



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: 3/2018/1082 and 1095

Date: 20th December 2018

FAO A Dowd

Dear Mr Macholc,

Planning Applications 3/2018/1082 and 1095: Conversion of the fives court to a learning hub, ancillary to the retreat centre. Five Courts, Stonyhurst College, Avenue Road, Hurst Green BB7 9PZ

Thank you for your consultation on the above applications. The Design, Access and Heritage Statement (DAHS, Cassidy and Ashton, 2018) and associated drawings set out the proposals in sufficient detail to be understood, and whilst there may be a requirement for further details for planning purposes, we consider that the heritage impact of the proposals can be established. The buildings are thought to have been constructed in the late 19th century (c.1880), although an exact date has not been established. In the AHP Conservation Management Plan (Gazetteer entry 15) they have been assigned a medium significance for historic and communal values, principally for their contribution to the school's sporting practices and traditions, but their aesthetic value was considered to be low. Their condition meant that they could not be inspected closely during the compilation of the plan, but photographs there and in the DAHS show them to have been simple open-fronted structures with little or no architectural embellishment. It was recommended in the gazetteer entry that further research and assessment be undertaken to review the above conclusions, prior to decisions being made about their future. This has been done to some degree by the DAHS, and no further assessment appears to be merited.

The proposed conversion works will incorporate some alterations to the buildings, including the provision of a new floor, roof timbers and the lining of the interior. New doorways are required between the former courts and the currently open frontages will be glazed. It is perhaps notable that no toilets or other domestic services are currently proposed, and it may be that alternative provision is intended or this will be addressed at a later date. In any case, the buildings seem to have no inherent archaeological potential, with any pre-1880s buried remains likely to have been lost during their construction. As such the new floors (and any services required) would have a negligible archaeological impact. The works to the standing structures themselves are

restricted and will have only a minor impact on their appearance, that impact being justified by bringing the buildings back into use.

We would conclude, therefore, that there are no archaeological grounds to refuse the application and insufficient justification to require any formal archaeological or building recording to be undertaken as part of the scheme.

Yours sincerely

Peter Iles