

S Kilmartin
Ribble Valley Borough Council
Council Offices
Church Walk
CLITHEROE
BB7 2RA

Phone: 01772 531343

Email: Archaeology@lancashire.gov.uk

Your ref: 3/2022/0966 and 0967

Our ref: 3_2022_0966-0967-LCC

Date: 2nd December 2022

Dear Mr Kilmartin

Applications 3/2022/0966 and 0967:

Proposed erection of 39 affordable residential units with access, parking and landscaping. Conversion and extension of former dairy outbuilding to open-market residential unit and refurbishment/modernisation of Crow Trees Farmhouse (open-market dwelling) including reconfiguration, rooflights, side window and extension of two outbuildings to form garages.

AND

Application for Listed Building Consent for refurbishment/modernisation of Crow Trees Farmhouse including internal reconfiguration, rooflights, side window and extension of outbuilding to form garage.

Crow Trees Farm, Crow Trees Brow, Chatburn BB7 4AA

The above applications are accompanied by a Heritage Statement (HS, Graeme Ives 2022). It discusses the built environment but despite quoting from the NPPF (HS 1.4 and 3.1) does not consider the potential for buried archaeology on the site. It does note that the Historic Environment Record (HER) was consulted and provides a copy of a map indicating HER sites within a 500m radius circle centred on the site in Appendix 1 but does not provide a list of all the sites identified on that map, nor is it pointed out that there are other known sites outside that circle. These include a prehistoric cairn and a Napoleonic rabbit warren on Worsaw and Warren Hills respectively, but also a considerable number of findspots. These have mainly been reported from metal-detector users in the 1990s-early 2000s but also include an 18th century find of a large Roman coin-hoard off Worston Road and the find of a prehistoric spearhead near the Ribble in the 1970s. The metal-detector finds come mainly from land east of the A59 and are of medieval (particularly buckles) and later periods, and thus could suggest that they derive from episodes of 'night-soil spreading' from an urban source, e.g. Clitheroe. The finds do, however, also include prehistoric and Roman finds and this seems less probable as a source for such material. The major Roman road (Ribchester to Elslack and on to York) passing to the south and east of the proposed development site is shown on the HER map but is not discussed in the HS.

It should also be noted that the references in the HS to the Ordnance Survey map published in 1847 (e.g., HS 3.18; Fig 3.38; first map in Appendix 2) have been

misinformed by the supply to the author of a revised map which actually dates to c.1860-65. The supplier, Landmark Information Group, was made aware of this issue many years ago, but still appears to be failing to inform clients adequately. The 'real' 1847 mapping (OS 1:10,560 sheet Lancashire 47; see map attached) which was surveyed in 1844 does not show the railway from Bolton or Chatburn Station. As the railway was not opened to Chatburn until 1850 and the original station west of Clitheroe Road was opened in 1853 (see e.g. Greville, M D, 1954, *Chronological list of the Railways of Lancashire, 1828-1939*) this is unsurprising. As far as can be seen, however, the actual proposed development site does not change between the 'original' and 'revised' maps.

Listed Farmhouse:

The HS does discuss the Listed farmhouse, and states that despite modernisation and alterations there are some historic features still present in the interior. In particular it notes that "*A short section of timber framed and wattle and daub partition, which may have enclosed an original hallway leading from the front door, has been retained to partly enclose the extended kitchen*" (HS 3.12). This wall may be visible in Figure 3.10, although it is not noted in the caption. It is perhaps unfortunate that all these surviving elements are not noted on the plans 'as existing' or 'as proposed', as it is thus difficult to see if they will be retained or if the changes proposed will impact any of them. If the timber-framed wall is indeed that short return section to the right of the modern kitchen partition, then it would appear from the 'plans as proposed' that it is to be retained as part of the refurbishment, however this needs to be confirmed and the need for it to be protected from damage when the modern partition is removed acknowledged. Another significant feature is the stone sink in the 'Cheese Room' (HS 3.15, Figure 3.18). This item is not shown in the plans 'as existing' or 'as proposed' and it may well be intended to remove it. The heritage impact and acceptability of this needs to be considered carefully. The HS does note some surprise at the absence of joist holes for a first floor in this room (3.15) and we would echo surprise should this be the case (but see below), particularly given the presence of a first-floor window above the door and a 'stair-window' on the opposite side, but it is possible that these have been filled and plastered or whitewashed over. The presence of the 'stair-window' would suggest that this section of the building was not originally intended as a common utility space but was of higher status (although the lack of an obvious chimney or flue is a concern for a function such as 'outside servant's' accommodation), but it may just have reflected a particular interest in the production of fine cheese by the builder. This extension may have been connected to the main house at ground floor level in the past (a blocked door is suggested on the plans) but with the information to hand it is not possible to be certain.

The Structural Survey (SS – R G Parkins, 2022) provides some useful views of the building, but it is worrying to note that it appears to recommend the wholesale replacement of the stone surround and mullions to the five-light ground floor window on the south front (SS 7.1 p. 11, and 14.2 p.38; Figure 7.1.3), perhaps the oldest window to this side of the building. This needs further consideration and more selective repair/replacement is to be preferred.

One of the internal illustrations of the Cheese Room (SS figure 7.53) appears to show a former first-floor joist to this part of the building, as well as the presence of a blocked former opening to the right of the 'stair window'. There is an obvious horizontal feature

at the base of this putative joist, but the function of this is unknown and there are no other obvious traces of joists.

These matters can probably best be dealt with by the Council's conservation team or as part of a site visit. If the Council find that the proposals are acceptable or can be made so, we recommend that a formal building record of the farmhouse is created prior to the works starting. Given the age of the building and its designated status, we would recommend that this is to Historic England Level 3 rather than a lower standard. We would also note that, given the need for removal of external render and internal finishes to investigate damp and structural issues within the house noted in the Structural Survey, it would be sensible for any such opening-up works to be observed by the building recorder and any features noted in the final building record.

Dairy or Associated Barn

This is very briefly mentioned in the HS (3.51-53.) and a small number of photographs of its exterior are provided, but the interior is not illustrated, and it is not discussed in any detail. It appears on the OS 1847 mapping, but the images in the HS suggest that stylistically it should be associated with the later 'Cheese Room' extension to the farmhouse. This would suggest that it is of 18th or early 19th century origin. The building is of some architectural merit, presumably reflecting the status of the adjacent farmhouse.

Several images of the interior and exterior of the building are provided in section 10 of the Structural Survey, where it is referred to as the 'Main Barn'. These would suggest that it is indeed of later 18th or early 19th century origin, with the single-storey extension to the southern gable (SS section 11 'Workshop') being a later addition. It seems possible that the single storey element was once open-fronted (e.g. 'inset' panel SS figure 11.1.3; possible iron post SS figure 11.2.1) and has been closed in in more modern times. Significant structural concerns are raised regarding these buildings, and it seems probable that significant repair or reconstruction will be necessary (SS 14.5 and 14.6 pp.39). Whilst there are stalls recorded on the ground floor of the barn, the images in the Structural Survey show these to be of cement and metal, and thus likely to be of mid-19th century date or later and of only very minor historic interest. Their loss as part of the proposed conversion is thus of little import. The timbers to the first floor are, however, likely to be original to the building and should be retained as far as possible, even though works are recommended to stabilise the walls (SS 14.5, p.39). The originality of the main roof timbers is less certain, with the Survey suggesting that they may have been replaced (SS 10.2, p.31, figure 10.2.3).

No new openings are proposed on the main front of the building, facing towards the Listed farmhouse, but a considerable extension in a modern style is proposed to its rear, with a new stair in a glass link section between old and new parts. The extension appears to be mainly hidden from the view of the historic house, and the face presented towards Crow Trees Barn to its north is essentially blank and could be taken as 'agricultural' in character. It is a concern that the Structural Survey recommends that much of this building is demolished and rebuilt, in some places down to ground level and with foundation works also being required. Combined with the new extension, this could be taken to be recommending what is in effect a new build, albeit with some retained and re-used architectural components – a substantial negative impact on its heritage

value. Whatever the decision of the council regarding this element of the development, we would recommend that a formal building survey be undertaken prior to any works commencing. Given its relatively simple layout and appearance, that it is not individually Listed and that the Heritage Statement claims that it cannot be considered curtilage listed, this record can be to the lower Historic England level 2.

Ancillary Buildings, inc. Garden Seat

The HS notes the existence of these structures and their presence within the curtilage of the Listed farmhouse but does not describe them in any significant detail or discuss the impact of the proposals. They appear to pre-date 1886, and may well be present on the 1847 mapping, but the latter is not particularly clear. The seat is an unusual feature and again points to a raised status for the site. It would appear from the 'proposed site plan' that the 'coal store' and seat are to be retained in situ, but the other outbuilding is to be extended to form a garage. We would not object to these proposals, but the Council may have views on the proposed loss of the original stone roof slabs. We would recommend that all these buildings are also recorded to level 2 prior to works commencing.

The Dutch Barn

This is a relatively modern construction of negligible heritage significance, and its conversion and extension does not appear to merit any further discussion by us or building recording.

New Housing Development

The proposed new build development is located in fields to the south of the farm, in an area shown on the OS 1847 mapping to have been former strip-fields extending beyond the railway to the parish boundary (approximately on the A59 line). These are subdivided by a northeast-southwest 'back lane' seen on that mapping and now represented by a boundary between The Royds (house) and Heys Brook, but it is not clear if this is an original feature of the field system as several the strip boundaries continue past it. On balance it seems more probable that this 'lane' is a later insertion. The layout of the fields would suggest that they represent a medieval town field, with the boundaries shown representing fossilized agricultural strips, although they do not have the definitive 'reversed S' shape of classic medieval strips. A similar area of 'strip-fields', also possibly representing another town field can be seen to the northeast of the village. Both areas of strip-fields are noted in the Historic Environment Record and Historic landscape Characterisation project as 'Ancient Enclosure'.

As noted in the HS, it would appear that these fields have been open and in agricultural use for a considerable time. As such it seems possible that they could retain buried evidence of prehistoric or Roman activity in this vicinity, suggested by the cairn, Roman road and findspots recorded in the HER. Any such remains will have been impacted by ploughing (there are some suggestions of ridge and furrow earthworks on the OS aerial photography), but there may still be features surviving below ground. We cannot state that such remains are likely to be of national importance and do not consider we are justified in requiring an archaeological evaluation to be undertaken prior to the Council making a planning decision (as per National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF – MoHCLG 2021) 194). We would, however, recommend that a condition requiring a

phased programme of investigation prior to development is attached to any consent granted.

We would suggest the following wording for conditions:

1. Building recording

Condition: No works to the application buildings, including any clearance/demolition or preparation works shall take place until the applicant, or their agent or successors in title, has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological building recording as set out in "*Understanding Historic Buildings*" (Historic England 2016). The recording should be to Level 3 for Crow Trees farmhouse, and Level 2 for the barn/dairy and other 19th century or earlier ancillary buildings. No record is required for the Dutch Barn. Wherever possible the recording of the farmhouse should also include observation and recording during opening-up and other investigative works to the building structure. This work must be carried out by an appropriately qualified and experienced professional contractor to the standards set out by the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists and in accordance with a written scheme of investigation, which shall first have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason: To ensure and safeguard the recording and inspection of matters of archaeological/historical importance associated with the buildings/site.

Note: Relevant archaeological standards and a list of registered contractors can be found on the ClfA web pages: <http://www.archaeologists.net>. Contact details for other non-registered contractors can be found on the BAJR web site: <http://www.bajr.org>. "*Understanding Historic Buildings*" can be accessed online at <https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/understanding-historic-buildings/>.

2. Archaeological Works

Condition: No new development, site clearance/preparation, or demolition shall commence until the applicant or their agent or successors in title has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation, which shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The programme of works shall include an initial phase of field investigation to include trial trenching, as well as the compilation of a report on the work undertaken and the results obtained. These works should aim to establish the presence or absence of buried archaeological remains and their nature, date, extent and significance. If remains are encountered then a subsequent phase of impact mitigation (which may include preservation in situ by the appropriate design or siting of new roads, structures and buildings, formal excavation of remains or other actions) and a phase of appropriate analysis, reporting and publication shall be developed, and a further written scheme of investigation submitted to and agreed with the local planning

authority before development commences. Copies of all reports should be deposited directly with the Lancashire Historic Environment Record. All archaeological works shall be undertaken by an appropriately qualified and experienced professional archaeological contractor and comply with the standards and guidance set out by the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA). The development shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason: To ensure and safeguard the investigation and recording of matters of archaeological/historical importance associated with the development.

Note: Relevant archaeological standards and a list of registered contractors can be found on the CIfA web pages: <http://www.archaeologists.net>. Contact details for other non-registered contractors can be found on the BAJR web site: <http://www.bajr.org>.

The council may wish to consider including a condition requiring a time limit (such as prior to first occupation) for the provision of the building records and fieldwork reports, up to and including the provision of a post-excavation assessment report (the first phase of any mitigation excavation reporting). We would, however, note that the specialist analysis required for a final excavation report and any publication can take significant time and it may not be practicable for such a time limit to apply to these items. It could be considered appropriate, however, for the condition to require an appropriate timetable to produce a final report, archive and any publication to be agreed with the council.

This is in accordance with NPPF paragraph 205: "*Local planning authorities should require developers to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage assets to be lost (wholly or in part) in a manner proportionate to their importance and the impact, and to make this evidence (and any archive generated) publicly accessible [Copies of evidence should be deposited with the relevant historic environment record, and any archives with a local museum or other public depository]*".

Please note that the above comments have been made without the benefit of a site visit.

Peter Iles

Planning Officer (Archaeology)
Historic Environment Team