

# Council for British Archaeology

*A National Amenity Society*

Mr Adam Birkett  
Planning Case Officer  
Ribble Valley Borough Council  
By email: [planning@ribblevalley.gov.uk](mailto:planning@ribblevalley.gov.uk)

8<sup>th</sup> February 2019

Dear Mr Birkett

**Duke of York Inn, Grindleton Brow, Grindleton, Clitheroe, Lancashire, BB7 4QR. Application No. 3/2019/0050**

Thank you for consulting the Council for British Archaeology (CBA) on the above case. Based on the information supplied with this application, we offer the following observations and advice to assist your authority in determining the application.

## Summary

The CBA has no objection to the adaptive reuse of the Duke of York Inn for residential and business purposes and defers to the Local Planning Authority's conservation advisors on matters of detail and implementation. However, the CBA **objects strongly** to the additional proposals for the infill development of three holiday cottages which we find to be harmful to the character and appearance of the Grindleton Conservation Area and the setting of the Listed Grade II Duke of York Inn. We consider that the proposals fail to meet the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework, specifically, section 16.

## Significance

The Duke of York Inn, one of three designated heritage assets in Grindleton, is a Listed Grade II public house of early 19<sup>th</sup> century origins with attached later stables evidencing its status as a coaching inn. The Heritage Statement records that little remains of the original internal fixtures, fittings and other features and the building has clearly undergone several unsympathetic extensions and infills to the rear including the 1960s side extension proposed for demolition. The property lies within the Grindleton Conservation Area and makes a substantial contribution to its character and appearance, especially as it fronts onto a prominent gateway location at the junction of Brow Top, Sawley Road and Main Street and is identified in the Conservation Area Appraisal as a Focal Building.

## Comments

We note that the Heritage Statement lacks any consideration of the proposals for the infill development of three holiday cottages and therefore fails to consider the impact of this substantial

element of the application on the significance of the Listed Grade II Duke of York Inn and the character and appearance of the Grindleton Conservation Area. The Heritage Statement clearly fails to meet the requirements of the NPPF, Section 16. The NPPF is clear regarding the requirements for applicant's, *"In determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary..."* (paragraph 189).

Having examined the plans, elevations and single visualisation for the proposed new builds and associated access, landscaping and garaging, we conclude that the proposed cottages and associated works will result in a substantial change to the setting of both the Listed Grade II Duke of York Inn and the Grindleton Conservation Area. The setting of the Inn will be heavily compromised by the new frontage building and the redesigned site access. The status of the Inn as a Focal Building at a gateway location to the conservation area will be challenged to the extent that from Brow Hill at least the Inn will no longer 'stand out'. We consider this to be *"harm"* as defined in the NPPF. Whether this impact on the setting of both designated heritage assets would amount to *"substantial harm"* or *"less than substantial harm"* may not be the issue.

NPPF paragraph 193 states, *"When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance."* and paragraph 194 considers that, *"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..."*.

The CBA notes from the applicant's Listed Building Statement document that there has been pre-application advice from the Local Planning Authority regarding several key issues including the acceptability of the proposed holiday cottages. The CBA also notes that the pre-application advice was heavily caveated as follows, *"...The Pre-Application Advice Officer made it clear that the advice was given without direct input from Conservation colleagues and that a separate detailed heritage response would be provided after a site visit from the Conservation Officer..."* (paragraph 6.6). The CBA considers this caveat to be correct in view of the site's heritage interest. Both the setting of the Grade II Listed Building and Conservation Area need to be considered in determining the impact of the application.

The NPPF is clear that, *"Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal"*

# Council for British Archaeology

*on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal."*

The absence of an appropriate assessment of significance notwithstanding, the CBA considers the design, scale and massing of the proposed new builds to be out of character. The main new build against Brow Hill is set forward from the Duke of York Inn and is far too large to successfully respect the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and the setting of the Listed Grade II Duke of York Inn. The proposed gable, for instance, introduces a design element that is not reflected in any other buildings within the immediate area.

The Design Statement accompanying the application purports that, *"The introduction of the new cottages seek to enhance the urban grain of the village by infilling the uncharacteristic gap in the street frontage caused by the car park. It seeks to provide an infill development and continue the ad-hoc architectural features of the existing lines progression through the village. The cottages sit on a lower level to the existing and so are not only subservient in their architectural language but are subservient in scale and material whilst responding to the vernacular architectural characteristics of the village."*

The CBA takes a different view. The car park does not constitute an uncharacteristic gap, it has historic significance. The village does not have urban grain, it has rural 'village' grain. A less obtrusive design set much further back with longer front gardens might be more successful.

## Recommendation

The CBA **strongly objects** to this application and recommends that it is **refused** because it harms the setting of the Listed Grade II Duke of York Inn and the character and appearance of the Grindleton Conservation Area as well as the status of the Inn as a "Focal Building" at the southern gateway into the village. Although we have no substantive objections to the adaptive reuse of the Duke of York Inn for residential and business purposes, we recommend that the Local Planning Authority defers to its conservation advisors on matters of detail and implementation for this aspect of the proposal. Any future application or revision of the current application should ensure that there is a more appropriate assessment of significance and impact and that new proposals are clearly informed by it as required by the NPPF. We also consider that a revised heritage statement should also examine the archaeological potential of the site.

I trust these comments are useful to you; please keep the CBA informed of any developments with this case.



Bob Sydes MCifA  
Listed Buildings Caseworker for England

# Council for British Archaeology

The Council for British Archaeology (CBA) is the national amenity society concerned with protection of the archaeological interest in heritage assets. Local planning authorities have a duty to notify the CBA of applications for listed building consent involving partial or total demolition, under the procedures set out in ODPM Circular 09/2005 and in Welsh Office Circulars 61/96 & 1/98.

## **Council for British Archaeology**

Beatrice de Cardi House, 66 Bootham  
York YO30 7BZ  
Tel: 01904 671417

## **Archaeology for all**

Email: [info@archaeologyUK.org](mailto:info@archaeologyUK.org)  
[www.archaeologyUK.org](http://www.archaeologyUK.org)

Registered charity in England and Wales (287815)  
and a charity registered in Scotland (SC041971).  
Company Limited by Guarantee (1760254)

Patron: HRH The Prince of Wales