



**RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL**

<b>Officer:</b>	Lee Greenwood	<b>Direct Tel:</b>	01200 414493	<b>Council Offices</b> <b>Church Walk</b> <b>Clitheroe</b> <b>Lancashire BB7 2RA</b>	
<b>Email:</b>	<a href="mailto:lee.greenwood@ribblevalley.gov.uk">lee.greenwood@ribblevalley.gov.uk</a>				
<b>Our Ref:</b>	RV/2019/ENQ/00067				
<b>Site Location:</b>	Duke of York, Grindleton			Tel: 01200 425111	Fax: 01200 414487
<b>Proposal:</b>	Change of use from public house with living accommodation to PH with letting rooms; holiday cottage and erection of detached manager’s dwelling.				
<b>Date:</b>	September 2019				

**Pre-Application Enquiry Response**

Dear Judith,

I write further to your submission of a request for pre-application advice at the Duke of York, Grindleton on behalf of Mr S Stansfield. The enquiry seeks the Council's views on the retention of the public house, a change of use of the upper floors to letting accommodation (currently used as the manager's flat) and part of the lower ground floor as a self-contained holiday let. The manager's accommodation would be relocated to a new purpose built two storey dwelling within the existing pub car park adjacent.

The site is located within the settlement boundary of Grindleton and washed over as part of the wider Forest of Bowland AONB designation. The host building is Grade II listed and the property sits almost wholly within the Grindleton Conservation Area, with the exception of a small section of the car park along the western boundary.

**Relevant Core Strategy Policies:**

- DS1 – Development Strategy
- DS2 – Sustainable Development
- EN2 – Landscape
- EN4 – Biodiversity and Geodiversity
- EN5 – Heritage Assets
- H1 – Housing Provision
- EC1 – Business and Employment Development
- EC3 – Visitor Economy
- DMG1 – General Considerations
- DMG2 – Strategic Considerations
- DMG3 – Transport and Mobility
- DME3 – Site and Species Protection & Conservation
- DME4 – Protecting Heritage Assets
- DMH3 – Dwellings in the Open Countryside and AONB
- DMH4 – The Conversion of Barns and Other Buildings to Dwellings
- DMB1 – Supporting Business Growth and the Local Economy
- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

## **Principle of Development:**

In preparing this response I have given due weight to the comments raised during the determination of the earlier application at this site (RVBC ref – 3/2019/0049) which proposed the conversion of the public house to a private dwelling with ancillary office accommodation, along with the erection of holiday lets and a storage building within the car park.

The proposals now comprise the following:

- Retention of the public house
- Conversion of the ground and upper floors to letting accommodation (rooms and a cottage)
- The erection of a two storey managers dwelling and garage within the car park

I will consider each matter in turn below.

### Retention of the public house

I consider the retention of the public house as a positive step, particularly as the Buck Inn has subsequently closed and remains unoccupied at the time of writing. The removal of the unsympathetic side extension raises no undue issues and the internal reconfiguration will be considered in the relevant heritage related sections below.

### Conversion of the ground and upper floors to letting accommodation

Key Statement EC3 of the Core Strategy confirms that proposals which contribute to and strengthen the visitor economy 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 particularly where they are located within a defined village, settlement or adjacent to existing groups of buildings.

The site lies within Grindleton and in this regard, development of the nature proposed could help to strengthen and contribute to the local economy of the village, whilst also helping to sustain retention of the PH.

### Manager's accommodation

The scheme as presented seeks to relocate the manager's accommodation to a new, two storey unit within the car park of the public house. Matters of design, layout and impact on the listed building will be considered later in this response.

The manager's accommodation is currently contained within the host building and therefore forms an integral part of the unit. Whilst I appreciate that there may be an economic element to providing secondary holiday accommodation at the site, my concern is that the approach taken requires the erection of an entirely new dwelling within the grounds of the site.

There would be mechanisms to tie occupation of the dwelling to the business; however the property would first require justification in terms of need. The relevant Core Strategy policies which relate to the provision of new homes in such locations (Key Statement DS1, Policy DMG2 and Policy DMH3) all contain criteria which should be satisfied. These include regeneration benefits, proven local needs; development essential to the local economy/social wellbeing of the area or an essential workers dwelling which would be subject to a functional and financial test.

The proposals effectively choose to locate the accommodation outside of the public house whereas it would seem more logical that it maintains the current, ancillary relationship with the primary business. Any supplementary tourist accommodation could then be located adjacent where it can perform its supporting

economic function, but also operate separately in the future if required. I would suggest that you give this arrangement further thought as I believe that it would generate less policy implications and may also provide a greater level of flexibility for the applicant.

Should you proceed with the proposals in any guise, I would recommend a robust and detailed justification statement is provided which covers the overarching business case for the development. Should the new manager's accommodation be proposed, I would suggest that you seek to demonstrate a functional requirement (is other accessible accommodation available which would negate the need for purpose built unit?) and how you see this approach would accord with the aims of Key Statement DS1, Policy DMG2 or Policy DMH3.

### **Design, Layout and Heritage Impacts:**

The proposals relating to the PH have been revised and you have had the opportunity to review comments prepared by my colleague Adrian Dowd in relation to the earlier proposals at the site. The following elements were considered to be harmful to the identified heritage assets and therefore stand to be assessed as part of any amended scheme:

- Loss of a historically important communal facility in the PH
- The impact on the setting of the LB and CA arising from any development in the car park of the pub
- The removal of important room divisions at ground and first floor
- The removal of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century staircase

The public house is now to be retained which addresses the first point above. We have previously discussed the impact of developing within the car park and the need to ensure that any development is sited in such a way that it does not compete with, dominate or detract from the listed building. Revised sketch layout plans have been provided which push the new build property (either a manager's dwelling or holiday lets) to the rear of the site, retaining an open area for parking to the frontage. Depending on the final design proposals, I would concur with the CBA view that a "less obtrusive design, set much further back with longer front gardens might be more successful". Based on the drawings to hand, 'option 01' would appear to create a smaller profile when seen in the context of the listed building which, in tandem with the set-back would help to allay earlier concerns. I suggest you also consider the amount of built form proposed, which should be kept to a minimum. In this respect I would question whether a garage is necessarily required to support the manager's property. You should seek to cover these matters as part of the Heritage Statement to provide the level of analysis and justification that the Framework requires.

In terms of the plan form, the majority of room divisions are now to remain with some minor exceptions. The 20<sup>th</sup> Century staircase stands to be removed as part of the internal reconfiguration of the site. These elements have previously been considered to be harmful to the asset and as such would require justification within the Heritage Statement. Commentary on the changes between the plan form of the refused and forthcoming scheme would be sufficient in this regard. Your Heritage Consultant should consider the matters raised previously regarding the matter of the staircase and seek to explain why its removal would not cause undue harm. I do not consider that this element would be critical to the determination of the wider proposals, however as Adrian has identified this as being a point of concern it must be given due consideration.

I would also highlight that care would be required with regard to any works in the roof space, particularly as the original Heritage Statement identifies the trusses to be amongst the most significant elements.

In summary and subject to the review of final proposals for works within the curtilage of the building, I consider that the scheme as indicated would represent an improvement in terms of the design and treatment of the respective heritage assets. It is, however, ultimately for you to provide the "*clear and convincing justification*" required by paragraph 194 of the Framework.

**Other Matters:**

I cannot see that any other significant or insurmountable issues were raised by statutory consultees as part of the earlier scheme. This development is less intensive as a whole and as such is unlikely to generate severe highway safety or amenity concerns. I note that the Woodland Trust had submitted comments in relation to the proximity of new development to the adjacent trees, as such an Arboricultural Impact Assessment should be provided.

**Conclusion:**

The previous application was refused with 4 reasons cited. Reasons 1 & 2 related to the impacts of the changes to the LB itself and wider matters of setting. In my view the indicative proposals are an improvement on the earlier scheme and could be supported in principle, subject to appropriate justification.

Reason 3 related to the loss of the PH as a community facility, which is overcome by its retention as part of these pre-application proposals. Reason 4 concerned the lack of information regarding the adjacent trees, which would be addressed by the provision of an assessment.

**Submission Requirements:**

Should you proceed to submission of a formal application, based on the nature of the proposal/site constraints identified above, it is my opinion that the Local Planning Authority would require the following information to accompany such an application:

- Application forms
- Location plan
- Site plan (existing and proposed)
- Elevations and floor plans (existing and proposed)
- Heritage Statement (incorporating a method statement for any works to the LB)
- Planning Statement
- Arboricultural Impact Assessment
- Bat Survey

Please note this aforementioned required information may not be exhaustive and is provided on the basis of the level of information submitted. Failure to provide required information is likely to result in an application being made invalid until such information is received or potentially refused on the basis of insufficient information.

Please also 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>

The above observations have been provided on the basis of 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 submitted. Should you wish to discuss any of these matters further please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours Sincerely

Lee Greenwood  
Pre-application Advice Officer  
[lee.greenwood@ribblevalley.gov.uk](mailto:lee.greenwood@ribblevalley.gov.uk)

