

To Maya Cullen  
From Growth Lancashire  
Subject Conservation Comments  
Date 25 April 2025

Ref: 3/2025/0086

**Proposal:** Listed Building Consent for removal of existing render including smooth rendered, surrounds, door surround and Quion feature to reveal stonework, raking out joints and pointing in lime mortar.

**Site Address:** 9 West View, Glen Avenue, Ribchester, PR3 2ZQ

**Site/Building/Location**

No.9 West View is part of a 17<sup>th</sup> century barn that was converted into cottages in early 19<sup>th</sup> century. The cottages are two storey and sit in a row fronting Glen Avenue with no.9 at the end of the row. They are set behind front gardens. No.9 sits adjacent to Grade II listed Knoll Hall.

**Designations**

No.9 West View is Grade II listed.

Listing description (HE):

<https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1072261>

**Legislation**

The principal statutory duty under the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 is to preserve the special character of heritage assets, including their setting. LPAs should, in coming to decisions, consider the principal Act, which states the following:

*Listed buildings - Section 16(2)*

In considering whether to grant listed building consent for any works the local planning authority shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

**Planning Guidance and Policy**

NPPF

P208 states Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.

P210 of the NPPF states in determining planning applications LPAs should take account of:

- a. The desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;
- b. The positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and
- c. The desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

P212 states that when considering the impact of proposals on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be applied. This is irrespective of whether any harm is identified as being substantial, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.

P213 states that any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification.

P215 states that where a proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.

### Local Plan

Ribble Valley Borough Council Core Strategy 2008 – 2028: A Local Plan for Ribble Valley

- Policy DME4: Protecting Heritage Assets

### Assessment

#### ***The site***

No.9 West View is part of a 17<sup>th</sup> century barn that was converted into cottages in early 19<sup>th</sup> century. No.9 is constructed from rendered sandstone rubble with quoins and a slate roof. The principal elevation has an entrance door and window at ground floor level and a smaller window at first floor level; the door and windows have plain rendered surrounds.

### ***The proposal***

I have read the information provided in the application. The key heritage issue for the LPA to consider is:

1. Whether the proposal preserves the special interest of the listed building through direct works.

The application is for Listed Building Consent for removal of the existing render including smooth rendered surrounds, door surround and quoin feature to reveal stonework, raking out joints and pointing in lime mortar.

It is noted in the Heritage, Design and Access Statement that: the cottage is pebble dashed on the front elevation only. Quoins, door and window surrounds are depicted with smooth faced render. The original stone quoins appear evident on the gable elevation and are assumed to be sound below the rendered front elevation.

No.9 is the only property along the row that is rendered, with all other properties being of exposed stonework. It states that no.10 is believed to have had its front elevation render removed many years ago and there is evidence of the stone window surrounds possibly being keyed to receive the render. It is not stated as to when the render was applied to the building, but it is noted in the Heritage, Design and Access Statement that it is failing and is a cement render which restricts the breathability of the listed fabric. As such, I do not object to its removal.

The Method Statement for the work notes that the render is to be removed with hand tools and cleaned with a Doff cleaning system. The pointing will be cut out with hand tools or a handsaw for finer joints, which is an appropriate means of removal and cleaning.

It states that the proposed mortar will be 1 part NHL3.5 to 3 parts Leighton Buzzard sand/Nosterfield washed river sand to walls.

Overall, I have no objections to the removal of the pebbledash render and rendered window/door openings and quoins. However, I feel that it would be more appropriate for an NHL2 to be used, as opposed to NHL3.5, as it is more flexible and vapour permeable and as such, would be a more appropriate. The use of NHL3.5 will cause slight harm to the listed building.

### **Conclusion / recommendation**

As I am required to do so, I have given S16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 considerable weight in my comments.

Subject to amendments (mortar) the scheme will meet the statutory duty to preserve and accord with Chapter 16 of the NPPF, meeting the requirements of local policy DME4. As noted above, I feel that an NHL2 should be used instead of

NHL3.5 to mitigate the slight harm identified. This could be dealt with via the use of a suitable Condition.

**Growth Lancashire**

A: Suite 18, The Globe Centre, St. James Square, Accrington, Lancashire,  
BB5 0RE

T: 0800 6122029

E: [heritage@growthlancashire.co.uk](mailto:heritage@growthlancashire.co.uk)

W: [www.growthlancashire.co.uk](http://www.growthlancashire.co.uk)