

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 11 August 2026 16:50  
**To:** Planning  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** DOWER HOUSE, PARK ROAD GISBURN BB7 4HT. 03/2026/0524 and 03/2026/0527

**⚠ External Email**

This email originated from outside Ribble Valley Borough Council. Do **NOT** click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and are sure the content within this email is safe.

Dear Planning Officer / Ben Taylor,

Application reference: 3/2026/0524 and 03/2026/0527 at Dower House, Park Road, Gisburn, BB7 4HT

We write to object to the above applications for Listed Building Consent for proposed conversion of residential annex to holiday accommodation, incorporating associated as-built alterations.

The site lies within the immediate curtilage of The Dower House, a Grade II Listed Building, and within the Gisburn Conservation Area. It also forms part of the wider historic Gisburne Estate group associated with Gisburn Park the Grade I Listed mansion house. The Dower House and application site share clear historic associations and intervisibility with Estate Group of highly designated heritage assets including the Grade I Listed Gisburn Park, Grade II\* Pair of lodges at southern entrance to Gisburne Park and the Grade II Registered Park and Garden. The proposal therefore must be assessed against its effect on the significance including the setting and group value of these designated heritage assets. Under section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, the Council must have special regard to the desirability of preserving the listed building and its setting; the NPPF requires great weight to be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets, with clear and convincing justification required for any harm, and less than substantial harm weighed against public benefits.

While the building was previously granted consent for conversion to a residential annex, the current application goes beyond a modest ancillary use by seeking to formalise alterations that erode the building's subservient, service-character and introduce an unnecessarily domestic appearance that is at odds with its role within the historic estate.

Our objections are:

**1. Harm to the setting of The Dower House**

The annex is a subordinate estate building, historically serving as a store, fuel store, wine store and garage to the Dower House. The building's historic interest lies partly in its modest, utilitarian, ancillary character. The large expanse of glazing, roof lights and more domestic front door/porch treatment diminish this character and create a more domestic appearance which is inconsistent with the estate's architectural hierarchy. This weakens the relationship between the annex and the Grade II listed principal house, and fails to preserve the setting and special interest of the listed building as required by statute and national policy, causing harm to the significance of the Dower House at the low end of less than substantial.

**2. Adverse impact on group value and the wider estate character**

The site occupies a key position within the historic estate landscape on Park Road, which forms the principal designed approach to Gisburne Park. The Gisburn Conservation Area Appraisal describes Park Road as "another haven of gentility, dating from the creation of Gisburne Park in the early 18th century." The low boundary wall around The Dower House clearly forms part of this designed estate composition, continuing towards the western lodge and then the eastern lodge, and running the eastern side of Park Road. As noted in the Appraisal, "both sides of Park Road and the walls surrounding the gatehouses at the entrance to Gisburn Park are lined with a handsome 1.5m-high sandstone ashlar wall, with coping stones that are moulded on the side facing out from the Park, and left rough on the side facing into the Park."

The site also has direct intervisibility with the lodges and gates, the estate approaches, the Registered Park and Garden and the Conservation Area. The introduction of holiday accommodation, together with the associated parking arrangements, would erode the coherent character of this important historic group. The inappropriate domesticisation

of the annex would detract from the legibility of the estate as a planned historic composition and would cause less than substantial harm, at the lower end of the scale, to the significance of these designated heritage assets.

### **3. Impact on Conservation Area**

The Gisburn Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan identifies as part of the area's special interest "the tranquil Park Lane, with its 'polite' architecture, gatehouses and park boundary walls." It is clear, therefore, that this part of the Conservation Area is valued for its calm, ordered and designed parkland approach.

The Management Plan also makes clear that all development within the Conservation Area must respond to its immediate context in terms of scale, density, form, materials and detailing, and that proposals should be accompanied by a Design Statement demonstrating how the scheme relates to its surroundings. It further states that the emphasis in any new development or alteration must be on high quality design.

In this case, the proposed alterations, particularly the large glazed opening to bedroom three and the more domestic treatment of the frontage, are at odds with those principles. The development fails to respect the established character of the area, and instead introduces a visually incongruous form of alteration that would detract from the Conservation Area's significance and fail to preserve, and where possible enhance, its character and appearance, causing harm to its significance.

In particular, the Management Plan advises that development should "reflect the proportion of solid to void found in the elevations of traditional buildings and employ robust detailing, avoiding fussy or gimmicky use of applied features or detailing." The extensive glazing proposed for bedroom three does not accord with this guidance and is harmful to the architectural consistency and special interest of this part of the Conservation Area.

### **4. Insufficient justification for the level of change proposed**

We do not consider that the application demonstrates that the extent of alteration is necessary or that less harmful alternatives have been properly explored. The design response appears to prioritise domestic convenience over the requirement conservation of significance.

In accordance with section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, the local planning authority must give special regard to the desirability of preserving the listed building, its setting, and any features of special architectural or historic interest. In addition, the NPPF confirms that great weight should be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets, with the greatest weight applying to the most highly graded assets. Where a proposal would cause less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, that harm must be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.

In this case, the public benefits of creating a single private holiday let are limited and, in our view, do not outweigh the identified harm to this sensitive and highly designated heritage context. The proposal would fail to preserve the setting, significance and group value of the heritage assets affected, and the degree of harm is not clearly or convincingly justified. For these reasons, we object to the application.

Yours sincerely