East Lancashire and West Yorkshire.

Interior

- 9.2.5 Within the existing farmhouse the missing and decayed first floors will be reconstructed in timber to match the original layout. The staircase will be rebuilt, reusing any sound fabric. A new opening will be created in the dividing wall between the older section and the 19th century extension at both ground floor and first floor levels to provide adequate access. A door opening will also be created between the existing farmhouse and the converted barn. These interventions will have no harmful impact on the internal character or appearance of the farmhouse.
- 9.2.6 Within the existing barn the only structural intervention will be the removal of a section of stone walling between the main space and the former loose box, so as to create a glazed internal screen to provide lighting to the proposed office. Although this will result in a loss of historic fabric, the space will remain understandable, since a screen will be inserted on the line of the wall at both ground and first floor levels.
- 9.2.7 The existing first floor over the cow shed within the barn will be retained and upgraded to form a bedroom and en-suite bathroom. An additional section of first floor of similar size will be constructed on the other side of the barn, and will be linked with the existing floor by a bridge. The central void will remain open to the roof, so as to admit light to the centre of the building and to preserve the overall sense of space within the barn.

- 9.2.8 The existing timber and slate cattle stalls will be removed. While these are currently of interest, their retention is incompatible with the domestic use of the building, and it is proposed that the slate panels be re-used within the building.

Conservation

- 9.2.9 The section of collapsed roof will be reconstructed in traditional fashion, as will the collapsed or missing sections of first floor within the farmhouse.
- 9.2.10 The whole roof will be stripped and re-slatted using the existing and matching stone slates, insulated and underlined in accordance with best practice. Any decayed roof timbers will be repair or reinforced. Roof lights will be of conservation type, set flush with the wall plane.
- 9.2.11 Stonework will be repaired and re-pointing in hydraulic lime mortar as required, rainwater goods will be replaced in cast iron, new windows and doors will be of timber to approved designs, and historic internal features such as the staircase, fireplaces and cast iron range will be retained and repaired.
- 9.2.12 Re-plastering, treatment of dampness and timber decay will be carried out to conservation standards. The building will be insulated to high standards of energy efficiency, including dry lining of the walls to the barn. New services will be introduced throughout. New construction and materials will be of high quality and compatible with the existing building fabric.

Setting

- 9.2.13 The building is currently reached by an unmade track, which requires surfacing. The access will remain single track, and the parking and turning area will be kept to a minimum and restricted to the land on the north side of the building. No garage is proposed to be erected. The garden is enclosed by existing stone walls, and as a result will not impact on the existing openness of the setting.

9.3 Overall Impact on Significance

- 9.3.1 The major benefit of the proposals relates to the conservation of an important non designated heritage asset which is currently at risk. The conversion to a dwelling will give the building a sustainable future.
- 9.3.2 Considered overall, and taking account of the benefits outlined above, the impact of the proposals on the significance of the property will be medium positive.

10 CONCLUSIONS

- 10.1 Policy 128 of the NPPF states that 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. The information in sections 2, 3, and 5 of this report provides an assessment of the significance of Cocklick End and its setting as a designated heritage asset.
- 10.2 The significance of the building is based on its historical associations, architectural interest and landscape setting. The building also contributes to the special interest of the AONB.
- 10.3 Policy 131 of the NPPF sets out the principles guiding the determination of applications for consent relating to designated heritage assets. This should take account of the desirability of sustaining and enhancing significance, the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to the establishment of sustainable communities and economic vitality; and the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.
- 10.4 The assessment of impact on heritage assets is set out in Section 9 of the report. This identifies neutral or positive impacts. The only heritage impact that could be considered to be negative is the removal of the timber and slate cattle pens, which are not reusable for any other purpose, and therefore cannot realistically be retained.
- 10.5 When the impacts are assessed cumulatively, the heritage statement has demonstrated that any minor harm as outlined above will be substantially offset by the heritage benefits of bringing the building into optimum use, giving it a sustainable future and enhancing and further revealing its significance. Thus the overall balance is shown to have a major positive impact on significance, with the proposals for conservation being particularly beneficial. The impact on setting is identified as neutral.
- 10.6 The application proposals are therefore compliant with the NPPF and the built environment policies of the Ribble Valley District Wide Local Plan.