

LCC HIGHWAYS:

9 August 2021 - Further information required because:

- Intensification of use of the existing access following the extension to the building and change of use of the manager's accommodation to 4 hotel rooms.
- Shortfall in 29 car parking spaces.
- Easy access and exit - require swept path analysis of largest delivery goods vehicle.
- Advise to just renovate without extending and proposing a hotel element - will not require any information and the site may not require planning permission (shortfall in car parking will be a pre-existing situation).

9 September 2021 - No objection subject to conditions (access, parking and turning and car park surfacing before occupation). Removed hotel element and will remain as landlords/managers flat. Will accept the shortfall in parking.

CADENT:

Apparatus in the vicinity. Advise of likely decision as soon as possible. Note to contractor.

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS:

Seven objections received which make the following points:

- Parking area - right of access to neighbouring properties.
- Increased on-street parking; remaining as village pub obviates need for additional parking.
- Noise after midnight including no supervision of hotel guests; outdoor seating.
- Re-opening of the Buck will affect (competition) the proposed Duke of York (Grade II listed) Community Hub (more than pub/restaurant).
- Over-development.
- Loss of light from extension location and finish.
- Overlooking from outdoor seating area.
- Restaurant more than village pub.
- Detrimental to conservation village.

Seventy-three letters of support which make the following points:

- Village needs pub and shop.
- Best plan.
- Not harmful to the conservation area or setting of Duke of York (Pre-application advice); enhance views.
- Good for economy – jobs; tourism
- Community facility – focal point, social cohesion and mental health. 200 people supported the Community Pub Project.
- Duke of York – offers to purchase rejected; continues to deteriorate (what RVBC doing about?).
- The Pavilion is a village hall (not pub/restaurant; more-bookable only).
- Prevent another pub deteriorating.
- Re-opening of the Buck will not affect (competition) the Duke of York.

1. **Site Description and Surrounding Area**

- 1.1 The Buck Inn is a prominently sited C18 public house (vacant for c.3 years) within Grindleton Conservation Area. It fronts Sawley Road and is close to the juncture of Brow Top/Sawley Road and Main Street and within the immediate setting of the Duke of York Hotel (Grade II listed; 'Public house, early C19th'; corner site; Focal Building in the Grindleton Conservation Area Appraisal). It is one of the very few non-listed buildings in Grindleton Conservation Area which the Appraisal (The Conservation Studio consultants) identifies as making a positive contribution to character and appearance (Building of Townscape Merit).
- 1.2 The Buck Inn has a symmetrical frontage with ground floor bay-windows (with castellated parapet) either side of a central pedimented front door. Quoins at each return. Chimneys at each gable. Adjoining traditional wall and gates to the front of a yard and recessed single-storey stone and render extensions. Modern rear extensions occupy just over half of the rear curtilage with adjoining stone flagged space to the west.
- 1.3 The 1890s OS map shows the 'Buck Inn' with yard and extension to the north-east as existing. The 1840s OS map shows a building of square plan with extensions to the rear and side in this location.

2. **Proposed Development for which consent is sought**

- 2.1 Planning permission is sought for a proposed 2-storey extension in the yard to the east of the frontage (with demolition of side extensions and front wall/gates; roadside frontage of arch-headed openings including ground floor cart-door type openings), single-storey extension to the rear (replacement of existing extensions; construction to whole of rear yard; flat roof) and external and internal alterations including the loss of walling identifying the historic double-pile planform.
- 2.2 Revised plans were received on 3rd September 2021 (following LCC Highways initial objection) deleting the proposed hotel accommodation and incorporating a revised parking design and numbers (now seven spaces).
- 2.3 The submitted application form identifies hours of operation as:
- Mon – Thurs 1100 to 0000
 - Fri-Sat 1100 to 0100
 - Sun and BH 1200 to 0000
- 2.4 The submitted application form identifies that the development will employ 10 Full-time and 10 Part- Time employees.
- 2.5 The submitted Design Statement summarises the Borough Council's Pre-application advice of May 2021. It suggests that the proposed en-suite boutique bedrooms at first floor (now deleted following LCC Highways concerns) are required to facilitate a viable business (paragraph 3.5).

3. **Relevant Planning History**

3/2007/0812 – Installation of a new stainless steel extract system with galvanised ductwork and associated fittings to exhaust fumes from the kitchen, away from neighbouring properties. PP granted 12/10/2007.

3/2007/0481 – Proposed erection of slate mono-pitch roofed shelter attached to existing flat roofed extension to rear of premises and replacement of existing sliding patio doors with French style doors and glazed side panels. PP granted 20/06/2007.

3/1986/0331 – Rear lounge to form covered way from main building to toilets. PP granted 16/7/1986.

3/1986/0180 – Family room to rear by roofing across main building to toilets. PP refused 6/5/1986.

BO1459 – Toilet. PP granted 1/8/1969.

4. **Relevant Policies**

Ribble Valley Core Strategy:

Key Statement EN2 - Landscape

Key Statement EN5– Heritage Assets

Key Statement EC2: Development of Retail, Shops and Community Facilities and Services

Key Statement EC1: Business and Employment Development

Policy DMG1– General Considerations

Policy DMG2 – Strategic Considerations

Policy DME4– Protecting Heritage Assets

Policy DMB1: Supporting Business Growth and the Local Economy

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. ‘Preservation’ in the duties at sections 66 and 72 of the Act means “doing no harm to” (*South Lakeland DC v. Secretary of State for the Environment* [1992]).

Grindleton Conservation Area Appraisal

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

5. **Assessment of Proposed Development**

5.1 **Impact upon the character and appearance of Grindleton Conservation Area, the setting of the Duke of York Hotel and the cultural heritage of the Forest of Bowland AONB:**

5.1.1 It is considered that the proposed extensions are harmful to the character and appearance of Grindleton Conservation Area, the setting of the Duke of York Hotel and the cultural heritage of the Forest of Bowland AONB.

5.1.2 The side extension is large (two-storey, two bay width and having little set-back or set-down), prominent and incongruous, unbalancing the carefully and intentionally designed symmetric façade (“*The Duke of York and The Buck Inn – dating from the 18th century, both symmetrical double pile houses*”; “*two public houses ... but the streetscape is largely made up of vernacular houses, without church (until 1805), manor, rectory or ‘polite’ houses*” – Grindleton Conservation Area Appraisal”).

- 5.1.3 The side extension's cart-door openings have no provenance to this site and undermine the significance and authenticity of the conservation area's buildings which do possess such characteristics ("a number of former agricultural buildings, with carriage arches ...at Stone Hill Farm, Swindlehurst Barn, Duck House Farm and Wythenstocks Barn, for example" – Grindleton Conservation Area Appraisal).
- 5.1.4 Construction of the side extension will result in the loss of a historic extension, traditional boundary walling, gates and yard ("Boundary walls: built from the abundant local gritstone, these are a distinctive feature of the conservation area"; "Railings and gates" - Grindleton Conservation Area Appraisal: Local details) and distinct planform ("the double pile layout of the building remains legible at ground floor level" – Heritage Statement).
- 5.1.5 Buildings along the southern side of Sawley Lane are characterised by spaces between buildings allowing through views to the open countryside. The spaces around the Buck and views of relatively undetailed gable walls additionally provides emphasis to its impressive symmetrically designed facade. This will be lost.
- 5.1.6 The Duke of York is diagonally opposite the Buck and the proposed rear flat-roofed and largely glazed extension (which is flush with the gable wall). The extension is unsympathetic to the C18 double-pile building in form and materials and unduly prominent in the streetscene.
- 5.1.7 In considering the proposed development due regard has been had to:
- Section 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990
 - The Framework paragraphs 199 and 200
 - Ribble Valley Core Strategy Policy DME4
 - Ribble Valley Core Strategy Policy DMG1
 - Building in Context Principles
 - The National Design Guide (2021)
 - Making changes to heritage assets' (Historic England, 2016)
 - The Forest of Bowland AONB Management Plan
- 5.1.8 The National Planning Practice Guidance states that "substantial harm is a high test, so it may not arise in many cases". The external additions are potentially reversible and most historic fabric is retained. Harm to the character and appearance of Grindleton Conservation Area and the setting of the Duke of York Hotel is 'less than substantial'.
- 5.1.9 NPPF paragraph 202 requires that 'less than substantial' harm be weighed against any public benefits of proposals including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use". The Ribble Valley Core Strategy also identifies:
- *"The expansion of existing businesses will, wherever appropriate, be considered favourably" (Key Statement EC1).*
 - *"Proposals that are intended to support business growth and the local economy will be supported in principle ... The expansion of existing firms within settlements will be permitted on land within or adjacent to their existing sites,*

provided no significant environmental problems are caused and the extension conforms to the other plan policies of the LDF" (Policy DMB1).

5.1.10 The re-use of the public house is welcomed for its economic (business growth and employment generation) and social (meeting place for the local and wider community) public benefits. Re-use for a public house also helps safeguard the historic interest of the site.

5.1.11 However, it is unclear whether the extent of development proposed, in particular the two-storey extension, which will appear incongruous and conspicuous, is necessary. Following concerns from the Highway Engineer the en-suite bedroom accommodation, which it was originally understood to be integral to business viability, were deleted from the scheme however the built form originally proposed was retained with Manager accommodation. Given the deletion of the en-suite accommodation it is considered that there is potential for a smaller scheme to be developed which would have the benefits associated with the development but result in less harm to the character and appearance of Grindleton Conservation Area and the setting of the Duke of York Hotel (Grade II listed). It is not considered that the harm resulting from the proposed development is outweighed by the benefits.

5.2 Impact upon Residential Amenity:

5.2.1 The concerns of local residents have been considered. The proposal (subject to minor amendment) does not have a significant impact on adjoining properties in respect to overshadowing, overbearing, or overlooking. The rear extension windows do overlook the neighbour's garden to the south but this could be resolved by obscure glazing. The proposed side extension will overshadow part of the west gable ground floor window of the neighbour to the east, but this is a secondary window to what appears to be a kitchen.

5.2.2 A noise assessment has not been submitted with the application and no observations have been received from Environmental Health (including hours of operation) but the applicant has advised that the hours of operation are to be reduced from the original request. Based on the historic use it is considered that the hours of operation are acceptable. Also, the application has changed in that the first floor is for Managers accommodation rather than letting which would overcome some of the objections.

5.3 Highway Safety and Accessibility:

5.3.1 The comments and advice (including suggested conditions) of LCC Highways has been considered. Appropriate conditions could be secured in the event of a positive recommendation.

5.4 Landscape/Ecology:

5.4.1 The submitted bat survey identifies bats will not be disturbed during demolition, the extension will not have a negative impact on a local bat population, no high value bat roost habitat will be removed, and no mitigation is required. The comments of RVBC Countryside will be reported to Committee.

6. **Observations/Consideration of Matters Raised/Conclusion**

- 6.1 In giving considerable importance and weight to the duties at section 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and in consideration to NPPF and Key Statement EN2, EN5, EC1 and EC2 and Policies DME4, DMG1, DMG2 and DMB1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy it is recommended that planning permission be refused.
- 6.2 The proposed extensions are incongruous and conspicuous and have a harmful impact upon the character and appearance of Grindleton Conservation Area and the setting of the Duke of York Hotel (Grade II listed) because of their form, size, location and materials. This is contrary to Ribble Valley Core Strategy Key Statement EN5 and Policy DME4 and DMG1.

UPDATE FOLLOWING 21st October PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING:

On 21 October 2021 Committee were minded to approve the application and deferred and delegated the application to the Director of Economic Development and Planning subject to appropriate conditions stipulating a minimum 2 m set back. Following discussion with the agent, they have advised that due to the location of the cellar it would not be a viable proposition and the maximum set back is 1.3m It is considered that although this is not ideal that the benefits associated with the development are sufficient to accept the reduced setback. The proposal has also been amended to secure appropriate design changes.

RECOMMENDATION 1: That the application be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

1. The development must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.

REASON: Required to be imposed pursuant to section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. Unless explicitly required by condition within this consent, the development hereby permitted shall be carried out in complete accordance with the proposals as detailed on drawings:

Location Plan -HTF-L01

Proposed Site Plan 6239-P01 Rev C received on 1/11/21

Proposed Floor Plan 6239-P02 Rev C received on 1/11/21

Proposed Elevation Plan 6239-P03 Rev C received on 1/11/21

REASON: For the avoidance of doubt and to clarify which plans are relevant to the consent.

Materials

3. Prior to the commencement of above ground construction of the development hereby approved full details of the external materials and surfacing materials shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development thereafter shall be constructed in accordance with the approved materials.

REASON: To ensure that the appearance of the development is appropriate to the character and setting of the area.

Highways

4. No part of the development hereby permitted shall be occupied until such time as the access arrangements shown on SPA drawing number 6239-P01 Rev C have been implemented in full.

REASON: To ensure that vehicles entering and leaving the site may pass each other clear of the highway, in a slow and controlled manner, in the interests of general highway safety and in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).

5. The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until such time as the parking and turning facilities have been implemented in accordance with SPA drawing number 6239-P01 Rev B. Thereafter the onsite parking provision shall be so maintained in perpetuity

REASON: To ensure that adequate off-street parking provision is made to reduce the possibility of the proposed development leading to on-street parking problems locally (and to enable vehicles to enter and leave the site in a forward direction) in the interests of highway safety and in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).

6. No building or use hereby permitted shall be occupied or the use commenced until the car parking area has been surfaced or paved in accordance with a scheme to be approved by the Local Planning Authority and the car parking spaces and manoeuvring areas marked out in accordance with the approved plan. The car parking area shall thereafter be kept free of obstruction and available for the parking cars at all times.

REASON: To allow for the effective use of the parking areas.

7. The premises shall not be open for customers after the following hours: 1200 and 02300 Monday to Thursday and 1200 to 2400 Friday to Sunday.

REASON: In order to protect the residential amenities of the occupiers of the adjacent properties

Should Committee consider the design amendments insufficient then the application should be refused as per the original recommendation.

RECOMMENDATION 2 That the application be REFUSED for the following reason:

1. The proposed extensions are incongruous and conspicuous and have a harmful impact upon the character and appearance of Grindleton Conservation Area and the setting of the Duke of York Hotel (Grade II listed) because of their form, size, location and materials. This is contrary to Ribble Valley Core Strategy Key Statement EN5 and Policy DME4 and DMG1.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

https://www.ribblevalley.gov.uk/site/scripts/planx_details.php?appNumber=3%2F2021%2F0725