



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: 3/2017/0577

Date: 8th August 2017

FAO V Walmsley

Dear Mr Macholc,

Planning Application 3/2017/0577: Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of replacement; Lower Clerk Hill, Clerk Hill Road, Whalley BB7 9DR

The above planning application is for the demolition of the existing farmhouse at Lower Clerk Hill and its replacement with a larger house. Whilst the planning application is accompanied by a Planning Statement and a Bat Survey, there is no Design and Access Statement or Heritage Statement on the council's web site.

The building is shown on the OS 1:10,560 mapping of 1848 (sheet Lancashire 55, surveyed 1844-6) and may also appear on William Yates' map of the county published in 1786 (although this cannot be confirmed). The north face of the building, as shown on the accompanying elevation drawings 'as existing', is unremarkable but the window pattern to the south face would suggest a number of alterations in the past and that the building is likely to be 18th century or earlier. The plans 'as existing' also show that there are significant ceiling/floor beams within many rooms and that a number of those on the upper floor are irregular in shape, suggesting an earlier origin. Finally, the Bat Survey has some useful photographs, including the south elevation and the roof space. The former supports the evidence of the elevation drawing, whilst the latter shows a simple collar truss and unsquared purlin roof structure. Such a design is again more likely to date to the 17th or 18th, rather than 19th, century.

Given that the above is somewhat conjectural and the planning history of the site as set out in the Planning Statement, it would not appear to be appropriate to recommend that the demolition proposal should be refused. It is however considered appropriate for the building to be preserved 'by record' by means of a fully-detailed survey, prior to its demolition. As such we would recommend a level 3 survey as set out in '*Understanding Historic Buildings*' (Historic England 2016) is required by planning condition. The following wording is suggested:

Condition: No development shall take place until the applicant, or their agent or successors in title, has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological recording 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. The programme of works should include the creation of a record of the building to Level 3 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. This work shall be carried out by an appropriately qualified and experienced professional historic building survey contractor to the standards and guidance of the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA, see www.archaeologists.net).

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

Note: A list of potential contractors may be found on the CIfA web site: www.archaeologists.net/RO or the directory on the BAJR web pages: <http://www.bajr.org/WhoseWho/>

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