

RECEIVED BY  
CHIEF EXECUTIVE

13 JUL 2020

10<sup>th</sup> July 2020

Planning Department  
Ribble Valley Borough Council  
Council Offices  
Church Walk  
Clitheroe  
Lancashire  
BB7 2RA

FAO	L Eastwood
-----	------------

**SUNDERLAND PEACOCK**

**spa**  
**ARCHITECTS  
SURVEYORS**

For the attention of Ms Laura Eastwood,

**Letter of formal objection to application no. 3/2020/0424 for the demolition of an existing dwelling and erection of replacement two-storey dwelling at Parsons Croft, Slaidburn Road, Waddington, Lancashire, BB7 3JQ**

Dear Ms Eastwood,

We write on behalf of our client [REDACTED] of Glebe House, Slaidburn Road, Waddington, who wish to register their formal objection to the above-mentioned proposals. Following the refusal of the previous planning application for the site, the current proposals have again been scrutinised in detail by our client and ourselves and a number of matters and concerns have been identified which do not appear to have been addressed following the refusal of the previous planning application. The previous planning application was refused due to the unacceptable impact on heritage assets as well as the over dominant design of the proposed dwelling. The present application appears to have been submitted with only minor amendments and has failed to take into account the reasons for refusal and it is our belief that the current proposals no more merit approval than the previous application.

The concerns raised within this letter of objection again relate to issues previously identified which have not been adequately addressed and remain relevant to the amended proposals. As such we believe these issues would provide sufficient grounds for the refusal of the application and ask that the application is refused as a result of the following matters;

#### **DESIGN AND APPEARANCE OF THE PROPOSED REPLACEMENT DWELLING**

1. The village of Waddington is described as 'one of the prettiest villages in the Ribble Valley' within the Waddington Conservation Area Appraisal and its buildings are mainly 18<sup>th</sup> century in origin and are typically vernacular in their appearance. The majority of the village's buildings are modest and conservative, with simple detailing and their attractiveness is derived from the homogenous use of local stone for walling and roofing.
2. The Waddington Conservation Area Management Guidance provides information in relation to new development which stipulates various requirements which Ribble Valley Borough Council will expect to have been considered and incorporated into development proposals. The council will insist on good quality and well considered schemes which respond positively to their historic setting. The Conservation Area Management Guidance states that 'All

SUNDERLAND PEACOCK & ASSOCIATES LTD.  
HAZELMERE, PIMLICO ROAD, CLITHEROE,  
LANCASHIRE BB7 2AG  
T 01200 423178 F 01200 427328  
E info@sunderlandpeacock.com  
www.sunderlandpeacock.com

development, but particularly in the Waddington Conservation Area must respond to its immediate environment, its 'context' in terms of scale, density, form, materials and detailing.

3. A Design Statement and also a Planning Statement have been submitted as part of this application but remain some way from providing clear and convincing justification for the design of the dwelling but rather make a number of unclarified assertions and assumptions.

*Materials and Appearance:*

4. The material choices remain mostly appropriate and have not been altered from the previously refused application. This includes the proposal for zinc cladding to the south elevation, most notably the large gable end to this elevation as well as to the north and south elevation of the proposed circulation wing. As stated previously, this will be very visible from within the site of Glebe House and also in views across the Conservation Area from Beechthorpe Avenue and Carter Fold. The zinc cladding to the north elevation of the proposed circulation wing will be visible from Slaidburn Road. The submitted design statement attempts to justify the use of zinc cladding through the use of such cladding within a development at the Three Millstones Inn in West Bradford. In our opinion, this example holds no weight as justification for this material choice as the context of the application site is vastly different to that of the example of the Three Millstones Inn which is some 1.5km away and outside of the village of Waddington and a Conservation Area. As a result, a local precedent, within the Waddington Conservation Area, has not been provided.
5. A large expanse of flat roof has been retained to the east wing of the proposed dwelling which appears as incongruous and not in-keeping with the traditional forms of the Conservation Area whilst making the proposed dwelling appear complex and consisting of a number of separate component parts. This would be contrary to the Conservation Area Management Guidance. The submitted design statement states that *"There is no compelling design reasons to require that this accommodation be two storey or have a pitched roof"* and as a result disregards the advice given with the Conservation Area Management Guidance which states *"...the Council will expect new buildings which are designed in a traditional form within the conservation area to be detailed in a manner appropriate to the historic setting. Roofs should be pitched and covered in stone slates or natural slate."* The prominence of the flat roofing and that fact that it is not in keeping with the local vernacular was highlighted by the planning officer with their delegated report for the refusal of the previously submitted application.
6. A separated mono-pitched roof has been introduced to the proposed circulation wing which appears to be highly incongruous and incompatible with the character of the Conservation Area. The justification provided for the mono-pitched roof is that it will reduce the impact on Glebe House, which is a vague assertion at best and no consideration has been given as to how this will appear from Slaidburn Road, the sites of Ivy Cottage and Glebe House as well as from areas to the south of the application site and what visual impact it will have. In our opinion this aspect of the proposed design will have a negative impact on account of its incongruity within the streetscape along Slaidburn road, the inappropriate and unjustified use of zinc cladding and the fact that it appears as a further individual element of an already complex design. As a result, the building appears complex and at odds with the simple vernacular forms, appearance and character of the Waddington Conservation Area.
7. With regards to the proposed chimney style, both the Design Statement and Planning Statement argues that the proposed chimney is 'simple' in its appearance and that there is no consistency in the appearance of chimneys locally. We would strongly disagree with this

attempted justification. The prevailing chimney style locally appears to be that of gable stacks located at ridge level which are of masonry construction and none of which appear to be of the width / depth proposed within this application. The depth / width of the proposed chimney adds to the complicated design and its incongruous appearance. The prominence of the chimney and it being at odds with the design is something that was highlighted within the delegated report of the previously refused application.

*Urban Grain:*

8. The application documents still maintain the argument that the proposals will restore the historic relationship between the Glebe House and the site of Parsons Croft by replicating the 'L shaped' plan form of a pre-existing building since demolished. However, this is not clear and convincing justification for the demolition of the existing dwelling and its subsequent replacement with a much larger contemporary dwelling. This was highlighted by the planning officer with their delegated report for the refusal of the previously submitted application.
9. The prevalent building forms within the village are simple and consist mostly of gable forms. Whilst the proposals do include a linear gabled wing, it still retains a large expanse of flat which contributes to the complex and incongruous appearance. Even though the building has slightly been reduced in depth, the proposed building to plot ratio remains inappropriate given that the building occupies the majority of the site due to its large increase in size and plan form compared to the existing dwelling. This would result in a dominant and obtrusive structure which will negatively impact on the street scene of Slaidburn Road and the Conservation Area overall.

*Scale, Height and Massing:*

10. The Conservation Area Management Guidance requires that the scale of development proposals should be respectful of surrounding buildings. The height of any new development should also be respectful and consistent within building heights within the locality.
11. Although the length of the proposed dwelling has been reduced, largely achieved through the omission of the adjoining garage block, the dwelling remains substantially larger than the existing dwelling. The design statement states that "The proposed dwelling is similar in width and height to the existing.". Whilst the width may be similar and has been maintained since the previously refused application, the height is not and is still proposed at approximately 1m higher than the existing dwelling and is slightly higher than the ridge level of Glebe House, which maintains the over-bearing nature and dominance of the proposed dwelling within the streetscape. The submitted Design Statement suggest that the footprint of the house appears to be twice of that of the existing dwelling, however it does not appear to be considerably smaller than the surrounding dwellings as falsely asserted within the submitted Design Statement. This is apparent when viewing the proposed site plan as the proposed dwelling appears to be considerably larger than the neighbouring vicarage. The depth of the house is also considerably deeper than the existing dwelling with an overall revised depth of 20.45m which is only a minor reduction from the 23m as was previously proposed. The proposed building to plot ratio remains inappropriate given that the building still occupies the majority of the site due to its large size and plan form with only a small reduction in size on what was originally proposed. This will still result in a dominant and overbearing elevation facing west towards Glebe House which has only been moved away from the boundary wall by a mere 1m and would still cause harm to the setting of the grade II listed building.

12. The increased size of the proposed dwelling above the size of the existing will cause it to compete with the size of the nearby Glebe House as opposed to being subservient so as not to compete and detract from the very visible appearance and hierarchical status of Glebe House. As a result, this will be harmful to the setting of the listed building and the character and appearance of the Conservation Area through its dominant and over-bearing size.

#### **IMPACT ON DESIGNATED HERITAGE ASSETS**

13. The application site is located within the Waddington Conservation Area and neighbours the sites of two grade II Listed buildings, namely Glebe House and Ivy Cottage (formerly Readers House). The designation of these buildings and the Conservation Area itself suggests the level of their importance and significance in a national context and both of the buildings are described as 'high status houses' within the Waddington Conservation Area Appraisal (page 13). Whilst the proposals will not have a physical impact on these buildings, it is their settings that will be greatly affected by the development proposals as well as the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
14. Sections 16(2), 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that in deciding whether to grant planning permission for development which affects the setting of a listed building or the character and appearance of a Conservation Area, special regard and attention should be given to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses, as well as the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area . In addition, the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that, 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.
15. The proposed dwelling would cause significant harm to the setting of Glebe House and Ivy Cottage as well as harm the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. This would be caused by the reasons that were stated in our previous objection and consist of;
- The inappropriate, building to plot ratio.
  - The size and scale of the dwelling is not subservient to surrounding dwellings but dominant and overbearing and would compete with the status of Glebe House detracting from the appearance and character of Glebe House and Ivy Cottage whilst causing harm to their settings. The setting of these listed buildings contributes to their significance and as previously mentioned their settings will be substantially altered though the introduction of the proposed dwelling for reasons already described therefore harming significance.
  - The appearance of the proposed dwelling as previously described is inherently contemporary and due to its mixture of forms and roof shapes would appear complex and incongruous in comparison to the simple and modest vernacular buildings within the Conservation Area.
  - The impact by the proposed dwelling on views across the Conservation Area towards Glebe House from Beechthorpe Avenue and its dwellings, and also from Carter Fold.
  - The loss of views across the Conservation Area from Glebe House towards St Helens Church, which is an important historical link as Glebe House was once the vicarage for the church. The view of glebe house from Slaidburn road as well as from the public footpath to the south will also be impacted upon. The submitted Heritage Statement acknowledges that views of Glebe House will be 'altered' but states that the significance of the building will not be affected. We would disagree with this as the setting of Glebe House contributes to its significance and as previously mentioned the setting of Glebe House will be substantially altered though the introduction of the proposed dwelling for reasons already described

therefore harming significance. The impact on views and how people experience the building from outside the site will be affected.

16. As a result of the above-mentioned impacts, the proposals would be contrary to Key Statement EN5, Policy DME4 of the RVBC Adopted Core Strategy and the policies of the NPPF.
17. The submitted Heritage Statement does not appear to comply with paragraph 189 of the NPPF as it lacks detail with regards to the assessment of significance. The main focus appears to be Parsons Croft which is not a heritage asset and the statement makes it clear that it does not possess heritage significance. The statement does now include mentions for the affected listed buildings within the assessment, however this remains vague and generalised. The assessment of significance still appears to ignore the significance of the Conservation Area in its entirety. The statement again makes a series of brief and vague assertions as to the impact of the development proposals which have been carefully worded to directly avoid saying that harm would be caused. The submitted Heritage Statement also claims that the area will benefit from a number of enhancements provided by the development proposals but these are again a series of largely unjustified assertions used in an attempt to justify the proposals. Therefore, the submitted Heritage Statement should be considered to be incomplete as it still does not provide the required level of information in order to understand the significance of the affected heritage assets, the potential impacts of the development proposals and to allow for a decision to be made on the application. Therefore, it is not in compliance with national planning policy.
18. The submitted heritage statement suggests that the level of harm caused by the proposals is 'less than substantial' and as such Paragraph 196 of the NPPF requires this to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposals. The submitted heritage statement suggests that the demolition of the existing dwelling would be a public benefit on account of the current appearance of the existing dwelling which the application considers to have a negative impact. The proposed dwelling is considered to have a positive enhancement but we would disagree with this for reasons already described. The Waddington Conservation Appraisal and Management Guidance documents do not specifically identify Parsons Croft as being detrimental to or an apparent threat to the character and appearance of the Waddington Conservation Area. However, the public benefits of the scheme are not clearly and convincingly demonstrated and no clear and convincing justification is provided that demonstrates the public benefits of the proposals will outweigh the level of harm caused to the setting of the listed buildings and the character and appearance of the Waddington Conservation Area.
19. As a one for one replacement, the development proposals would not result in a net gain of housing within the village and does not provide a public benefit in respect of housing provision. The application site will remain in private use and will not provide significant public benefits in regard to the use of the site. The demolition of the existing building would result in only a minor public benefit and enhancement. Nonetheless this small benefit would not outweigh the level of harm caused by the development proposals to the setting of Glebe House and Ivy Cottage as well as the character and appearance of the Conservation Area due to reasons already highlighted previously within this letter of objection with regards to the design of the proposed dwelling. There appears to be no significant and demonstrable public benefits associated with the development proposals and therefore the harm caused cannot be outweighed.

## **CONCLUSION**

20. On behalf of [REDACTED] we conclude that, based on the above points and detailed scrutiny of this new application, the revised development proposals do not preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area or the settings of the Grade II listed Glebe House and Ivy Cottage, but would cause harm to these important and significant designated heritage assets.
21. The proposals as amended do not accord with Key Statements EN5 and EN2 and Policies DMG1, DMG2 and DME4 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy or the policies of the National Planning Policy Framework and the Waddington Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Guidance. These require a high standard of design that reflects and respects local context and the distinctiveness of local character, preserves or enhances local character and respects the appearance, scale, massing, height and pattern of surrounding buildings, which we have demonstrated the development proposals do not. The proposals do not provide a significant public benefit that would outweigh the level of harm caused and would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and the settings of Glebe House and Ivy Cottage. Therefore, we ask that the issues we have identified are carefully considered and that the application be refused.

Yours Sincerely




Mr Matthew Fish *B.Sc (Hons) M.Sc (BldgCons) MCIAT IHBC*

Chartered Architectural Technologist and IHBC accredited Historic Buildings Advisor

For and on behalf of Sunderland Peacock and Associates Ltd

Written on behalf of

  
Glebe House  
Slaidburn Road  
Waddington  
Lancashire  
BB7 3JQ

**From:** webmaster@ribblevalley.gov.uk  
**Sent:** 13 July 2020 13:47  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Form completion: Planning Application Comments Form

**FORM DETAILS**

*Web Ref No:* 21045  
*Form:* Planning Application Comments Form  
*Completed:* 13/07/2020 13:46:32  
*Status:* Pending

-----  
**USER DETAILS**

*Site user email:* Unregistered user

-----  
**USER INPUTS**

*title:* [REDACTED]  
*LastName:* [REDACTED]  
*firstName:* [REDACTED]  
*numberName:* 77  
*postAddress:* 77Oulderhill Drive Rochdale Lancashire  
*postCode:* O1151b  
*refNo:* 3/2020/0424  
*addDev:* Parsonâ€™s Croft, Slaidburn Road, Waddington. BB73JG  
*comments:* I support Mr and Mrs Beswickâ€™s application to transform a property in need of renovation. They have chosen a design produced by professional architects and will spend a lot of money in doing so. This benefits the economy (build, build, build) and the local area. To those who object to the style it is not unique having been approved elsewhere. I also recall that there were similar objections to what turned out to be Parisâ€™s no.1 Tourist attraction-the Eiffel Tower. Renovating a property which is in a poor condition can only be welcomed in these difficult times.

## Nicola Gunn

---

**From:** webmaster@ribblevalley.gov.uk  
**Sent:** 15 July 2020 11:24  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Form completion: Planning Application Comments Form

### FORM DETAILS

*Web Ref No:* 21056  
*Form:* Planning Application Comments Form  
*Completed:* 15/07/2020 11:24:12  
*Status:* Pending

### USER DETAILS

*Site user email:* Unregistered user

### USER INPUTS

*title:* [REDACTED]  
*LastName:* [REDACTED]  
*firstName:* [REDACTED]  
*numberName:* 10  
*postAddress:* Stackley Road Great Glen Leicester  
*postCode:* LE8 9FZ  
*refNo:* 3/2020/0424  
*addDev:* Parsons Croft Slaidburn Road Waddington Clitheroe BB7 3JQ  
*comments:* Very much in favour of this application. A vast improvement compared to the existing dwelling.  
Very much in keeping with the luck of the village. Considering the levels of flooding this year, the design appears essential.

LE

**Sharon Craig**

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 10 July 2020 14:57  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Objection to application NC2/3/2020/0424

Dear Sir/Madam,

Please record this as an objection to planning application 3/2020/0424 at Parsons Croft in Waddington.

This objection is to the modified proposal following the 2019 proposal. The current proposal appears to be very little altered. It simply addresses the review required because the Diocese of Blackburn withdrew from the required sale of land that was necessary in order to facilitate the original scheme. The Diocese withdrew because they recognised the detrimental effect on the current Vicarage and the lack of merit in the proposal on a number of counts.

The present application remains detrimental to the Vicarage. It will double the mass of the building and take light from the garden as well as overlooking the property. This increase at the rear will also block the view to the original Vicarage. Parsons Croft is part of the historic complex of buildings in this part of the village. That context will be obliterated if Parsons Croft is demolished.

Currently, the attractive and historic 18th century gable end of Parsons Croft, including a blocked door and window which carry a historic context, form the boundary of the Vicarage property. In a Conservation area it seems inconceivable that such destruction and out of place and scale replacement should be allowed.

There would be no sense of the historic coach house in a property which even includes the use of zinc cladding which I can only find examples of in commercial buildings. Surely in a conservation area the materials should be in keeping.

The extension of the footprint at the front of the building would make construction vehicle use of Slaidburn Road a very dangerous prospect and would increase the danger of access in the finished project.

The proposed plan would overwhelm the neighbouring property, take away light, dominate in a way that is inappropriate to a conservation area and destroy for ever part of the history of this village. I feel very strongly that any plan should retain the historic 18thc gable in order to tell the story of this site.

This application is simply inappropriate and I hope that your professional judgement will consider this to be the case.

[REDACTED]  
The Vicarage  
Slaidburn Road  
Waddington  
BB7 3JQ

Bonny Bird Burn  
Waddington  
BB7 3HY

Friday 10<sup>th</sup> July

Dear Sir / Madam,

Re: application No: 3/2020/0424  
Parsons Croft, Skidburn Road, Waddington

Having looked at the revised plans for the above property I see very little change - comments from the council have been ignored with a view to its size or inappropriate design as well as its position in a heritage area.

With this in mind I'd like to put in another objection.

Yours Sincerely,

A large, dark, rectangular redacted area, likely covering a signature or name.

**Nicola Gunn**

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 12 July 2020 19:06  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Application 3/2020/0424 Parsons Croft, Slaidburn Rd, Waddington, Clitheroe...

Application 3/2020/0424 Parsons Croft, Slaidburn Rd, Waddington, Clitheroe, BB73JQ

To the Head of Planning, Ribble Valley.

We write to offer full support to the above planning application. We have reviewed the plans for Parsons Croft and can see that Mr and Mrs Beswick have made changes to their original plans to accommodate the various concerns of local residents.

The plans in our mind, are sympathetic to the local surroundings and pleasing to the eye, with a modern twist.

Our thoughts are, the current building is lacking pleasing contours and has a blocky high aspect frontage which is featureless. We also feel its demise would have little impact or consequence to the surrounding area.

The new build would offer style and future representation.

Regards  
[REDACTED]

**From:** webmaster@ribblevalley.gov.uk  
**Sent:** 12 July 2020 13:32  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Form completion: Planning Application Comments Form

**FORM DETAILS**

*Web Ref No:* 21034  
*Form:* Planning Application Comments Form  
*Completed:* 12/07/2020 13:32:23  
*Status:* Pending

-----

**USER DETAILS**

*Site user email:* Unregistered user

-----

**USER INPUTS**

*title:* [REDACTED]  
*LastName:* [REDACTED]  
*firstName:* [REDACTED]  
*numberName:* 4  
*postAddress:* 4 Edward Drive Clitheroe  
*postCode:* BB7 1FF  
*refNo:* 3/2020/0424  
*addDev:* Parsons Croft Slaidburn Road Waddington BB7 3JQ

*comments:* I am putting some time aside to convey my views and opinions with regard to this planning application as I feel very strongly in support of the proposals. As a resident of the Ribble Valley, with a keen interest in building proposals and new developments I would like to say that I believe the proposed replacement property will be an asset to the village of Waddington. The property as it stands is tired, does nothing for the village and appears to be well beyond cosmetic renovations. The proposed new build, may be more contemporary, but would be no way out of place in the village. Times change, places change and we should not prevent people who care about the local area so much that they are prepared to spend a considerable amount of their own money and time to add significant value to Waddington. I trust the Council will give due consideration to this application and I truly hope that permissions to proceed will be granted.

-----

Hillocks Farm  
Whalley Old Road  
Billington  
Clitheroe  
BB7 9JE

Ribble Valley Borough Council  
Planning Department  
Council Offices  
Church Walk  
Clitheroe  
Lancashire  
BB7 2RA

12<sup>th</sup> July 2020

Dear Sir

**Planning Application 3/2020/0424**  
**Parsons Croft, Slaldburn Road, Waddington, BB7 3JQ**

I wish to comment on and object to the above planning application on the following grounds:

- (1) The design is not in keeping with the character of the area
- (2) It will impact upon Glebe House including loss of light and privacy

Having resided at Glebe House previously and also known Parsons Croft closely through my mother converting the original coach-house/stables there in 1983/84, I do not believe the current property should be demolished and a new building erected in a different configuration on the property.

Parsons Croft was re-built on the existing footprint of the original coach-house to maintain the integrity and character of this part of the village, formerly the original vicarage, Glebe House. To demolish Parsons Croft and erect a new building at right angles to it overlooking Glebe House completely changes the character of this part of the village and its original heritage. In addition, the proposed new structure will impact on the light and privacy of Glebe House as since 1953 when my parents bought Glebe House, including the coach-House, there has been no other building on the property of Parsons Croft.

I trust these comments will be considered in reviewing this planning application.

Yours faithfully

[Redacted Signature]

[Redacted Address]

J

## Nicola Gunn

---

**From:** webmaster@ribblevalley.gov.uk  
**Sent:** 12 July 2020 13:50  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Form completion: Planning Application Comments Form

### FORM DETAILS

*Web Ref No:* 21035  
*Form:* Planning Application Comments Form  
*Completed:* 12/07/2020 13:50:16  
*Status:* Pending

-----

### USER DETAILS

*Site user email:* Unregistered user

-----

### USER INPUTS

*title:* [REDACTED]  
*LastName:* [REDACTED]  
*firstName:* [REDACTED]  
*numberName:* 3  
*postAddress:* 3 Edale Avenue Haslingden  
*postCode:* BB4 6QL  
*refNo:* 3/2020/0424  
*addDev:* Parsons Croft Slaidburn Road Waddington BB7 3JQ

*comments:* I did attempt to submit this earlier, but I am not sure it went through, so apologies if you have two submissions from me. I have considered the planning application and proposed re-development property. Although I am not a resident of the Ribble Valley I have family and friends in and around the area and pay frequent visits to Waddington, hence my knowledge of this proposal. I would like to offer my unreserved support of this application. The current property is in no way aesthetically pleasing and does little to enhance Waddington's charm. I do not wish to offend anyone, but as it stands it is a blot on the landscape and ugly. The proposed replacement property would do so much to enhance the area, without any detriment to the character of the Village. The current owners should be commended for wishing to invest so much into the Village, I wish them luck with their application.

-----