



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: 3/2018/1081

Date: 4<sup>th</sup> January 2019

FAO A Birkett

Dear Mr Macholc,

**Planning Application 3/2018/1081: Demolish and rebuild main farm house. Change of use to one live/work unit. Change of use from a mono pitch building to garage unit for live/work unit. Demolish existing farm buildings. Startifants Farm, Goose Lane, Chipping PR3 2QB**

This application seeks to make considerable changes to this farmstead, but of the elements proposed those with heritage impacts appear to be (i) the demolition of (and replacement of) the extant farmhouse; and (ii) the change of use of a traditionally-built barn to two dwellings.

Unlike the previously withdrawn application (3/2017/0742) this application comes with a Heritage Statement (HS - S Haigh, Oct 2018). It also has a Structural Appraisal (J Hadfield Engineering Surveying, nd) and a Bat Survey (D Anderson, Sept 2017), both of which also contain photographs of and comments on the buildings on site.

The HS notes the comments we made on the previous application and gives some limited information on the history of the site, noting that it was extant in 1773 when it was purchased by Richard Howson of Bolland. The farmhouse extant at that date must have been demolished as the present farmhouse bears the date 1820 and the initials of Thomas Howson, a date considered '*entirely in keeping with the building's outward and interior appearances*' (HS p.4). The attached garage to the farmhouse (also to be demolished) is suggested to have been built between 1820 and 1844 and comments are supplied relating to its previous uses (HS pp.5-6). Finally, the barn to be converted is suggested to be of earlier, probably 18<sup>th</sup> century origin, with an extension and alterations of the 19<sup>th</sup> century (HS p.6).

The Heritage Statement goes on to assess the heritage significance of these buildings and the impact of the proposals upon them, concluding that their significance is limited but that there will be both losses and gains as part of the development. Finally, it

suggests that '*Mitigation for any loss ... could include the creation of a detailed archaeological record of the historic buildings*' (HS p.9).

We would agree with this, but consider that the limited heritage significance of the buildings (particularly given the retention of the shell of the barn) does not merit recording of the buildings beyond that supplied with the application. Consequently we would not recommend the addition of an archaeological condition to any consent granted to the application.

Yours sincerely

*Peter Iles*