

APPLICATION REPORT – 21/00532/LBC

Validation Date: 25 May 2021

Ward: Clayton West And Cuerden

Type of Application: Listed Building

Proposal: Application for listed building consent for works to the Grade II listed stables to facilitate a change of use of vacant care home (Use Class C2) to residential dwelling (Use Class C3) with associated staff and guest accommodation; internal and external repair/refurbishment works and alterations; selective demolition; and two storey extension to service buildings in south west corner of stableyard

Location: Cuerden Hall Shady Lane Cuerden Bamber Bridge Preston PR5 6AZ

Case Officer: Mike Halsall

Applicant: Mr Colin Shenton

Agent: Paul Butler Associates

Consultation expiry: 3 October 2022

Decision due by: 9 December 2022 (Extension of time agreed)

RECOMMENDATION

1. It is recommended that listed building consent is granted, subject to conditions.

SITE DESCRIPTION

2. The application relates to Cuerden Hall, a Grade II* listed building with attached Grade II listed stable block at the western end, forming a courtyard area. The Hall has early C18 origins and has undergone a significant level of historic change and development including significant remodelling and extension to the east in the early C19 and the addition to the west housing servant's accommodation. A detailed chronology of the site is provided within the submitted Conservation Management Plan.
3. Cuerden Hall lies in the Green Belt on the western side of Cuerden Valley approximately one mile to the south east of Bamber Bridge. The Hall is accessed from the west via a long, surfaced carriage drive off Shady Lane and its grounds extend to approximately 6.5 hectares. The driveway emerges through substantial woodland into a surfaced forecourt. The grounds include formal lawns, parking areas, hardstanding, areas of woodland and Grade II listed iron gates at the foot of terrace steps to the east of the Hall. The majority of the application site is subject to woodland Tree Preservation Order ref. 'Chorley BC TPO 8 (Cuerden) 2013'.
4. The Hall sits on an elevated site above the River Lostock with open land to the north and east. Modern housing developments of Cuerden Close and Berkeley Drive lie to west.
5. The Hall was most recently used as a care home operated by Sue Ryder Care, having been converted from offices in the latter half of the 1980s. The building has been vacant since 2020 when Sue Ryder moved to a purpose-built facility in Preston.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

6. The application seeks listed building consent for works to the Grade II listed stables to facilitate a change of use of vacant care home (Use Class C2) to residential dwelling (Use Class C3) with associated staff and guest accommodation; internal and external repair/refurbishment works and alterations; selective demolition; and two storey extension to service buildings in south west corner of stableyard.
7. Application refs. 21/00531/LBC and 21/00530/FULMAJ have been submitted in parallel with this application and respectively seek listed building consent for works to the Grade II* Hall and full planning permission for the works proposed by this application and application ref. 21/00532/LBC.
8. The proposal involves renovation works to repair fire damaged sections of the stable building (affectively a two storey extension to the existing undamaged building) and to create staff and guest accommodation.
9. The applicant's supporting Planning Statement identifies the following proposed works as intended to enhance the heritage significance of the building:
 - *“High quality landscaping proposals which return a sense a formality and high quality planting to the immediate setting of the Hall. This will also enhance the setting of Cuerden Valley Country Park. Reinstatement of the 1880s pond and tree thinning will help recreate historic designed views, enhancing setting.*
 - *A wholesale repair programme of the Hall and stables including repointing, window repairs and works to rainwater goods. The use of appropriate, traditional materials will enhance external appearance and help protect internal spaces.*
 - *Internally, the removal of inappropriate features such as suspended ceilings, modern floors, radiators, non-breathable concrete, M&E and modern fittings from the principal Wyatt rooms is highly beneficial due to the significance of these spaces.*
 - *Historic paint analysis will be used to inform the new decorative schemes within the principal rooms.*
 - *The proposal to construct a new orangery on the south face of the 1717 House is considered to be an enhancement to significance overall. Wyatt had intended for a conservatory to be constructed in this location. The proposals offer a contemporary interpretation of this design that will help connect the gardens and the house and allow the low-quality paving and loggia in this location to be replaced.*
 - *Reinstatement of missing historic architectural features for which there is archival evidence in the form of historic drawings and photographs – for example the reinstatement of chimney pots and internal joinery features.*
 - *Reinstatement of the fire damaged southern wing of the stableyard.*
 - *Replacement of external ladder access enclosures, currently detrimental to significant views of the hall, with sensitively designed and high-quality new stair and enclosure”*
10. The Planning Statement also explains that the scheme has also sought to avoid and minimise harmful impacts with appropriate mitigation taken including:
 - *“Carefully designed M&E systems that allow for use of the turrets as low-impact service risers.*
 - *Use of the existing plant room below the Service Wing to serve the new swimming pool and boilers.*
 - *Reuse of redundant and fire-damaged Stable ranges for guest accommodation rather than new structures in the landscape.*
 - *Use of spaces that have already been substantially altered to accommodate major change.*
 - *Reuse of existing bathroom and en-suite facilities where possible to avoid additional service installations.*
 - *More intrusive uses, such as the spa/sauna rooms, to be installed in areas of detrimental and neutral significance to avoid harm to principal rooms.*

- *An iterative design process has ensured evolution of proposals based on an understanding of significance and consultation with key stakeholders, including statutory bodies.”*

REPRESENTATIONS

11. Representations have been received from six individuals in objection to the proposal, including Councillor Mark Clifford, citing the following summarised issues:
 - Harm to bats
 - Insufficient level of ecology surveys having been undertaken
 - Ecological harm
 - Gates at the junction of Cuerden Close and the Hall driveway are unnecessary and block a right of way / easement
 - Request conditions be attached if the gates are approved so that residents and Utilities have free access, that the gates remain operational and access can still be gained by pedestrians
 - Vehicle turning space should be provided near the gates
 - Closure of the access for 5 years during the construction work is too long and interim access should be provided to residents
 - Object to the infilling of the tunnel on Cuerden Close from the Cinder Path due to harm to bats that hibernate there
 - Object to the staff accommodation in the stables, reports of bats within there
 - Comments about utilities – water bills paid through Sue Ryder previously
 - Landownership issues
 - Insufficient tree survey and lack of an arboricultural method statement and tree protection plan
 - Conflict with policy BNE1 of the Chorley Local Plan 2012-2026 in relation to temporary gates during construction work
 - Highway and pedestrian safety
 - Lack of consultation by the applicant
 - Conflict with policy BNE5 of the Chorley Local Plan 2012-2026 in relation to Green Belt harm
 - Conflict with Chorley Local Plan paragraph 2.14 with regards to harm to the character and distinctiveness of the area and visual intrusion
 - Conflict with sections of Chorley Local Plan 2012-2026, National Planning Policy Framework and Central Lancashire Core Strategy
 - The Hall is part of the lives of people in Cuerden since it was owned by the MOD in the 1950s and surrounding properties were lived-in by the workers, Sue Ryder maintained public access and the proposal cuts it out
 - Proposal does not take into account how it will impact local community
 - Conflict with policy BNE10 of the Chorley Local Plan re. tree harm
 - Conflict with policy BNE11 of the Chorley Local Plan re. protected species
 - Drainage and flood risk
 - Fear the hall will become a multi-residency and not a single household
 - Light pollution
12. One representation has been received which states they neither object nor support the application, citing the following summarised points:
 - Welcome the proposal to change the building back into residential use
 - Ecology assessment is inadequate
 - Harm to heritage assets
 - Request public access to some Permissive Paths is maintained
 - Similar issues to those identified above by those objecting to the proposal

13. Campaign to Protect Rural England have also commented in objection to any blocking of any paths and roads, infilling of the Cinder Path Tunnel, any tree and hedge loss, ecological harm and any new development in the Green Belt.
14. The Wildlife Officer for Cuerden Valley Park Trust has commented as follows: I note with a little concern the development at Cuerden Hall. The tunnel which carries the Cinder Path under the main driveway is a regular roost for Brown Long-eared bats and they have also been recorded as hibernating there in winter. In addition to this, when Sue Ryder did a survey of the main hall the ecologists reported the following "The Stable building supports a very large maternity (breeding) roost of brown long eared bats with smaller numbers of non-breeding summer roosting common and soprano pipistrelle bats. In overall terms the roost is likely to be one of the largest of its type in the County and is of regional significance" I am sure the Planning Dept at Chorley will take this into consideration when dealing with the application from the owners of Cuerden Hall.
15. The vast majority of the above representations relate to issues which are covered within the committee report in relation to the full planning application, ref. 21/00530/FULMAJ and are not material considerations for this listed building consent application. The material considerations of this application are limited to the works to the listed building and their potential impact upon the significance of the building.

CONSULTATIONS

16. Historic England: have responded with no objection to the proposal, stating that the proposals have been considered carefully and respond sensitively to the significance of the listed building. They state that a number of elements of the works, including the reconfiguration of the interior of the building, and the reconsideration of the wider landscape masterplan, address concerns that have arisen due to the building's previous use, and will have a positive impact. They have, however, recommended that the local planning authority attach conditions to any approvals, as there are a number of areas where the sensitivity of the works will be determined by the exact details of the proposals. For example, providing details of the exact nature of the conservatory's construction, including sectional details of the windows and roof lanterns, samples of the proposed materials, and details of how it will physically tie into the building.
17. Historic Buildings And Places: have not responded on this occasion.
18. The Council For British Archaeology: have not responded on this occasion.
19. SPAB: have not responded on this occasion.
20. The Victorian Society: have not responded on this occasion.
21. Twentieth Century Society: have not responded on this occasion.
22. Lancashire County Council Archaeology Service: have recommended that the following is secured by a planning condition:
 - Photographic record of the Stables
 - Drawn and photographic record of the Cinder Path Tunnel
 - Earthwork survey of the woodland features in Wilbraham's Wood identified by the ARM 2013 DBA
 - Test pitting and trial trenching, as outlined in the Matrix Archaeology 2021 DBA
23. The Georgian Group: initially responded in objection to the proposal. Whilst they welcomed much of the proposed works, they objected to the erection of the conservatory, filling of the Cinder Path tunnel and the service court and consider the grandeur of the swimming pool structure is inappropriate in this location and should be moved to the stable-yard. Following a site visit and agreed changes that have been made to the proposals, they have subsequently removed their objection to the proposal.

24. Cuerden Parish Council: have responded in objection to the proposal, as follows:

"The Phase 1 Habitat report gives insufficient information on the current Bat population within the grounds AND the hall. We have concerns about light pollution and the effects this will have on the local wildlife. There has been no consultation with United Utilities with regards to the condition of the water supply pipes to the hall and to surrounding houses and offices. Within this application there is no reference made to the future supplies of water which is currently administered and billed to households and offices in Cuerden by the owner, Sue Ryder Care. The existing pipework was of concern to United Utilities many years ago but has not been addressed since. With plans for a swimming pool the Parish Council feel that this, and new living quarters, could put excessive strain on an already weakened pipe system. The Parish Council has concerns about the very basic tree survey. There are no details of the qualifications and experience of the site surveyor. The Parish Council have concerns about the removal of long-standing trees in this area and with insufficient data from a tree report object to this proposal. We have concerns about light pollution and the effects this will have on the local wildlife. The Parish Council have concerns about easement and resident's rights to access their homes if gates are to be erected at the entrance to the main drive and at the entrance to Cuerden Close. Concerns have been raised about safety, access for emergency vehicles, deliveries, service vehicles such as refuse collection and oil deliveries. Until these areas are addressed the Parish Council objects to this application".

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Impact on the listed building

25. Paragraph 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the PLBCA) are relevant to the 'Special considerations affecting planning functions'.

Section 66 states:

- (1) *In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State 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.*
- (2) *Without prejudice to section 72, in the exercise of the powers of appropriation, disposal and development (including redevelopment) conferred by the provision of sections 232, 233 and 235(1) of the principal Act, a local authority shall have regard to the desirability of preserving features of special architectural or historic interest, and in particular, listed buildings.*

26. Section 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) refers to conserving and enhancing the historic environment. The following paragraphs contained therein are considered to be pertinent in this case:

194. In determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.

195. 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.

197. In determining applications, local planning authorities 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.*

199. When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.

200. 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. Substantial harm to or loss of:

- a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional;*
- b) assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, registered battlefields, grade I and II* listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional.*

201. Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to (or total loss of significance of) a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or total loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss, or all of the following apply:

- a) the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site; and*
- b) no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation; and*
- c) conservation by grant-funding or some form of not for profit, charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and*
- d) the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use.*

202. Where a development proposal will 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.

206. Local planning authorities should look for opportunities for new development within Conservation Areas and World Heritage Sites, and within the setting of heritage assets, to enhance or better reveal their significance. Proposals that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to the asset (or which better reveal its significance) should be treated favourably.

27. The Central Lancashire Core Strategy (2012) (the Core Strategy), policy 16 refers to Heritage Assets. This policy mirrors that given in the Framework and states that it seeks to:

'Protect and seek opportunities to enhance the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting by:

- a. *Safeguarding heritage assets from inappropriate development that would cause harm to their significances.'*

28. The Chorley Local Plan 2012 – 2026, policy BNE8 refers to the Protection and Enhancement of Heritage Assets. Essentially this policy mirrors the Framework. Paragraph b, states that, *'Applications will be granted where they sustain, conserve and, where appropriate, enhance the significance, appearance, character and setting of the heritage asset itself and the surrounding historic environment and where they show consideration for the following: iii, The Conservation and, where appropriate, the enhancement of the setting of heritage assets.'*

Heritage Assessment

29. The Council's heritage advisors, Growth Lancashire, have provided the following comments in relation to the proposals:

"The LPA in this instance is required under the P (LBCA) Act to have special regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings and its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. Recent High Court judgements identify the need to give considerable (great) weight and importance to that duty. Indeed P.199 of the NPPF requires greater weight to be applied to more significant heritage assets.

I have read through the relevant supporting documents and attended a previous site meeting (at pre-application stage) to discuss the initial proposals.

The key heritage issue for the LPA to consider, in relation to the LBC application, is;

1. *Whether the proposed alterations/works to the listed building would harm the significance of Cuerden Hall and if so can the proposed works be justified by any public benefits delivered by the scheme.*

Significance of the heritage assets

A detailed description and phased analysis of the Hall is contained in the Conservation Management Plan and is referenced in the other submission documents.

The significance of the building is explained in Section 6 of volume 1 of the CMP. I am in agreement with the stated levels of significance which are identified in P148-152 of the CMP.

The multi phased nature of the Hall lends itself to an approach which seeks to limit the interventions to the more significant elements in lieu of concentrating the changes to the later additions and in particular the C19 service court which lies to the west of the 1717 house.

Impact on the significance of the heritage asset

The assessment of the impacts is contained in volume 3 of the CMP. The report contains a full and detailed assessment which is identified in a table of impacts (p.344-379) and in plan form (p.380-401). A summary of the impacts is included on P.340-341.

I am generally in agreement with the findings and the levels of harm/impact assigned within the assessment including those elements of the work which represents positive change. My only issue is with the assessment of the likely impact of the new Orangery which runs across the rear (south) elevation of the 1717 house and fills in the space at GF level between the Wyatt house and Service Court. Whilst this work replaces an existing loggia and does not seem out of place it does however impact on how you appreciate the existing asset and how you view onto the south elevation of the 1717 house. I would assign this

element as having a low adverse impact rather than low beneficial as provided in the report.

Nevertheless I find the work to the property to be well thought out and suitably detailed. The reports themselves provide a sound and convincing justification for the necessary interventions.

In relation to the principle interventions my views are as follows;

Swimming pool and enclosure

In principle I raised no objections to this insertion of the pool in the Pre-application discussions. Whilst it is clearly a modern intervention the Courtyard area is of lower significance and is already affected by modern development which is not a positive contributor. The enclosure will be largely glazed and will be unseen from view in relation to any of the principle elevations of the building. The design reflects the style of the adjoining buildings without being a pastiche. In this respect any impact is likely limited and I share the view expressed in the submission documents that the harm is low.

Orangery/conservatory

Whilst I can understand the wish to provide a better interface/transition into the garden from the south elevation I feel the erection of a new structure across the GF causes some harm to how we appreciate the rear elevation of the Hall. The presence of previous drawings re does not justify the intervention as the proposal has to be assessed as a change to the designated LB. I am however not opposed to the design and feel (as with the swimming pool enclosure) that it is well thought out and considered and its effect of the elevation is somewhat limited. I would regard the change as being at the low end of less than substantial harm.

I note that the work to facilitate the addition and those to open up the dining/kitchen area (to provide a more modern living space) are identified as having a medium adverse impact in the Assessment of Heritage Impact report (volume 3 of the CMP).

New staircase

This work to provide an oval stair from basement level to the 2nd floor provides better use and accessibility through the different phases of the Hall. The work is justified in the DAS and assessed in the Impact assessment. Visually whilst restrained in design and involves reworking of an area already altered it nevertheless involves a major intervention and one which is visible at roof line level. I feel the high quality architectural design helps the work blend in with the overall composition of the hall and any view of the stair will be seen in the context of the larger/taller roof (which it adjoins) immediately to the east. However similar to the comments on the Orangery this represents a physical and structure change which impacts on the form of the existing Hall. Nevertheless the work would have a low, less than substantial impact.

Stable Courtyard

It is acknowledged that the significance of the stables is considerably lower than the main Hall. Generally I feel the proposed works to reconstruct/repair the fire damaged sections to be a positive intervention and help retain the integrity of the original design. Subject to detailed design/materials etc. I raise no objections.

Gate lodges

I have no objections to the addition of the new entrance gates/lodges. The entrance is visually detached from the Listed Hall and will be seen in its own context. Given the status of the Hall I feel the design seems appropriate.

Landscape/gardens

I note the comments re the Cinder Path Tunnel both from The Georgian Society and LCC Archaeology. Whilst not listed in its own right the structure is clearly of heritage interest. I believe following discussions, it has been agreed that the proposals will no longer involve the infilling of the tunnel and will be temporarily bridged over during construction works. Following the construction works the tunnel will be repaired. This seems an appropriate course of action. The LPA will however need to consider how this work can be secured through the PP/LBC.

Summary

I note the comments by Historic England (29 June 2021) and the Georgian Society (29 June 2021 and subsequent comments 08 September 2021). I also note that amendments to the scheme (and supporting documents) have been made to address concerns from the Georgian Society. Historic England have no objection to the scheme.

In summary, I conclude that the proposals will undoubtedly cause some visual change to the building however I am however mindful that this need not translate into significant levels of harm or loss of significance of the building.

The impacts noted above would represent a low/medium level of harm and will fall in the less than substantial category as defined by the NPPF.

It is clear that some of the changes and in particular the change back to a single dwelling and the investment into its repair will bring forward considerable public benefits. The removal of the modern room partitions and stripping back of the former institutional use will better reveal the high significance of the internal layout and the special character of the building. Benefits are also gained by the repair works to the building including the roof, rain water goods and windows.

Overall I think the proposals represent positive works for the future of the building and will help sustain the Hall's very high significance. In this respect the benefits gained by the proposal far outweigh the harm generated by the interventions.

The NPPF requires LPA's to consider the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them into viable uses consistent with their conservation. Whilst any level of harm caused to heritage assets is regrettable this must be balanced by the overall benefits being achieved by the scheme. Paragraph 202 of the NPPF allows the harm to a heritage asset to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. The LPA must however give great weight (NPPF P.199) to any harm in its planning balance.

Conclusion / recommendation

As I am required to do so, I have given the duty's imposed by s.66(1) of the P(LBCA) Act 1990 considerable weight in my comments. NPPF Paragraph 199 states that great weight should be given to the conservation of heritage assets regardless of the level of harm. High Court decisions have been clear that lower levels of harm does not equate to a lesser objection given the principle duty under the Act is to preserve the heritage asset.

As indicated above in my view I feel, when taken as a whole, the proposal will preserve the special interest of the designated heritage assets and that any harm caused by the works is adequately justified and mitigated against. In my view taking the proposal as a whole, which I am required to do, the benefits far outweigh any identified harm and therefore on balance the application meets the duty to preserve and the objectives of Chapter 16 of the NPPF and conforms to the policies of the Local Plan.

If the LPA agrees then I would suggest that suitable Conditions are added to secure;

- *The submission of a detailed schedule of all materials to be employed including relevant samples. This will need to include details of any new stone and brick work, coursing, pointing profiles, mortar mixes, rainwater goods, windows and doors.*
 - *I work methodology (statement) for removal and repair works, proposed alterations and proposed finishes on the building explaining the practices to be employed to safeguard fabric and mitigate harm or loss during the construction phase.”*
30. Taking the above comments into account, it is clear that some elements of the proposal, namely the new staircase, conservatory/orangery and swimming pool extensions would cause some harm to the significance of the Hall. This harm is of a low/medium, less than substantial scale and must be given great weight in the planning balance.
31. The Local Planning Authority must therefore consider the wider public benefits of the proposal against the level of harm to the significance of the heritage asset affected in its planning balance.
32. As noted by the Council’s heritage advisor, the change back to a single dwelling and the investment into the repair of the building will bring forward considerable public benefits. The removal of the modern room partitions and stripping back of the former institutional use will better reveal the high significance of the internal layout and the special character of the building. Historic England have noted that the proposal has been considered carefully by the applicant, responds sensitively to the significance of the listed building and will have a positive impact. This should be given significant weight in the planning balance.
33. On balance, it is considered that the benefits of the proposal from the programme of restoration work outweighs the harm caused from the new proposed additions. The proposal therefore accords with the aforementioned national guidance and local planning policies.

CONCLUSION

34. As noted by Historic England, the applicant has carefully considered the proposals which respond sensitively to the significance of the listed building. The reconfiguration of the interior of the building and the reconsideration of the wider landscape masterplan, address concerns that have arisen due to the building’s previous use and will have a positive impact. The proposal would nevertheless result in less than substantial harm to the character of the listed building by virtue of the new extensions.
35. On balance, it is considered that the wider public benefits of bringing the listed building back to its original use as a single dwelling and the associated programme of restoration work comfortably outweigh the harm caused by the proposal.
36. The proposal accords with the aims of policies within the Framework and the Chorley Local Plan 2012 – 2026 and is accordingly recommended for approval.

RELEVANT HISTORY OF THE SITE

Ref: 00/00781/ADV **Decision:** REFADV **Decision Date:** 13 December 2000
Description: Erection 1 no. totem sign.

Ref: 98/00269/LBC **Decision:** PERLBC **Decision Date:** 2 September 1998
Description: Application for listed building consent to demolish and make safe gable wall and roof to courtyard stables,

Ref: 06/00717/LBC **Decision:** PERLBC **Decision Date:** 25 August 2006

Description: Listed Building Consent to install a ladder tie system around the perimeter of the building, install wire system to part of the roof parapets and exchange and/or improve existing ladders for safe access, all to comply with the Working at Heights Regulations 2005

Ref: 13/01033/SCE **Decision:** PESCEZ **Decision Date:** 12 November 2013
Description: Request for Screening Opinion Pursuant to Regulation 5 of The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England and Wales) Regulations 2011.

Ref: 19/01085/ADV **Decision:** PERADV **Decision Date:** 25 February 2020
Description: Installation of 1 no. hoarding board fronting Wigan Road (A49) and 1 no. hoarding board on Shady Lane.

Ref: 21/00530/FULMAJ **Decision:** PCO **Decision Date:** Pending
Description: Change of use of vacant care home (Use Class C2) to residential dwelling (Use Class C3) with associated staff and guest accommodation; internal and external repair/refurbishment works and alterations; selective demolition; extension including orangery, staircase enclosure, creation of swimming pool with glazed enclosure, and two storey extension to service buildings in south west corner of stableyard; hard and soft landscaping works including associated structures and landscape features including reinstatement of dilapidated pond; construction of gate lodges and secondary gates to access road; removal of driveway bridge crown and repair of tunnel; provision of associated car parking; together with other associated development

Ref: 21/00531/LBC **Decision:** PCO **Decision Date:** Pending
Description: Application for listed building consent for works to the Grade II* listed hall to facilitate a change of use of vacant care home (Use Class C2) to residential dwelling (Use Class C3) including internal and external repair/refurbishment works and alterations; extension including orangery, staircase enclosure and creation of swimming pool with glazed enclosure

Ref: 92/00677/FUL **Decision:** PERFPP **Decision Date:** 23 October 1992
Description: New foul and surface water sewers (approx 1333 metres) and erection of prefabricated building to house control equipment to serve existing premises

Ref: 86/00558/FUL **Decision:** PERFPP **Decision Date:** 18 March 1987
Description: Alterations

Ref: 85/00834/FUL **Decision:** PERFPP **Decision Date:** 25 February 1986
Description: Change of use from offices to a sue ryder home providing nursing and residential care with associated facilities including coffee and gift shop

Ref: 80/00204/FUL **Decision:** PERFPP **Decision Date:** 17 March 1980
Description: Change of use of part of stable block to offices

Ref: 77/00015/FUL **Decision:** PERFPP **Decision Date:** 25 January 1977
Description: Change of use of part of Cuerden Hall to Offices

Ref: 77/00014/FUL **Decision:** PERFPP **Decision Date:** 25 January 1977
Description: Entrance canopy

RELEVANT POLICIES: The Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that the Local Planning Authority has a primary duty in relation to listed buildings to 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. Policy 16 of the Central Lancashire Core Strategy, 'Heritage Assets' and Policy BNE8, 'Protection and Enhancement of Heritage Assets' of the Adopted Chorley Local Plan 2012 - 2026 seek to protect and enhance the Borough's heritage. Also of relevance is the Framework (National Planning Policy Framework), section 16.

Suggested conditions

1. The proposed development must be begun not later than three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: Required to be imposed by Section 18 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans below:

Title	Plan Ref	Received On
Proposed Ground Floor Plan	240729-PUR-00-XX-DR-A-2002 Rev P01	29 April 2022
Proposed First Floor Plan	240729-PUR-00-XX-DR-A-2003 Rev P01	29 April 2022
Proposed Second Floor Plan	240729-PUR-00-XX-DR-A-2004 Rev P02	12 September 2022
Proposed Stableyard GF Sheet 1	240729-PUR-00-XX-DR-A-2041 Rev P01	29 April 2022
Proposed Stableyard GF Sheet 2	240729-PUR-00-XX-DR-A-2042 Rev P01	29 April 2022
Proposed Stableyard GF Sheet 3	240729-PUR-00-XX-DR-A-2043 Rev P01	29 April 2022
Proposed Stableyard FF Sheet 4	240729-PUR-00-XX-DR-A-2045 Rev P01	29 April 2022
Proposed Stableyard FF Sheet 5	240729-PUR-00-XX-DR-A-2046 Rev P01	29 April 2022
Proposed Office Wing GF Sheet 1	240729-PUR-00-XX-DR-A-2040 Rev P01	29 April 2022
Proposed Office Wing FF Sheet 1	240729-PUR-00-XX-DR-A-2044 Rev P02	12 September 2022
Proposed Elevations Stableyard Sheet 01	240729-PUR-00-XX-DR-A-2100 Rev P01	29 April 2022
Proposed Elevations Stableyard Sheet 02	240729-PUR-00-XX-DR-A-2101 Rev P01	29 April 2022
Proposed Repair Elevations Sheet 04	240729-PUR-00-XX-DR-A-2102 Rev P01	29 April 2022
Proposed Elevation Office Wing Sheet 06	240729-PUR-00-XX-DR-A-2105 Rev P02	29 April 2022
Proposed Repair Elevations	240729-PUR-00-XX-DR-A-2200 Rev P01	29 April 2022
Proposed Repair Elevations Sheet 2	240729-PUR-00-XX-DR-A-2201 Rev P01	29 April 2022
Proposed Repair Elevations Sheet 03	240729-PUR-00-	29 April 2022

	XX-DR-A-2202 Rev P01	
	240729-PUR-00-XX-DR-A-2203 Rev P01	29 April 2022
Proposed Repair Elevations Sheet 05	240729-PUR-00-XX-DR-A-2204 Rev P01	29 April 2022
Proposed Repair Elevations Sheet 06	240729-PUR-00-XX-DR-A-2205 Rev P02	12 September 2022
Proposed Repair Elevations Sheet 07	240729-PUR-00-XX-DR-A-2206 Rev P01	12 September 2022
Proposed Repair Elevations Sheet 08	240729-PUR-00-XX-DR-A-2207 Rev P01	29 April 2022
Repair Elevations Office Wing 06	240729-PUR-00-XX-DR-A-2105 Rev P02	12 September 2022
Typical Repair Details, Masonry	077572-CUR-ZZ-ZZ-DR-S-27002-01	29 April 2022
Typical Repair Details, Trusses and Roof	077572-CUR-ZZ-ZZ-DR-S-27001-0	29 April 2022
Roof Repairs	240729-PUR-00-RF-DR-A-2120 Rev P01	10 September 2022
Roof Condition Survey Key	240729-PUR-00-XX-DR-A-2221 Rev P01	29 April 2022
Proposed Bat Loft Option B	240729-PUR-00-XX-DR-A-2151 Rev P01	12 September 2022
Cuerden Bat Volume Options Option 2	240729-PUR-00-XX-M3-A-9010 Rev P01	12 September 2022
Landscape removals, retentions and demolitions	376-L-P-110 Rev P03	22 November 2022
Proposed First Floor with Demolition	240729-PUR-00-XX-DR-A-1004 Rev P01	29 April 2022
Location Plan	240729-PUR-00-XX-DR-A-1000 Rev 5	24 November 2022
Existing Ground Floor with Demolition	240729-PUR-00-XX-DR-A-1003 Rev P01	29 April 2022
Proposed Second Floor with Demolition	240729-PUR-00-XX-DR-A-1005 Rev P01	29 April 2022
Existing Elevations Stableyard Sheet 01	240729-PUR-00-XX-DR-A-1010 Rev P02	29 April 2022
Existing Elevations Stableyard Sheet 02	240729-PUR-00-XX-DR-A-1011 Rev P02	12 September 2022
Existing Elevations Stableyard Sheet 03	240729-PUR-00-XX-DR-A-1012 Rev P02	12 September 2022

Existing Elevations Sheet 04	240729-PUR-00-XX-DR-A-1013 Rev P02	12 September 2022
Existing Elevations Sheet 05	240729-PUR-00-XX-DR-A-1014 Rev P02	12 September 2022
Existing Elevations Sheet 06	240729-PUR-00-XX-DR-A-1015 Rev P02	12 September 2022
Proposed Site Plan	240729-PUR-00-XX-DR-A-2000 Rev P03	12 September 2022

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

3. Prior to the commencement of any external works to the buildings samples of all external facing and roofing materials (notwithstanding any details shown on previously submitted plan(s) and specification) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. All works shall be undertaken strictly in accordance with the details as approved.

Reason: In the interests of the character and appearance of the Listed Building.

4. Details of the proposed fenestration (windows, doors and other joinery), to include full details at a scale of not less than 1:10 shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to any proposed fenestration works being carried out. All works shall then be undertaken strictly in accordance with the details as approved.

Reason: To maintain the integrity of the historic building.

5. Full details of the proposed rainwater goods, including the eaves detail, to be used on the building shall have been submitted to and been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to proposed rainwater goods being implemented. All works undertaken on site should be strictly in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of the character and appearance of the Listed Building.

6. Full details shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in relation to the type of mortar to be used on the building prior to mortar works being carried out. The required details shall include the ratio of the materials to be used in the mortar, its colour and the proposed finished profile of the pointing. The work shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of the character and appearance of the Listed Building.

7. Notwithstanding the details already submitted, this consent relates to the use of 'flush' fitting roof lights to the stable building, only in accordance with details to be first submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include the model/make, exact dimensions and the fixing detail (including a cross section) of the roof light(s) to be used. The work shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of the character and appearance of the Listed Building.

8. Prior to any works taking place above DPC level, a work methodology for the repair and treatment of the listed building, including internal finishes, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. All works shall be undertaken strictly in accordance with the details as approved.

Reason: To ensure that the materials used are visually appropriate to the listed building and the locality.

9. No works shall take place until the applicant, or their agent or successors in title, have secured the implementation of a programme of building recording and analysis to at least level 2 as outlined in *Understanding Historic Buildings: A Guide to Good Recording Practice* (Historic England 2016). This must be carried out by a professionally qualified archaeological/building recording consultant or organisation. Upon completion of the programme of building recording and analysis it shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority. The programme should include the following:

- Photographic record of the Stables
- Drawn and photographic record of the Cinder Path Tunnel
- Earthwork survey of the woodland features in Wilbraham's Wood identified by the ARM 2013 DBA
- Test pitting and trial trenching, as outlined in the Matrix Archaeology 2021 DBA

Reason: To ensure and safeguard the recording and inspection of matters of archaeological/historic importance associated with the building.

10. A programme of archaeological work (building recording, earthwork survey and evaluation by test pitting and trial trenching) in accordance with a written scheme of investigation, which shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority, shall be undertaken. Where the programme of test pitting and/or trial trenching encounters archaeological features that require further archaeological investigation, such works will be the subject of a separate supplementary written scheme of investigation. 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.

11. Prior to any works taking place involving the approved conservatory, a work methodology detailing the exact nature of the conservatory's construction, including sectional details of the windows and roof lanterns and details of how it will physically tie into the building shall first be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. All works shall be undertaken strictly in accordance with the details as approved.

Reason: To ensure that the extension is appropriate to the listed building.