



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: 3/2018/0468 and 0474

Date: 4th July 2018

FAO A Dowd

Dear Mr Macholc,

Planning Applications 3/2018//0468 and 0474: Erection of a single storey extension to the south of an existing modern extension. Reconfiguration of existing patio and railings. Removal of pointed arch doorway to the southern wall of the modern extension and replacement with a window. Repainting of existing rendered gable to the Hall. Great Mitton Hall, Mitton Road, Mitton BB7 9PQ

These applications are accompanied by a Planning Statement and Heritage Statement, but although the plan as proposed refers to a Design and Access Statement one does not appear on the relevant web page. There also appear to be no details given as to the proposed reconfiguration of the patio and railings. The section drawings 'as existing' and 'as proposed' stop short of this element of the scheme and the site plan as proposed and proposed plan do not show the same arrangements. The Heritage Statement does not consider buried remains and archaeological deposits and does not discuss this element of the scheme in any detail. It is therefore not possible to comment on the potential archaeological impact of this element of the scheme.

As noted in the heritage and Planning Statements the proposed extension and the replacement of the door with a window only impact an extension to the historic building. The doorway itself appears to be an insertion permitted in 2009 although the detail seems to differ from the plans submitted at that time. As such there is no direct impact on the historic building fabric from these two elements. There is potentially a small impact on buried remains relating to the historic hall within the existing viewing terrace, but without details of this element of the scheme (as existing or as proposed) it is difficult to be sure of the scale of the impact. It seems probable that this area has already been somewhat disturbed by the construction and reconstruction of the extant extension, and it would seem that any impact would be minor and could be mitigated with an archaeological watching brief if required.

The impact on the appearance of the building from the proposals is more difficult to judge (particularly without a DAS) and must be to some degree subjective. The impact

of the proposed changes to the door and the new extension would not appear large to us, but we would defer to the expertise of your conservation officer in this regard. We would comment that the major change to the appearance of the building is likely to be the change in paint colour of the gable end and extension wall that is proposed. No detail of the actual colour seem to have been submitted and it must be commented that render on historic buildings in the county is almost always either unpainted or painted white (sometimes with black detailing) and that an alternative colour is likely to appear surprising. The justification for this change is given in the Heritage Statement as:

"...By toning down the stark white gable to a stone colour, the Hall will be tonally balanced with the adjacent Church." (HS 4.6)

It could be said that by being white, the gable end allows a clear distinction between the hall and the structure of the church beyond it when viewed from the road and the bridge (HS Fig 10) and if they were the same colour may tend to lose their distinct identities. It is acknowledged that changing the paint colour will not affect the historic fabric and, if a change is permitted but found to be damaging, it would be possible to reinstate the white colour at a later date.

Please note that the above comments have not been able to benefit from a site visit.

Yours sincerely

Peter Iles