



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: 3/2018/0395

Date: 2nd July 2018

FAO A Dowd

Dear Mr Macholc,

Planning Application 3/2018/0395: Resubmission of planning application 3/2017/1021. Demolition of lean-to extension to side, and erection of two-storey extension to side. Susie Cottage, Rimington Lane, Rimington BB7 4DT

Thank you for your consultation on the above application. I am sorry for the delay in responding, but there seems to have been a hiccup in my dealing with the email inbox, and a batch of consultations seems to have only recently re-appeared.

The application is accompanied by a Heritage Statement (HS, C J O'Flaherty dated May 2018), a Design and Access Statement (DAS, Stanton Andrews Architects dated April 2018) and a Bat Survey (Dave Anderson dated November 2017). The Heritage Statement suggests that the building was originally a single-unit cottage of perhaps 18th century origin, with a later added bay to its southwest end. Photographs in the Bat Survey and DAS compliment the two external photographs provided in the HS, and show that the site is a modest cottage which has undergone some modernisation. It is notable that the photograph of the first floor room provided (DAS p.4) shows what appears to be the base of a king post roof truss crossing the room in front of the chimney breast, and that there are also exposed ceiling beams on the ground floor. The roof photographs in the Bat Survey (p.4) confirm that former ceilings were set into the roof space but have since been removed, and also seem to show that some, if not all, of the roof timbers are of sawn timber and may be of relatively recent date.

As noted in the HS, the site is not a Listed Building, but it is shown on the OS first edition 1:10,560 mapping (sheet Yorkshire 183, surveyed 1849) published in 1853, an extract of which is provided as HS Fig 2 (note that the date given in the HS is incorrect). It appears as a roadside building with a small outshut to its rear (southeast) face, set in a garden and with two small detached buildings adjacent and a third slightly further away to the southwest. At this time a stream appears to have flanked the north-western side of Rimington Lane. It would seem likely that the building was at that time accessed directly from the road and that there should, therefore, be a blocked doorway in the

northern half of the northwest side. Comparison of this map with the modern mapping would suggest that the added bay noted in the HS had already been attached to the southwest gable by this time. Within the original section the stair is set against one side of the former gable wall with a fireplace and chimney on the opposite gable wall. We would not dispute the possible 18th century date of the original cottage assigned in the Heritage Statement, nor the probable loss of older windows from this part. As such we would consider that this is an example of a very modest rural dwelling, of a type which gets little attention unless incorporated into a larger complex.

The proposed new development appears to retain most of the extant historic building, a single new opening being proposed through the northeast gable on each floor, that to the ground floor replacing an existing window opening. It is not clear however if the proposals retain the existing roof truss and the existing ceiling beams (although this would seem possible). The proposed repair and 'making good' works are not specified in any detail, and it is not known if the existing brick elements are to be removed and replaced with matching stone and if the remaining render is all to be removed. It is noted that existing windows include a number of wooden sliding sash windows (HS Figures 4 and 5) and proposed windows are noted as 'grey aluminium'. The extent of these direct impacts on the building are thus hard to quantify, and it is not possible to say without further information if it should be considered a 'substantial' or 'less than substantial' impact.

The proposed new extension is a considerable size and from the plans as proposed would appear to be (measured externally and using the dimensions quoted) to be 86.36 sqm per floor, compared to the 55 sqm of the original. The extension is thus 156.66% of the size of the original. If internal measurements are used, the percentage increase is likely to be higher. As such it is certain that the proposals will have a large and significant effect on the setting of the existing building.

With regard to the design of the new works, I must leave commenting on that to others and would suggest that an opinion is sought from the Conservation Officer.

Should the application be approved, I would recommend that the provision of a historic building record be required by condition. The following wording is suggested:

Condition: No development including any demolition works shall take place until the applicant or their agent or successors in title has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological recording, analysis and reporting work. This programme of works should comprise the creation of a record of the building to level 2-3 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 a checked and corrected architect's drawing), and a full photographic coverage, inside and out. The work must be undertaken by an appropriately qualified and experienced professional archaeological contractor to the standards and guidance of the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists. This archaeological recording shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority and the Lancashire Historic Environment Record before the dwelling hereby approved is first occupied.

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

Note: Relevant archaeological standards and lists of potential contractors can be found on the ClfA web pages: <http://www.archaeologists.net> and the BAJR Directory: <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