



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: 3/2018/1121

Date: 27th February 2019

FAO A Dowd

Dear Mr Macholc,

Planning Application 3/2018/1121: Change of use to new restaurant on ground floor and new retail unit at first floor. General refurbishment of existing building with new single storey extensions and structures to courtyard area and to rear elevation. New wall, gate and timber screen to front and side boundaries. Resubmission of application 3/2018/00530. The Stables, rear of King Street, Whalley BB7 9SP

Thank you for your consultation on the above planning application. The development involves some alterations to a relatively modern building, including a small extension to the west end and a small linear extension to the north face. Works are also proposed in front of the north boundary wall to the adjacent churchyard and to the eastern boundary wall, as well as the installation of a '*covered exterior dining area*'. The application comes with a brief Heritage Statement and a '*Statement of Significance & Assessment of Impact*' (both Fletcher Smith Architects, 15 November 2018) but the '*Proposed Roof Plan, Elevations and Detail Section of Courtyard Wall*' (Plan 3357/14) and Design and Access Statement mentioned on the application form were not available on the Council's web page whenever it was consulted.

The site is located within a plot extending backwards from King Street, probably an original medieval burghage plot, flanking the southern wall to the medieval church of St Mary. The building itself is not shown on the OS first edition 1:2,500 mapping, surveyed in 1892 (sheet Lancashire 55.10, published date probably 1893), although the churchyard wall is shown on the present line on that mapping. A structure with the same footprint as the present building does appear on the second edition surveyed in 1910 (published 1912). That structure appears to have had open fronts to the north and east facing elevations, but it has, however, been substantially if not completely rebuilt since that time. As such, whilst the building clearly has townscape merit in its form and materials, there is no significant archaeological interest in the building itself. There is, however, some potential for buried archaeological remains pre-dating its erection to survive, particularly in the courtyard area. As may be expected, however, these buried

remains will have suffered from the original construction of the building and any excavations undertaken as part of the refurbishment or rebuilding.

None of the supplied documents give any detail of the 'covered exterior dining area' beyond a simple dashed outline on the Proposed Ground Floor Plan, nor are there any details of the 'timber slatted screens' to be placed alongside the wall to the churchyard boundary, although it is stated that they will be independent of the wall and 'entirely self-supporting' (Plan 3357/13). It is not clear from this if the 'cover' for the dining area and these screens will require foundations or will stand on the extant courtyard surface, although some ground works could be assumed from the statement that "...*any visible roots [to the tree overhanging from the churchyard] will be protected...*" (Heritage Statement p.3). It is thus not possible to comment on their potential archaeological impact.

A small section of the existing courtyard entrance is to be closed up with a new blockwork wall, and the front courtyard wall itself is to be topped with a new timber screen, stated to be '*on top of steel channel independent of existing stone wall*' (Plan 3357/13). The new wall section will require foundations, as will the small timber store to the west face and the bar extension to the north face. These works are relatively small in scale and are likely to be in areas already partly disturbed by the construction and reconstruction of the present building. As such it would not appear that these works on their own would justify any archaeological response. If, however, the screens and/or courtyard cover works also require footings to be constructed, then a formal archaeological watching brief may be justified, so that any remains disturbed can be recorded. If this is likely to be the case a standard 'programme of archaeological works' (note: not a 'building recording' condition) condition could be applied to any consent granted, to ensure that a watching brief is undertaken.

We are happy to defer to Mr Dowd's expertise with regard to the impact of the scheme on the overall townscape and the setting of the adjacent church and churchyard, etc. You may wish to obtain more details on the works to the courtyard and how it is to be operated (music, lighting, etc.) to judge its impact and the need for any controls on e.g. hours of lighting and music, acceptable sound levels, etc.

Please note that the above comments have been made without the benefit of a site visit.

Yours sincerely

Peter Iles