



RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL

please ask for:

direct line: Adam Birkett
01200 414571
e-mail: adam.birkett@ribblevalley.gov.uk
my ref: RV/2020/ENQ/00097
date: 06/01/2021

Council Offices
Church Walk
CLITHEROE
Lancashire BB7 2RA

Switchboard: 01200 425111
Fax: 01200 414487
DX: Clitheroe 15157
www.ribblevalley.gov.uk

REQUEST FOR PRE-APPLICATION ADVICE RELATING TO PROPOSED CHANGE OF USE FROM PUBLIC HOUSE WITH LIVING ACCOMMODATION TO PUBLIC HOUSE WITH LETTING BEDROOMS, CONSTRUCTION OF FOUR HOLIDAY APARTMENTS AND MANAGERS ACCOMMODATION. DEMOLITION AND REPLACEMENT OF SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION TO CREATE CAFE AREA AND CREATION OF PARKING AREA AT DUKE OF YORK INN, BROW TOP, GRINDLETON.

I write in response to your pre-application enquiry regarding the proposed change of use from a public house with living accommodation to a public house with letting bedrooms, construction of four holiday apartments and managers accommodation including demolition and replacement of a single storey extension to create a cafe area and creation of a parking area at the Duke of York Inn.

Relevant Core Strategy Policies:

Key Statement DS1 – Development Strategy
Key Statement DS2 – Sustainable Development
Key Statement EN2 – Landscape
Key Statement EN4 – Biodiversity and Geodiversity
Key Statement EN5 – Heritage Assets
Key Statement H1 – Housing Provision
Key Statement EC1 – Business and Employment Development
Key Statement EC3 – Visitor Economy

Policy DMG1 – General Considerations
Policy DMG2 – Strategic Considerations
Policy DMG3 – Transport and Mobility
Policy DME3 – Site and Species Protection & Conservation
Policy DME4 – Protecting Heritage Assets
Policy DMH3 – Dwellings in the Open Countryside and AONB
Policy DMB1 – Supporting Business Growth and the Local Economy
Policy DMB3 – Recreation and Tourism Development

National Planning Policy Framework

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

Principle of Development:

New build holiday units and conversion of floors to letting accommodation:

The principle of introducing new tourism accommodation in this location has been previously deemed acceptable. Key Statement EC3 relates specifically to the visitor economy stating that proposals that contribute to and strengthen the visitor economy of Ribble Valley will be encouraged. This includes the creation of new accommodation and tourist facilities. Policy DMB1 supports business growth in principle and Policy DMB3 further encourages such facilities where they are suitably located.

The proposed development of up to 6 letting bedrooms and 4 one-bed holiday cottages at the site would contribute to the tourism economy and would provide an additional source of income for the owners of the Duke of York. As such, the proposed letting rooms and holiday cottages would accord with the general intentions of Key Statement EC3. It is considered that the proposed incorporation of a café use ancillary to the public house would also be generally supported.

The application site is located in the Open Countryside. Core Strategy Policy DMG2 requires development within tier 2 villages or outside of defined settlement areas to meet at least one of six considerations one of which is *"4) The development is for small scale tourism or recreational developments appropriate to a rural area"*. It is considered that the proposals would constitute a small-scale tourism development.

Policy DMB3 relates specifically to recreation and tourism development. Tourism and visitor attractions are generally supported subject to the criteria in Policy DMB3 being met including the requirement that they are located within a defined village, settlement or adjacent to existing groups of buildings.

The proposed holiday cottages would be located within a tier 2 village and would be physically well-related to existing built development and therefore, in terms of its location, it would accord with the conditions of Policy DMB3. There is a requirement to further consider the design and visual appearance, impact on highway safety, capacity of the site to accommodate appropriate parking, servicing areas and landscaping and the impact on nature conservation. Further, given the status of the Duke of York Inn as a Listed Building in the Grindleton Conservation Area, the impact of the proposals on the significance of heritage assets must be considered.

Managers accommodation:

The principle of creating a new, two storey unit within the car park of the public house was previously considered in pre-application response ref RV/2019/ENQ/00067. The managers accommodation is currently provided on the first and second floors of the Duke of York Inn and thus the public house and managers accommodation form parts of a single planning unit with the managers accommodation being ancillary to the operation of the public house. As such, at present the managers accommodation at the site does not constitute a C3 dwellinghouse but is considered ancillary to the primary use of the building as a public house, a use that is classified as 'sui generis' since 1 September 2020.

As presented the proposal to relocate the manager's accommodation to a new, three-bed detached dwelling within the car park of the public house would not be supported by the relevant housing policies of the Core Strategy, including Key Statement DS1 and policies DMG2

and DMH3, given that it would result in a new residential planning unit within a less sustainable Tier 2 village. Policy DMG2 does state that housing that meets an identified need and is secured as such can be supported in Tier 2 villages however this is restricted to 'local housing need' as evidenced in the Housing Needs Survey, Housing Waiting List and Strategic Housing Market Assessment. Having regard to the above, it would be advised that the managers accommodation should retain its current ancillary relationship with the primary business and the erection of the new dwelling to support this use will not be supported.

Alterations to the Public House (PH):

The main consideration in respect of the proposed extension to the public house is the design and visual appearance considerations along with the impact on the significance of the listed building and Grindleton Conservation Area as discussed below.

Design, Layout and Heritage Impacts:

Section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that 'when considering applications for listed building consent, special regard shall be had to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses'.

The proposal includes the replacement of an existing single storey extension on the south-west gable elevation of the listed PH. The proposed extension incorporates a heavily glazed gable elevation with chimney stack and glazed doors on the front elevation, opening to an outdoor seating area. The proposed extension would be larger than the existing. Whilst the existing extension may be considered detrimental to the historic significance of the PH and its removal would be a benefit, it is important to ensure that any new built form takes a more sympathetic approach.

The proposed extension would be highly visible in the public realm and from Grindleton Conservation Area. The proposed design adopts a mixed approach by incorporating traditional and contemporary design elements such that it is not thought to sit well with the main building. In my view any extension should either adopt an approach of replicating the design of the main building, including materials and solid-to-void ratios, or a modern design approach such that it can obviously be seen as a new addition, with a clear line between the old and new. The Conservation Officer notes that the proposed new build extension is wider than the earlier two-storey extension and almost flush with the front elevation and it is therefore advised that any proposed single storey extension should be clearly set back from the front elevation of the main building and that its width be reflective of the existing two storey extension. Concerns are also raised with regard to the inclusion of roof lights on the front and rear roof slopes of the proposed extension.

Regarding the proposed internal alterations to the public house, these would appear in the main to retain the traditional plan form of the listed building. The public house bar, seating and dining areas at ground floor would be retained and the proposed extension would provide an extended café/dining area. However, the Conservation Officer retains his concerns relating to alterations to the building's interior as expressed during previous planning applications, and therefore any proposed alterations to the interior layout or features of the building should be fully considered and assessed within the Heritage Statement.

The change of use of the upper floors to letting rooms would require some alterations to room configuration and minor revisions to the rear elevation of the building including enlargement of an existing window to door and provision of a fire escape but the main concern arising would be

the loss of the managers accommodation and its 'replacement' elsewhere within the site as a three-bed detached dwelling.

The proposals include significant additions of built form being introduced to the existing car park of the PH. As shown on the proposed site plan, the proposed 4no. holiday apartments and managers accommodation would be contained within a terraced row, with the proposed building appearing to be constructed in stone and slate. The Conservation Officer identifies harm to the longstanding and little-changed open historic curtilage which in extent and form (including raised garden area) befits and compliments the historic inn and provides the focus (particularly on the approach from Brow Top) for the 'Focal Building'.

The proposed holiday apartments and managers dwelling have been orientated such that the gable end would face the road, Grindleton Brow, and the building would be sited well back into the plot. The Conservation Officer comments however that the stand-alone new build is a dominant structure (footprint little different to the historic building) and questions the narrative behind the design approach given the new build (NE elevation) appears as a converted laithe house (house with attached barn in single range). As a result, the Conservation Officer suggests that the interest/setting of the adjoining and authentic Towneley House (Grade II listed; house with attached barn in single range) is impacted.

In terms of the elevational design of the proposed holiday apartments and managers dwelling, there are a number of window openings on the front (north east) elevation that could be removed or reduced (e.g. Wc/en-suite windows to be reduced in proportion and first floor kitchen served by two windows). The rear elevation is in my view poorly designed and would not be acceptable in the Conservation Area. Further consideration should be given to the arrangement of openings on this elevation to provide some interest rather than the uniform and standardised approach presented and it is unlikely that the incorporation of glass balustrades at first floor would be deemed appropriate.

In assessing the development as a whole, notwithstanding the concerns raised by the Conservation Officer above, I consider that the site is unable to accommodate the development proposed, in particular the requisite car parking and service areas. At present, the attempt to provide sufficient parking to serve the development results in a scheme layout that appears somewhat cramped and is likely to be harmful to the setting of the listed building. It is envisaged that parking requirements will dictate that one or more elements of the development proposals will have to be removed so that adequate parking to serve the development can be provided.

If, upon submission of a formal planning application, it was deemed that a proposed development would result in 'less than substantial harm' to the significance of designated heritage assets, this harm must be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing the assets optimal viable use. It is important that any use is viable, not just for the owner, but also for the future conservation of the asset. If there is only one viable use, that use is the optimum viable use. If there is a range of alternative economically viable uses, the optimum viable use is the one likely to cause the least harm to the significance of the asset. Therefore, the optimum viable use may not necessarily be the most economically viable one.

In order to demonstrate that a proposed development is the optimal viable use there would be a requirement to demonstrate that the original use is no longer viable, detail the alternative options considered (and explain why these were either not economically viable or considered to

cause more harm to the significance of the asset) and set out why the proposed development is considered to be the optimal viable use.

Notwithstanding the above comments, which represent officer opinion only, any planning application should be supported by a comprehensive and detailed Heritage Statement which should set out the significance of the affected assets and assess the impact of the proposal on that significance.

Other matters:

There remains a number of issues that require further consideration. The proposals would require a change in levels to the rear of the PH. Any formal application should convey level changes proposed and any changes to existing boundary structures which are likely to be included as part of the listing. It would appear unlikely based on the information provided that the proposals would have an undue adverse impact of the amenity of nearby residents, 1-4 Kayley Terrace, but this would only be able to be determined once proposed land levels are submitted.

Please be advised that Lancashire County Council provide a separate, chargeable pre-application service for highway related matters. You should contact the County Council directly to discuss any such issues - <https://www.lancashire.gov.uk/business/business-services/pre-planning-application-advice-service/pre-planning-application-highways-advice-service>.

Considering the proposals, there is likely to be a considerable under provision of off-street parking for the development proposals. The proposed manager's dwelling, holiday apartments and letting rooms would require a total of 12 parking spaces, leaving only 3 spaces to serve the PH. Consideration should also be given to the requirement for refuse and delivery vehicles to access and manoeuvre around the site.

There are existing trees immediately adjacent to the site boundaries and therefore it is recommended that a formal application for permission is supported by an Arboricultural Impact Assessment (including Tree Constraints Plan).

Conclusion

Having regard to the above, the provision of holiday accommodation in the form of letting bedrooms and holiday apartments in this location would generally comply with the relevant policies in the Core Strategy, Key Statement EC3 and policies DMB1 and DMB3. However, based on the information as submitted there are concerns relating to the impact of the proposed holiday apartments and manager's dwelling on the setting of the Duke of York (loss of open historic curtilage), nearby listed buildings and Grindleton Conservation Area. There are also concerns regarding the design and elevational language of the proposed new building and the ability of the site to accommodate the necessary car parking, service areas and landscaped areas as required by Policy DMB3, criterion 5.

The provision of detached managers accommodation, as submitted, would be contrary to Key Statement DS1 and policies DMG2 and DMH3 of the Core Strategy which restrict new residential development within Tier 2 villages such as Grindleton. It is not considered that the provision of a detached dwelling for the manager of the public house would meet any of the exemptions set out by policies DMG2 and DMH3 and the points listed at 4.7 of the Supporting Statement are not sufficient to outweigh this conflict with policy. As stated above, the existing managers accommodation is considered ancillary to the public house use at the site and

therefore the proposed new managers accommodation could not be supported on the basis that it is a 'replacement' dwelling or would not result in a net increase in dwellings at the site.

Regarding the proposed single storey extension to the PH, it is considered that the design of the extension as submitted would result in some harm to the significance of the heritage asset for the reasons set out in the relevant section above and in assessing the development as a whole, the site would be particularly cramped due to the requirement to provide sufficient on-site parking. This may also give rise to harm to listed building setting.

The above observations have been provided on the basis on the level of information submitted and the comments contained within this response represent officer opinion only, at the time of writing, without prejudice to the final determination of any application received.

Yours sincerely

Adam Birkett (Principal Planning Officer)