|  |
| --- |
| **Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.** |
| **Signed:** | **Officer:** |  | **Date:** |  | **Manager:** |  | **Date:** |  |
| **Site Notice displayed** |  | **Photos uploaded** |  |  |
|  |
| **Application Ref:** | 3/2020/0742 (LBC) |  |
| **Date Inspected:** | 15/10/20 |
| **Officer:** | AD |
| **DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:**  | **Decision** | **Refusal** |
|  |
| **Development Description:** | Single storey extension to garage, increase in roof height of garage and amendment to fenestration details in western facing gable |
| **Site Address/Location:** | **Mill House 10 Long Buildings Sawley Road Sawley BB7 4LE** |
|  |
| **CONSULTATIONS:**  | **Parish/Town Council** |
| No comments received. |
|  |
| **CONSULTATIONS:**  | **Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies** |
| **LCC Highways:** |  |
| No concerns.**LLFA:**No comment as LLFA Flood Risk Standing Advice should have been applied and the development is not listed in the ‘When to Consult the LLFA’ document or in the Development Management Procedure Order 2015.**Environment Agency:**Consulted, no comments received.**Historic amenity societies:**Consulted, no comments received.**LCC Archaeology:**The formerly approved Written Scheme of Investigation has been submitted. No objection to the proposed changes to the currently approved scheme as long as all parts of the development are subject to the watching brief (by condition).**RVBC Countryside:**Re: incorrect completion of Q12 (Trees and Hedges) of planning application form - Tree impact assessment required before any grant of permission.A condition to provide a bat and bird roosting site is suggested. |
| **CONSULTATIONS:**  | **Additional Representations.** |
| None received. |
|  |
| **RELEVANT POLICIES:** |
| Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990Sawley Conservation Area AppraisalRibble Valley Core Strategy:Key Statement EN2– LandscapeKey Statement EN5– Heritage AssetsPolicy DMG1– General ConsiderationsPolicy DMG2– Strategic ConsiderationsPolicy DME4– Protecting Heritage AssetsNPPFNPPG |
| **Relevant Planning History:**No formal pre-application advice has been sought.3/2017/0349 & 0350 - Single storey extension to rear. PP & LBC granted 16/6/17. *Neither ‘Existing’ or ‘Proposed’ plans show the existing kennel structure.*3/2017/0347 & 0348 - Single storey extension to rear. PP & LBC granted 16/6/17. *Neither ‘Existing’ or ‘Proposed’ plans show the existing kennel structure.*3/2016/0835 & 0834 - Demolition of existing conservatory and erection of single storey extension to west elevation. LBC & PP refused 3 November 2016.3/1992/0358 & 0357 –Conversion of westerly section of former Wesleyan chapel to form one dwelling. LBC & PP granted 29 July 1992.3/1992/0356 & 0355 – Conversion of easterly section of former Wesleyan chapel to form one dwelling. LBC & PP granted 29 July 1992.3/1990/0885 & 0884 –conversion of the former Wesleyan chapel to form one dwellinghouse. LBC & PP granted 5 March 1991.3/1989/0103 - Proposed conservatory to gable wall of dwelling (Mill House). PP granted 19 May 1989.3/1989/0178 – Proposed conservatory to gable wall of dwelling (Mill House). LBC granted 31 May 1989.3/1985/0062 – C/u store beneath Wesleyan Chapel Reading Rooms into joiners workshop. PP refused 4 April 1985.3/1987/0143 – Erection of dwelling adjacent to Old Mill, Sawley. PP granted 14 April 1987. *Plans suggest site is a new build. No existing plans. Proposed plan annotation “New dwelling: Arch – existing arch to south elevation taken down and rebuilt. Walls – take existing walls down to ground level and rebuild in stonework to match Long Buildings”. However, the Notice of Passing of Building Plans is entitled ‘Reinstatement of dwelling’ and includes the drawing entitled ‘Detail of support to existing stone arch’ suggesting a degree of repair/restoration which is supported by site inspection (see photos where stones tie-in with adjacent three storey element rather than vertical break).*3/1988/0646 – C/u to two dwellings at the Reading Rooms. PP granted 11 January 1989.3/1986/0449 & 0448 –Conversion to 5 dwellings, erection of 5 garages and 2 detached houses. LBC granted 2 October 1986. PP granted 21 October 1986.3/1983/0610 – Erection of 1 pair of semi-detached houses on land adjacent the Reading Rooms, Sawley. Outline PP granted 12 January 1984.3/1979/0607 – Withdrawn.3/1980/1031 – Residential development on land adjacent Sawley Reading Rooms. Outline PP granted 9 December 1980.3/1978/1013 – Withdrawn. |
|  |
| **ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:** |
| **Site Description and Surrounding Area:**‘Ivy Cottage, Reading Room, and connecting buildings in same range’ is a prominently sited Grade II listed building within Sawley Conservation Area and the Forest of Bowland AONB.The list description (first listed 27 April 1984) identifies the building range to have an interesting historical development with the survival of fabric and design from each era. The reference to scheduled ancient monument is not confirmed by reference to the National Heritage List for England:*“Row of buildings, probably early C19th and industrial, with medieval remains, partly converted for domestic use and partly converted into a Methodist Chapel in 1867. Sandstone rubble with stone slate roof. Ivy Cottage, at the east end, is of 2 storeys, and of one bay to the south, having tripartite windows with plain stone surrounds and square mullions. To the right is a door with plain stone surround. The main range has openings with plain reveals, including 5 doorways on the ground floor. Towards the left is the chapel, with 3 windows on the 1st floor with plain stone surrounds and semi-circular heads. To its right is a chamfered ground-floor window. The west gable wall adjoins the site of the former Abbey mill and incorporates a wide chamfered fireplace with segmental head and with a narrower arched recess to its left. On the 1st floor is a blocked chamfered doorway with Tudor-arched head. The north wall has openings with plain reveals, some 1st floor doors towards the left reached from an external platform, The chapel, further right, has 3 windows with plain stone surrounds and semi-circular heads. At the left is a 1st floor door with similar surround. At the far right is a chamfered slit opening on the ground floor. Interior not fully inspected, but 2 ground-floor windows on the north side and one on the south side have splayed reveals and chamfered inner arches of dressed stone. The site of the former Abbey Mill, at the west, is a Scheduled Ancient Monument”.*The Sawley Conservation Area Appraisal (The Conservation Studio consultants; adopted by the Borough Council 3 April 2007 following public consultation) has numerous references to the Long Buildings and its setting and identifies:1. The land to the west of the site to be Significant Open Space; the views from the west towards the site and across the Significant Open Space to be Important Views (Townscape Appraisal Map);
2. *“The ruins of the Cistercian Abbey founded in 1147 … the Abbey is a Grade-I listed building and its surroundings are designated as a Scheduled Monument”;*  “*Its listed buildings, several of which owe their character to the reuse of Abbey masonry* ”; *“The unusual industrial character and historical importance of The Long Building, a former textile printing works”;* “*Its open and dispersed character, with green fields forming an important component of most views*”; “*The setting of the village on the banks of the Ribble, whose meanders provide many scenic views from various points in the village”; “The Ribble Way Long Distance Footpath, which passes through the village and brings visitors to Sawley”; “location within the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty*” (Summary of special interest);
3. “*At the Dissolution the Abbey was granted to Sir Arthur Darcy de Gray (who also owned Fountains). For 250 years, the village took shape around the ruins of the Abbey … A textile printing works was then established in the village around 1790 by Messrs Peel of Blackburn. The works were built on or close to the site of the Abbey mill, using the mill leats as a source of water for washing and rinsing cloth and disposing of chemical waste into the River Ribble. The printing works thrived and had a reputation for the bright colours of its cloth. Cloth printed or dyed elsewhere was also sent to the village to be rinsed and ‘brightened’. The Peels (the same family as Sir Robert Peel, statesman and former prime minister) were already substantial and wealthy proprietors of textile mills all over Lancashire. The Sawley branch of the family occupied Bank House, which stands on the opposite bank of the Ribble, looking over the river to the Abbey.*

*The printing works appears to have closed by 1867 (and possibly earlier – the building is described as ‘Old Print Works, implying no longer used, on the 1850 Ordnance Survey map) when part of the building was converted into a Wesleyan Chapel and reading room. The building seems to have suffered a fire at some date in the 20th century. In the Sawley Conservation Area Draft Proposal (1971) it was described as ‘dilapidated and run down’. The building has since been converted to a series of apartments.”* (Origins and historic development);1. “*The village falls into four distinct areas:* … *The western side of the same road is lined by dwellings, most of which are modern, but with a large 18th-century industrial building set at right angles to the road on the site of the former Abbey mill, and some older cottages*” (Location and context);
2. “*the remains of Sawley’s Cistercian Abbey are also of great importance to the character of the village … the Abbey has been used as a quarry for building stone. As a result, many buildings incorporate medieval carved masonry in their gable walls*” (General character and plan form);
3. “*It is noteworthy that a number of the properties constructed in Sawley from the 18th-century are located on slightly higher ground: an exception is the Long Building, whose site was dictated by the availability of medieval water channels that were reused for industrial purposes … The village is surrounded by pasture and small fields watered by water channels that look artificial and that were probably dug by the Abbey to create water meadows and to power the Abbey mill”* (Topography, geology, relationship of the conservation area to its surroundings);
4. “*The open green fields, crossed by footpaths, and the views of the river from various parts of the village and the backdrop of wooded hills all contribute to the special character of the village … The following views are of particular merit and should be protected: … Eastward views from the banks of the Ribble opposite Bankview Cottages.*

*In the twentieth century there has been much infill along the main street and the Sawley Road, so that half of the houses in the vicinity of the Abbey are of recent construction. Again this fact was noted and regretted in the Sawley Conservation Area Draft Proposal (1971), which said that these modern encroachments were not in keeping with the architectural character of the village, competed with the Abbey for visual dominance, and detracted from the setting of these important medieval remains*” (Spaces and views);1. “*Sawley’s buildings are for the most part relatively simple and conservative, but are attractive because of the homogeneity of the stone walls and roofs all built from local stone with boundary walls of the same material … Several buildings in the conservation area have medieval moulded or carved stone incorporated randomly into gables and quoins, including Riverside Barn and Ivy Cottage (at the eastern end of The Long Building)”* (Architectural qualities);
2. *“The Long Building: Grade II, industrial building (former calico printing works) with medieval remains, the eastern end (Ivy Cottage) converted to a Reading Room in the 19th century and part converted to a Wesleyan Methodist Chapel in 1867, the whole now converted to residential use. The site of the Abbey mill at the western end of the building is a scheduled monument” (Listed buildings);*
3. “*Within the conservation area there are many fields and open spaces that add to the character of the conservation area, especially those that border the River Ribble. The fields surrounding the Abbey, including Sawley Park, have ditches and banks representing possible monastic fishponds, water meadows, field boundaries and barns, and the meadows on the western side of the main street have ditches and watercourses (or lathes) representing parts of the water management system to supply the monastic mill (and, subsequently, the textile printing works in The Long Building) … Another attractive row of trees enhances the view from the Spread Eagle across the Ribble and screens the overlarge and visually undistinguished dining room with its large picture windows*” (Green spaces, trees and other natural elements);
4. *“The most important positive features of the Sawley Conservation Area are: Its location on the banks of the River Ribble, with its meanders, gravel islands, wild flowers, wildlife, footpaths and bridges, all of which are attractive scenic features of the village that attract visitors, as does the back drop of fells to the north and south; The Abbey ruins and associated features in the surrounding fields; The existence of buildings of character and individuality associated with the Abbey or with the subsequent textile printing works”* (Strengths);
5. *“The principal negative features of the Sawley Conservation Area are: The number of modern buildings that have been sited along the main street opposite the Abbey; The replacement of many of the windows and doors in the conservation area with UPVC or treated timber in a different style from the original, including the very large and blank windows of The Long Building*” (Weaknesses);
6. “*Continuing loss of original architectural details and use of inappropriate modern materials or details*” (Threats);
7. “ *… Care should be taken to ensure that window and door designs reflect traditional practice in the village*” (Opportunities).

The submitted Heritage Asset Statement includes a map regression which appears to confirm that additions to the north of the historic linear building are C20.  |
| **Proposed Development for which consent is sought:**Revised plans received 21/10/20 which confirm that planning permission and listed building consent is sought for: new fenestration (larger apex-headed window to west elevation) to the extension approved in 2017; increase in height of existing store; demolition of the existing kennel and rebuild as a store with new ridge height continuous with the new ridge height of the existing store (without slight set-back from existing store east elevation) and remodelling of the east and west elevations (new windows and doors) of the existing and proposed store. |
| **Impact upon the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building, the setting of listed buildings, the character and appearance of Sawley Conservation Area and the cultural heritage of the Forest of Bowland AONB:**The proposed development is harmful to the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building, the setting of listed buildings and the character and appearance of Sawley Conservation Area because of the undue prominence, incongruity and conspicuousness of proposed extensions resulting from new fenestration and the elongated appearance of the proposed stores from the proposed uniform ridge height.The west facing windows of the proposed extension granted consent in 2017 have head heights which match those at the adjoining gable of the historic building. The formation of a triangular-headed light (above historic gable window head height) catches the eye. The importance of views from the west including those across the river from the Grindleton part of the conservation area (including listed buildings) is identified in the conservation area appraisal.The listed building has an *“unusual industrial character”* and is *“a large 18th-century industrial building set at right angles to the road”.* The existing modern extensions are at right angles to the historic industrial range and are very visible from the main road. However, they have very little fenestration (reflective glazing) and their impact is diminished by the step-down of roof ridges (‘read’ as ancillary structures). The proposed fenestration catches the eye and the range perpendicular to the historic build is ‘read’ as a separate single-storey dwelling.NPPG Historic Environment (paragraph 13) identifies “When assessing any application which may affect the setting of a heritage asset, local planning authorities may need to consider the implications of cumulative change”. In this respect, consideration has been made to the conservation area appraisal’s identification of “the very large and blank windows of The Long Building”as a Weakness.‘Making changes to heritage assets’ (Historic England, 2017) identifies:“The main issues to consider in proposals for additions to heritage assets, including new development in conservation areas, aside from NPPF requirements such as social and economic activity and sustainability, are … use of materials … relationship with adjacent assets … alignment … It would not normally be good practice for new work to dominate the original asset or its setting in either scale, material or as a result of its siting. Assessment of an asset’s significance and its relationship to its setting will usually suggest the forms of extension that might be appropriate” (paragraph 41).“Doors and windows are frequently key to the significance of a building” (paragraph 15).NPPG states that “substantial harm is a high test, so it may not arise in many cases” and the harm to the designated heritage assets is ‘less than substantial’ (this is acknowledged at paragraph 5.6 and 5.8 of the Planning Statement). NPPF paragraph 196 requires that ‘less than substantial’ harm be weighed against any public benefits of the proposal. Contractor employment is a public benefit but does not outweigh the harm to the designated heritage assets. The submitted Planning Statement (paragraph 5.8) does not explain why the proposed development is essential for the continued residential use of the listed building. |
| **Residential Amenity:**The proposal has an acceptable impact upon the amenity of nearby residents. |
| **Trees and bats:**The comments (on the two trees immediately adjacent the proposed development) of the RVBC Countryside officer are noted in respect to a positive application recommendation.The comments (bat roost provision) of the RVBC Countryside officer are noted in respect to a positive application recommendation. |
| **Highways:**The comments of LCC Highways have been considered.**Archaeology:**The comments (watching brief) of LCC Archaeology are noted in respect to a positive application recommendation.**Flooding:**A submitted letter from the agent identifies the site to be in Flood Zone 1 (the site is contiguous with land in Flood Zone 2). No adverse comments received from LLFA or the Environment Agency. **Consideration to revised plans received 16 November 2020 (following applicant’s receipt of case officer draft recommendations on 13 November 2020):**Concerns retained in respect to the form and elevational treatment of the road facing east elevation of the proposed historic industrial building additions. The difference in ridge heights (and opening head heights) is not substantial (there is also no set-back of any component of the east elevation) and the extensions would be conspicuous and ‘read’ from the roadside (albeit, no further site inspection has been made by the case officer) as an elongated, overtly residential, single range. |
| **Observations/Consideration of Matters Raised/Conclusion:**Therefore, in giving considerable importance and weight (where relevant) to the duties at section 16, 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, in giving ‘great weight’ to the conservation of the designated heritage assets (NPPF paragraph 193) and in consideration to Key Statement EN5 and Policies DME4 and DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy, the refusal of listed building consent is recommended. |
| **RECOMMENDATION**: | That listed building consent be refused for the following reason:The proposed development is harmful to the special architectural and historic interest and setting of the listed building because of the undue prominence, incongruity and conspicuousness of proposed extensions to the historic industrial building resulting from overtly residential fenestration and the elongated appearance of the proposed stores from very similar roof ridge heights. |