

John Macholc
Head of Planning Services
Ribble Valley Borough Council
Council Offices
Church Walk
CLITHEROE
BB7 2RA

Phone: 01772 531343

Email: Archaeology@lancashire.gov.uk

Your ref: 3/2020/1100

Our ref: 3_2020_1100-LCC

Date: 29th January 2021

FAO A Dowd

Dear Mr Macholc,

Planning Application 3/2020/1100: Listed Building Consent for the retention of the works undertaken to the building to create a dwelling and the replacement of the 12 rooflights.

The Orangery, Woodfold Park, Mellor BB2 7QA

Thank you for your consultation on the above application. As you will be aware the original consents for the conversion of this building to a dwelling included a condition requiring a record of the structure to be made once it had been made safe but prior to construction. As far as we are aware this condition has not been complied with. There clearly are some records of the building prior to conversion, as demonstrated by the photographs in the Planning Statement and Heritage Statements, and an 'architect's reconstruction drawing' of the original structure submitted with this application (Reilly Developments Ltd drawing 5705-L02 "Existing Plans and Elevations", revised 09/2002). It is recommended that a package of all the available photographs of the structure prior to conversion, this and any other available 'pre-conversion' drawings are put together and submitted to the Historic Environment Record in lieu of the formal record required by the condition.

With regard to the present application it is notable that the IWA drawing 2442.E02 "Existing Elevations, Window Details and Roof Plan" (Jan 2019) shows the twelve rooflights as constructed and as illustrated in the Planning Statement and Heritage Statement photographs. In contrast the Reilly Developments Ltd drawings 5755-L07 "Proposed Plans and Section", (last revision undated but post-03/2003) and an untitled drawing which is presumably that referred to in the Planning Statement (section 1.2) as 5755-L13B2 "Current Upper Floor Plans and Section", show a significantly different pattern of rooflights. These drawings omit one rooflight on the east elevation and show, in place of three equally-spaced rooflights in the roof to the bowed centre bays on the south elevation, what appears to be a continuous row of twelve rooflights. Section A-A in the latter drawing also appears to be incorrect as it shows rooflights on both north and south elevations. In both drawings the rooflight in Bedroom 4 appears to be incorrectly marked as top-opening. These differences are not noted in either the Planning Statement or Heritage Statement, which imply that it is simply intended to replace the

existing rooflights with similar rooflights of a different brand. The sizes of the proposed replacement rooflights also do not appear to be given anywhere, although the approximately equal-sized Velux windows would appear to be GPL MK06 and GPL MK08. The applicants should be asked to clarify their intentions and provide either corrected and updated drawings or a description of the proposed changes and a justification of their impact.

Whilst the proposed changes in the rooflight pattern (if that IS what is intended) are largely a matter for your Conservation team, there are potentially impacts to any surviving historic structural roof elements, particularly in the bowed centre bays on the south. We would suggest that any loss of surviving original roof elements should be resisted without particularly strong justification and appropriate recording.

The changes to the bowed centre bays on the south would also introduce a much larger flat/angled section to this part of the roof than the three present rooflights. Given that this section of the original roof would have been formed from curved glass, this is a further distinct step away from the historic profile of the building, which is one of the few elements to survive here and which is considered to be an important element of the present conversion in the Heritage Statement. It may be possible to argue that the installation of more glass in the roof harkens back to the original glass roof, but if this is intended then these new elements should be appropriately curved, and full details provided.

The loss of the rooflight on the eastern elevation removes an element of planned regularity to that elevation, a particular feature of Georgian architecture, which is to be regretted and may bring an objection from the Georgian Society.

Yours sincerely

Peter Iles

Planning Officer (Archaeology)
Historic Environment Team