



John Macholc
Head of Planning Services
Ribble Valley Borough Council
Council Offices
Church Walk
CLITHEROE
BB7 2RA

Phone: 07847 200073

Email: Lancashire.archaeology@gmail.com

Your ref: 3/2017/0248

Date: 13th April 2017

FAO S Kilmartin

Dear Mr Macholc,

Planning Application 3/2017/0248: New dwelling to replace existing farmhouse and two barn conversions approved under planning permission 3/2016/0575; Painley Farm, Knott Lane, Newsholme, Gisburn BB7 4JF

We provided comments on the previous application on this site (mentioned above) and recommended that a programme of building recording was undertaken in advance of development. However, possibly due to the submission date of those comments, no condition was applied to the consent granted.

The farmstead of Painley is noted on the OS 1:10,560 mapping of 1853 (sheet Yorkshire 166, surveyed 1849-50) and its location and name would suggest that it is likely to be of considerably earlier origin. Several of the buildings proposed for alteration or demolition in the present proposals appear on that map, although of course the more modern portal-framed units do not. We note that there is no heritage statement accompanying the application. The plans and drawings do not appear to include detailed plans or elevations of the extant buildings to be refurbished and retained, either as existing or as proposed. Given the scale of some of the interventions noted in the planning documents, such as the insertion of two new garage doors and a new floor into the retained barn, we would suggest that at least these missing drawings should be submitted and given due consideration before any decision is made on the application.

In the mean time we would state that we would again recommend that a scheme of building recording, to include all traditionally built structures on the farmstead (whether they are to be removed or retained) should be undertaken before any works start on site. Given the scale of the groundworks likely to be necessary to construct the proposed new dwelling, we would also recommend that a formal archaeological watching brief is undertaken to record any buried remains during those groundworks. The following planning condition wording is therefore suggested:

Condition: No works shall take place on the site until the applicant, or their agent or successors in title, has secured the implementation of a programme of

archaeological works. This must be carried out in accordance with a written scheme of investigation, which shall first have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure and safeguard the recording and inspection of matters of archaeological/historical importance associated with the buildings/site.

Note: The programme of works should comprise two elements. The first should be the creation of a record of the building to Level 2-3 before any site clearance or development begins, as set out in '*Understanding Historic Buildings*' (Historic England 2016). It should include a full description of the building, inside and out, a drawn plan, elevations and at least one section (which may be derived from checked and corrected architect's drawings), and a full photographic coverage inside and out. The record should also include a rapid desk-based assessment, putting the building and its features into context. The second element should be the holding of a formal archaeological watching brief during any ground disturbance required as part of the development, including the lifting of extant ground floors, slabs or yard surfaces, and any grubbing up of extant foundations and services.

The programme of works should be undertaken by an appropriately qualified and experienced professional archaeological contractor or contractors to the standards and guidance of the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (www.archaeologists.net).

This is in accordance with National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 141: "*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*".

Please note that the above comments have been made without the benefit of a site visit.

Yours sincerely

Peter Iles