

## Sharon Craig

---

**From:** Adrian Dowd  
**Sent:** 13 February 2019 12:39  
**To:** planning  
**Cc:** Adam Birkett  
**Subject:** RE: Consultation on planning application 3/2019/0049 and application for Listed Building Consent 32019/0050 Duke of York Inn, Grindleton Brow, Grindleton BB7 4QR

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Adam,

### **Application 3/2019/0049 and 3/2019/0050 Duke of York Inn, Grindleton Brow, Grindleton**

The application submission (including exterior site inspection) has now been considered.

#### The Heritage Assessment

It is concerning that the author does not consider the impact on the architectural and historic interest (section 16 and 66 of the Act) to be amongst the 'heritage issues raised by the proposals' (Executive Summary; 3.3 Heritage Impact). See Dog & Partridge and historic interest below.

The assessment appears dismissive of the historic development of the building, interior plan form and historic interest. There is no discussion as to why the main stairs were moved in the early C20 or the significance of this (reflected in east gable windows). It is suggested that the attic was probably originally served by a continuation of the main stair at the rear – is there evidence in the floorboards for this? The building appears to retain the double-pile plan (two rooms at front and two at the back) identified in the list description – many listed pubs do not. Historic England 'Commerce and Exchange Buildings: Listing selection guide' (2017) refers to pubs at page 15 and Specific Considerations at page 18-19:

*"Selectivity - Most commercial buildings post-date 1850 ... pubs ... and hotels – are largely nineteenth-century creations. Because they survive in such large numbers and were subject to a high degree of standardisation, selection for designation needs to be very discriminating".*

*"Alterations - Commercial premises are intrinsically prone to change and alteration, and cannot be expected to survive in their original configuration".*

*"Community interest - Commercial premises, as prominent places of public gathering, have sometimes played leading parts in the story of a community and their claims to note should be considered accordingly".*

<https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/dlsg-commerce-exchange-buildings/heag121-commerce-and-exchange-lsg/>

There is no description or analysis of the interior of the 'low single-bay element to the rear' at which a spiral staircase is proposed.

The 1848 tithe survey map suggests that the relationship between the pub (and possible house prior to this?) and its curtilage is long standing. However, the significance of this is not discussed in the assessment. 'The Setting of Heritage Assets' (Historic England, 2015, page 4) states:

*“Settings of heritage assets which closely resemble the setting at the time the asset was constructed or formed are likely to contribute particularly strongly to significance”.*

<https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/gpa3-setting-of-heritage-assets/heag180-gpa3-setting-heritage-assets/>

The assessment does recognise that the Duke of York is of *“national importance ... occupies a prominent location and is itself a distinctive building of the conservation area”* (7.3 The Conservation area). It is also recognised that prime significance resides in its *“streetscene presence”* (7.2 The application building). This is reflected in the Grindleton Conservation Area Appraisal identification of the building as a Focal Building (corner site; elevated building at gateway and approach to village from the west; ‘polite’ architecture whereas *“the historic buildings of Grindleton are relatively modest and conservative”* – Appraisal page 12). The use of the building is also distinct *“Grindleton is primarily a residential village, with little employment within the village except for two pubs”* (Appraisal, page 12).

### Considerations

The proposals are harmful to the special architectural and historic interest and setting of the listed building and the character and appearance of Grindleton Conservation Area as an area of special architectural and historic interest because:

the Historic (and communally important) use is to be lost in its entirety (see Dog and Partridge appeals);

*“It would not normally be good practice for new work to dominate the original asset or its setting in either scale, material or as a result of its siting”* (‘Making Changes to Heritage Assets’, Historic England, 2016, paragraph 41). The holiday let block (projecting forward of the listed building’s façade) and garage/store block are prominent, incongruous and intrusive. There is an intrinsic and historic relationship between the Duke of York and the land immediately to the building’s west and north. Furthermore, this open area is a fitting apron to one of a small number of architecturally ‘polite’ buildings in Grindleton and ensures that the listed building rightfully retains its intentionally imposing (to capture passing trade) place in the streetscene and at the entrance to the village from the west (‘Focal Building’).

*“Doors and windows are frequently key to the significance of a building”* (Making Changes, paragraph 15). The Heritage Statement provides an example of this in discussion of new windows and changes made to plan form in the early C20 (photos at page 11). The east gable attic window and two-light front elevation windows are also indicative of the interesting historic development of this building. The proposed installation of two windows in the west gable, three rooflights in the roofslope (prominent from Main Street; significance from lack of previous intrusion – *“the unbroken line of a roof may be an important contributor to its significance”* paragraph 45) and large expanses of glazing in the proposed extension (*“the junction between new work and the existing fabric needs particular attention, both for its impact on the significance of the existing asset and the impact on the contribution of its setting”* paragraph 43) are harmful.

Making Changes paragraph 45 identifies *“The plan form of a building is frequently one of its most important characteristics and internal partitions, staircases (whether decorated or plain, principal or secondary) and other features are likely to form part of its significance. Indeed they may be its most significant feature. Proposals to remove or modify internal arrangements, including the insertion of new openings or extension underground, will be subject to the same considerations of impact on significance (particularly architectural interest) as for externally visible alterations”*. The list description identifies the building’s distinct and indicative (typically Georgian and later) double-pile form. It is proposed to remove the important (plan form and/or fabric) room divisions at ground and first floor in the historic west bay. This is harmful.

Making Changes paragraph 43 identifies *“Where new work or additions make elements with significance redundant, such as doors or decorative features, there is likely to be less impact on the asset’s aesthetic, historic or evidential value if they are left in place”*. The proposed removal of the early C20 staircase is harmful.

Making Changes paragraph 47 identifies “*The introduction of new floors into a building or removal of historic floors and ceilings may have a considerable impact on an asset’s significance*”. No information has been submitted to provide assurance that the proposed spiral staircase will not be harmful.

No details of attic conversion have been submitted. The Heritage Statement identifies the roof trusses to be amongst the most significant elements. Careful attention to issues such as insulation would be required.

It is proposed to significantly change the historic topography at the back of the site (lowering garden). This may have implications for historic boundary walls and the relationship of historic properties (significance?). The application form (Q10) is incorrect it asserting that there are no trees or hedges on land adjacent to the proposed development site that could influence the development or might be important as part of the local landscape character – car park perimeter trees and hedges help to soften its impact.

In the absence of interior site inspection, the proposals are of substantial harm to the special architectural and historic interest and setting of the listed building (see section 16 and 66 of the Act; NPPF paragraph 195) and less than substantial harm (but approaching substantial harm to the conservation area Focal Building) to the character and appearance of Grindleton Conservation Area (see section 72 of the Act and NPPF paragraph 196).

The Planning, Design and Access Statement identifies that the property has only recently been purchased (June 2018). This is very relevant to viability considerations, the weight to be attached to harm to the designated heritage assets (e.g. section 16, 66 and 72) in the ‘planning balance’ and considerations to NPPF paragraph 195, 196 and 194 (“*any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting, should require clear and convincing justification*”). Note is also made to the comments of the Parish Council that The Buck public house has been closed since November 2018.

Adrian Dowd BSc (Hons) MA (URP) MA (Arch Cons) RTPI IHBC  
Principal Planning Officer

---

**From:** Adrian Dowd  
**Sent:** 24 January 2019 16:20  
**To:** planning  
**Cc:** Adam Birkett  
**Subject:** FW: Consultation on planning application 3/2019/0049 and application for Listed Building Consent 32019/0050 Duke of York Inn, Grindleton Brow, Grindleton BB7 4QR

Adam,

This is a Grade II listed building prominently sited in Grindleton Conservation Area and within the setting of other listed buildings.

<https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list>

[https://www.ribblevalley.gov.uk/downloads/download/3332/grindleton\\_conservation\\_area](https://www.ribblevalley.gov.uk/downloads/download/3332/grindleton_conservation_area)

The Development Description suggests significant impact to the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building as well as its setting and the character and appearance of Grindleton Conservation Area. The recent appeals at the Dog and Partridge, Tosside would appear relevant – both Inspector’s found substantial harm to this listed building because of loss of historic use (little physical change to the building).

Special regard/ special attention will be required to preservation of the listed building and its setting and the character and appearance of the conservation area in the ‘planning balance’ (see section 16, 66 and 72 of the Act <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1990/9/contents>)

The following advice would appear most relevant:

<https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/making-changes-heritage-assets-advice-note-2/>

<https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/gpa3-setting-of-heritage-assets/>

<https://content.historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/conservation-principles-sustainable-management-historic-environment/conservationprinciplespoliciesguidanceapr08web.pdf/>

The article 'The Big Issue of Little Harm', Conservation Bulletin: Issue 73 Winter 2014, page 46 concerns the duties at section 16, 66 and 72 of the Act <https://www.historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/conservation-bulletin-73/>

Adrian Dowd BSc (Hons) MA (URP) MA (Arch Cons) RTPi IHBC  
Principal Planning Officer

---

**From:** Jane Tucker

**Sent:** 24 January 2019 15:48

**To:** Grindleton Parish Council; Adrian Dowd; Amenities Societies (casework@jcnas.org.uk); Archaeology (lancashire.archaeology@gmail.com); LCCHighways (lhscustomerservice@lancashire.gov.uk); LLFA (suds@lancashire.gov.uk); Environmental Health

**Subject:** Consultation on planning application 3/2019/0049 and application for Listed Building Consent 32019/0050 Duke of York Inn, Grindleton Brow, Grindleton BB7 4QR

Please will you let Adam Birkett have your comments on the above applications. (Please respond to [planning@ribblevalley.gov.uk](mailto:planning@ribblevalley.gov.uk) FAO Adam Birkett).

The application is for a change of use from a public house with living accommodation to one dwelling with business use. Demolition of existing single-storey extensions and construction of new single-storey extension. Construction of new, two-storey, three-car garage with business storage above. Construction of three new two-storey holiday lets.

Here are links to view the submitted documents on our website

[https://www.ribblevalley.gov.uk/site/scripts/planx\\_details.php?appNumber=3%2F2019%2F0049](https://www.ribblevalley.gov.uk/site/scripts/planx_details.php?appNumber=3%2F2019%2F0049)  
[https://www.ribblevalley.gov.uk/site/scripts/planx\\_details.php?appNumber=3%2F2019%2F0050](https://www.ribblevalley.gov.uk/site/scripts/planx_details.php?appNumber=3%2F2019%2F0050)

Planning Department, Ribble Valley Borough Council, Council Offices, Church Walk, Clitheroe BB7 2RA  
T: 01200 425111