



Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 10 June 2025

Site visits made on 9 and 10 June 2025

by R Morgan BSc (Hons) MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21st July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/B2355/W/25/3361545

Land South of Hardman Avenue, Rawtenstall BB4 6BL

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by MCI Developments Ltd against the decision of Rossendale Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 2023/0462.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing buildings and the erection of 44 dwellings, creation of a new vehicular access off Hardman Avenue, along with landscaping, public open space, drainage and all other associated works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for demolition of existing buildings and the erection of 44 dwellings, creation of a new vehicular access off Hardman Avenue, along with landscaping, public open space, drainage and all other associated works at land south of Hardman Avenue, Rawtenstall BB4 6BL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2023/0462, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Council refused the application on five grounds. The third reason for refusal concerned the failure to make financial contributions towards off-site public open space and playing pitches, and to support the running of a bus service. During the appeal, the appellant confirmed they are now able to make the requested contributions, and I have been provided with a signed legal agreement to that effect.
3. The need to provide financial contributions is no longer in contention, and so I have not included it as a main issue in this appeal. However, it is still necessary to consider whether the agreed contributions meet the tests set out in the relevant regulations. I have addressed this matter in the 'Planning Obligation' section of this decision letter.
4. Before the hearing, the Council said that it no longer intended to defend its fourth reason for refusal, concerning highways issues. The main parties no longer disagree on these matters, but during consultation local residents have expressed concerns about the effect of additional traffic on local roads, parking issues and the adequacy of the proposed access. I have addressed these points under 'Other matters' below.

5. The appeal site is adjacent to the Grade II listed Carr Farmhouse. In accordance with Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act), I have had special regard to the desirability of preserving the setting of the listed building in this appeal.
6. Carr Barn is located immediately adjacent to Carr Farmhouse, and lies within the appeal site. Carr Barn and Carr Farmhouse would once have been part of the same farmstead, but are now in separate ownership and divided by a stone wall. Whilst physically close, it is likely that historically there would have been separation between the domestic use of Carr Farmhouse and the agricultural use of Carr Barn. Given their different functions, and having regard to recent caselaw¹, I am satisfied that Carr Barn does not fall within the curtilage of the listed building for the purposes of the Act.
7. Notwithstanding that, Carr Barn is very close to Carr Farmhouse, and, as discussed below, forms part of its setting. Carr Barn also has local heritage value of its own, and during the application, the Council identified it as being a non-designated heritage asset (NDHA). I agree that there are good reasons to treat Carr Barn as a NDHA, and have done so in this appeal.

Main Issues

8. The main issues are:
 - the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area,
 - the effect of the proposal on the setting of the Grade II listed Carr Farmhouse and on Carr Barn as a non-designated heritage asset, and
 - whether the proposal would provide acceptable living conditions for future occupiers, with particular regard to internal space.

Reasons

Character and appearance

9. The appeal site is an area of largely undeveloped land on the edge of Rawtenstall. The site, which has an area of around 1.7 hectares, rises beyond the existing houses on Hardman Avenue and Carr Farm Close, towards open moorland and the hills beyond. At its southern extent, the site is bounded by a farm track and a powerline. From here, the countryside begins to have a distinctly upland character.
10. Much of the appeal site comprises open land used for grazing horses, subdivided by wooden or wire fences. On its eastern side, the site includes a pond surrounded by trees and shrubs, adjacent to a larger area of woodland beyond the site boundary. Within the northern part of the site is Carr Barn and the attached Carr Barn Cottage, both of which would be demolished to form a new vehicular access from Hardman Avenue.
11. With the exception of Carr Barn, Carr Barn Cottage and the adjacent manège, the appeal site falls within a larger area allocated for up to 25 houses under policies HS2 and H15 of the Rossendale Local Plan 2021 (LP).

¹ R (Hampshire CC) v SSEFRA [2022] QB 103

12. The Council has explained that the LP figure of 25 dwellings reflects the sensitive location of the site, on the edge of the countryside and adjacent to the Grade II listed Carr Farmhouse. The Local Plan Examiner's Report notes that a development of up to 25 units here, based on a density of 20 dwellings per hectare (dph), would allow for buffering of the heritage asset and landscaping to soften the edges of the development.
13. The appeal site does not exactly follow the LP allocation, but the need to address the interface with the countryside and the setting of the listed building equally apply. The site is in an elevated position, and development here would extend the existing settlement edge up the valley side, onto an area which is currently green. The change would be visible in distant views from various vantage points on the other side of the valley, including the footpath above the ski slope, which provides panoramic views of the wider hillside. From here, new built development on the appeal site would be seen above the line of existing development, encroaching onto the open countryside and increasing the extent of built form.
14. Hardman Avenue and Lomas Lane are steep in places, and from the surrounding streets to the north the new houses would be well screened by existing built development and topography. However, the proposed development would be seen from Carr Farm Close, higher sections of Lomas Lane and the houses on Hardman Avenue which back onto the site. It would also be visible from the footpaths which run alongside the site, and those which criss-cross the hillside above.
15. The development would be seen in close and distant views, and would inevitably lead to a significant change, from open, undeveloped land to a housing estate. However, the principle of development has already been accepted here, and any new housing development would have a visual impact.
16. The appeal scheme proposes a density which is comparable with, or lower than, that of the nearby streets to the north. Whilst it reflects surrounding development, I acknowledge that a less dense scheme, as supported by LP policy H15, could allow for larger gardens and additional landscaping throughout the development. This could provide further softening at the countryside edge, and help the new houses assimilate into its countryside setting.
17. A lower number of houses on the site might result in a reduced visual impact, but the appeal proposal has been designed to mitigate its effect on the wider landscape, and to reflect the character of the surrounding area, as required by LP policy ENV3. The southernmost, top corner of the site would remain free of built form, and the scheme provides for buffer planting along the eastern and southern boundaries, as site specific LP policy H15 requires.
18. Soft landscaping would be included at the site entrance, to provide space around the listed Carr Farmhouse. A larger area of open space would be retained along the eastern boundary, which would incorporate the existing pond and new tree and wildflower planting. Within the site, greenery would be incorporated through front and rear gardens, with beech hedging around front boundaries.
19. The proposed houses would largely be arranged in rows, at 90 degrees to the hillside, continuing the existing pattern of development, which follows the contours of the slope. The houses would be faced with reconstituted stone, which would reflect the colour palette of the surrounding built development. Together, these

factors would help to integrate the development into the landscape and mitigate the visual impact, when viewed from a distance and close by.

20. Penny Bennett Landscape Architects were commissioned by the Council to review the application. The consultant concluded that the landscaping proposals have been well considered to reduce the landscape and visual effects, with further refinements made during the course of the application.
21. I agree that the landscape proposals are appropriate. However, because of the scale of the proposal, there would be a modest amount of additional landscape and visual harm, over and above that accepted through the LP allocation.
22. Overall, I conclude that the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. New housing in this location would not comply with the objectives to protect the distinctive landscape character of Rossendale set out in LP policy ENV3. However, the principle of development here has been established. Taking into account the measures to minimise the visual impact of the scheme, the conflict with policy ENV3 over and above that already accepted would be minor.
23. The scheme would not comply with LP policy H15 in terms of the housing requirement figure and development density, but I am satisfied that the specific landscaping requirements contained in the policy have been met. The conflict with policy H15 is partial.
24. In relation to matters of character and appearance, I have not identified any particular conflict with the requirements for high quality development set out in LP strategic policy ENV1.

Heritage assets

25. I agree with the conclusions of the appellant's Heritage Statement (Wardle Armstrong, September 2023) that the heritage assets which would be affected by the proposed scheme would be the Grade II listed Carr Farmhouse, and Carr Barn, which as mentioned above is a NDHA.
26. Being located on the valley side and edge of the urban area, the appeal site could be considered to form part of the wider setting of the Rawtenstall Conservation Area (CA). However, due to topography and intervening buildings, the site is not readily visible from within the CA, and the proposed development on the edge of the town, adjacent to an area of modern housing, would have very little impact on its significance.
27. Development at the appeal site would not affect either the Grade II listed Church of St Mary or the Former United Methodist Church, both of which derive their significance from their immediate setting within the historic core of the town.
28. Owing to the degree of physical and visual separation between them, development of the appeal site would not detract from the setting of the Grade II listed Hardman's Mill and Chimney, or the Longholme Methodist Chapel, both of which are within 1km of the site. The Grade II listed Gravestone in the grounds of Carr House is close to the sit but its setting is limited in extent. The Gravestone would not be affected by the proposed development.

Carr Farmhouse

29. Carr Farmhouse is Grade II listed and lies adjacent to the appeal site. It dates from the late 18th century. The building would once have been part of an isolated farmstead, associated with surrounding agricultural land.
30. As a rare example of this type and age of building, Carr Farmhouse has historical interest. Architectural significance is also derived from the appearance and fabric of the building, with the use of local building materials contributing to its vernacular character.
31. Historical maps from between 1840 and 1930 show a range of outbuildings associated with Carr Farmhouse. The outbuildings were positioned just behind the house on its north-eastern side, where the existing Carr Barn and Cottage are sited. Carr Barn has been altered over time, but it seems likely that part of the building dates to a similar time to the Farmhouse.
32. Carr Farmhouse faces towards the south-west, with the main windows looking out across the grassed front garden area, towards the open countryside beyond. With its largely blank rear elevation, the Farmhouse turns its back to Carr Barn, which would once have been part of the working farm.
33. A footpath from Carr Farm Close to Hardman Avenue passes immediately adjacent to Carr Farmhouse and Carr Barn. From here, the close relationship between the two buildings is readily apparent. The proximity of the Barn to the Farmhouse, and the arrangement of the buildings around a small courtyard, gives an appreciation as to how the farmstead would have operated, and indicates that this would likely have been a relatively low status farm.
34. When viewed from Carr Farm Close, Carr Barn forms a backdrop to the Farmhouse, reinforcing its agricultural origins. Carr Barn Cottage is a later addition to the Barn, whose scale and light-coloured exterior draw the eye. The projecting Cottage, formed of modern materials, relates poorly to Carr Barn. Despite this, Carr Barn forms an important and prominent part the setting of the Farmhouse, that contributes to its historical significance.
35. Over time, the wider, agricultural setting of Carr Farmhouse and Carr Barn has changed significantly. The buildings are no longer isolated, with extensive twentieth century housing to the north and more recent small developments on Carr Farm Close.
36. Despite those changes, the appeal site, which is used for grazing in association with Carr Barn, is still undeveloped and open. The area to the front of Carr Farmhouse also remains largely open, with views to the hills beyond intact. These elements of open countryside form part of the setting of the Farmhouse. By reminding us of its former isolated position and agricultural origins, they contribute positively to its significance.

Carr Barn - Non-Designated Heritage Asset

37. The appellant's Heritage Statement notes that Carr Barn is typical of a Lancashire type stone barn. The form of the building and its pattern of openings indicate that it would likely have been a multifunctional working building, used for housing animals and storing feed, with evidence of a threshing bay. I have no reason to doubt these observations.

38. Carr Barn has been significantly altered over time, most notably by the modern addition of Carr Barn Cottage, which has introduced a new, domestic use. This large, dominant addition with its rendered finish and tile roof, fails to respect, and visually detracts from, the older stone and slate building.
39. Nonetheless, and despite the changes that have taken place, Carr Barn has architectural and historical significance in its own right. For the reasons described above, it also contributes positively to the setting and significance of Carr Farmhouse.

Effect of the proposals on heritage assets

40. The proposed development would not alter the fabric of Carr Farmhouse, or its domestic garden. However, the proposed demolition of Carr Barn and Cottage, and their replacement with the new site access and an area of soft landscaping, would, in visual terms, be a significant and visually obvious change to the immediate setting of the Farmhouse.
41. When viewed from Carr Farm Close, the primary elevation of Carr Farmhouse would no longer be seen with the backdrop of the large Carr Barn immediately behind. From other nearby vantage points, in particular the footpath running through to Hardman Avenue, the loss of Carr Barn would also be a highly visible change.
42. Owing to its size, form and appearance, Carr Barn Cottage does not make a positive contribution to the setting of Carr Farmhouse, and its loss could be seen as a positive change. However, the loss of Carr Barn itself would diminish the appreciation of the agricultural origins of the listed building, and detract from its historical significance.
43. The once isolated Carr Farmhouse and associated farm buildings have already been partially enclosed by residential development, and the former link between the Farmhouse and the appeal site is no longer immediately obvious. Even so, the proposed loss of grazing land once associated with the farmstead would detract from the wider agricultural setting of the Farmhouse.
44. That said, the principle of housing development on former farmland associated with Carr Farmhouse has already been accepted. Even at a lower density and with additional landscaping throughout the scheme, development of the site allocated in LP policy H15 would detract from the wider, agricultural setting of the Farmhouse.
45. The remaining area of open land around Carr Farm Close, which Carr Farmhouse looks out over, would remain undeveloped in the appeal scheme, preserving that element of its setting.
46. Carr Barn itself has also been altered over time, and its internal condition is unknown. Nonetheless, part of the building is historic, and it is functionally and spatially linked to Carr Farmhouse. As a NDHA it has heritage significance in its own right, which would be lost as a result of the proposal.
47. As part of the proposal, a programme of recording would be undertaken, which would ensure that an understanding of Carr Barn and its significance would be retained. Whilst this would provide an important record, it would not fully compensate for the total loss of the building and the historic fabric it contains.

48. The LP allocation excludes Carr Barn; the intention being for access to be taken from Lomas Lane, rather than Hardman Avenue as now proposed. Retaining the Barn as assumed in the LP would avoid the total loss of the NDHA, and the associated harm to the setting and significance of Carr Farmhouse. However, development to the east of Lomas Lane, which is included in the allocated site, could detract from the open aspect to the south-west of the Farmhouse, which could harm its setting in a different way.
49. Taking all these considerations into account, I conclude that the proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the setting of the Grade II listed Carr Farmhouse and would result in the total loss of Carr Barn as a non-designated heritage asset. It would conflict with LP Strategic Policies ENV1 and ENV2, both of which are concerned with conserving and enhancing the historic environment of Rossendale, including pre-Industrial farmhouses.
50. Taking into account the changes that have already taken place as well as the proposed landscaping, the additional harm to the heritage assets and their significance, over and above that already accepted through the LP, would be modest in extent.

Heritage Balance

51. In the context of paragraph 212 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), the harm to the significance of the listed building would be less than substantial, and modest in extent. Nonetheless, the Framework requires that, when considering the impact of a proposal on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.
52. In accordance with Framework paragraph 214, the harm to the designated heritage asset must be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. In relation to Carr Barn as a NDHA, Framework Paragraph 216 advises that the effect of the proposal on the significance of the heritage asset should be taken into account, and a balanced judgement made.
53. In this case, the proposed development would exceed the LP policy requirement figure of 25, but it would make efficient use of land, in a location with good access to a range of local services and facilities. The provision of 43 (net) additional homes would make a positive contribution to the supply of homes in an area with an acknowledged shortfall.
54. All the houses would be affordable (as defined in the Framework glossary), and would contribute towards the substantial need in this area, identified in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment. I note that the Council's Strategic Housing Unit fully endorse the proposal, which they say would alleviate some of the strain on the current social housing waiting list. The proposed mix of 1, 2 and 3 bed dwellings would reflect the identified need for smaller and family homes in this area. These are public benefits to which I give very significant weight.
55. The development would generate economic benefits through construction jobs and demand within local supply chains, as well as spending by future occupiers within the local economy. It would also generate additional revenue through New Homes Bonus and Council tax paid by future occupiers. I afford moderate weight to these economic benefits.

56. When taken together, the public benefits of the scheme would be sufficient to outweigh the less than substantial harm to Carr Farmhouse as a designated heritage asset. In addition, the social and economic benefits of the proposed housing would outweigh the loss of significance of Carr Barn as a NDHA.

Living conditions

57. Providing sufficient space for households and families to thrive and grow is important for the wellbeing of occupiers. As highlighted by the Council, many children are now living at home for longer, resulting in households made up of parents and their adult children. Providing homes which are large enough to meet the long term needs of families, with flexible and adaptable space and room for storage, is an important consideration.
58. The Nationally Described Space Standard (NDSS) sets out an internal space standard, based on the overall gross internal area of a home, with minimum sizes for bedrooms and storage areas. It is a useful way of assessing the adequacy of internal space in new housing development, and is a material consideration in this appeal. However, the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) is clear that the NDSS can only be a requirement for new development in an area if it is referred to in the development plan². That is not the case here, indicating that the justification for adopting the standard in Rossendale, including consideration of the effect on viability, has not been robustly tested through the local plan examination process.
59. None of the proposed 44 homes would achieve the NDSS. However, the appellant has confirmed that, based on the number of bed spaces to be provided in each house type, all would achieve at least 85% of the standard. I note the appellant's comment that this appears to be a minimum requirement for affordable housing grant funding, based on information from Homes England.
60. I also note that the proposal would meet the requirement contained in Policy HS5 for at least 20% of new dwellings to be easily adaptable to meet the needs of elderly or disabled residents, by meeting Part M4(2) of the Building Regulations.
61. The proposed dwellings would be modest in size but having reviewed the floorplans, I am satisfied that all would provide a reasonable standard of internal accommodation, with none of the houses or individual rooms being overly small or cramped. Additionally, the provision of a further 44 affordable homes would, in a small way, help provide opportunities for young people in the local area to move into their own home.
62. Access to outdoor space is also important for wellbeing. The houses would have reasonable sized rear gardens, and future occupiers would have access to extensive areas of open space close by, accessed via the network of local footpaths.
63. Overall, I conclude that the proposal would provide acceptable living conditions for future occupiers, with particular regard to internal space. With regard to this issue, I have identified no conflict with the specific requirements for high quality development contained in LP Strategic Policy ENV1, or with the amenity requirements contained Framework paragraph 135f.

² Paragraph: 018 Reference ID: 56-018-20150327

Other Matters

Planning Obligation

64. I have been provided with copies of a legal agreement, signed in counterpart, which includes a number of obligations to come into effect if planning permission is granted. I have considered these in light of the statutory tests contained in Regulation 122 of The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations 2010.
65. The signed legal agreement makes provision for 100% of the homes to be affordable. This exceeds the requirement for 30% affordable housing contained in LP policy HS3. The appellant has chosen to provide an above policy level of affordable housing, and the proposed tenure split is acceptable to the Council. I have no reason to take a different view.
66. LP policy HS6 requires housing developments of 10 or more dwellings to make provision for open space. Further detail on the amount of provision that is required for various typologies of open space and recreation land is contained in the Open Space and Sports Provision Supplementary Planning Document 2024 (SPD), together with a schedule of costs. The signed legal agreement makes provision for a contribution of £89,012 towards the provision of off-site public open space, playing pitches and built sports facilities. For the number of houses proposed, and taking account of the provision of open space to be made on-site, the contribution reflects the Council's most up to date requirements in the SPD.
67. LP policy SD3 says that where developments will create demands for additional services, which include sustainable transport, the Council may seek a financial contribution to address this issue. The County Council has requested a contribution of £20,000 to support the running of the No. 12 bus service (now No. 42), which the legal agreement provides for.
68. This service runs along Fallbarn Crescent, a short distance from the appeal site. Operation of the service is fully subsidised by Lancashire County Council, with no alternative commercial provision. The proposed development of 44 affordable homes would generate additional demand for bus travel, and the requested contribution would help ensure that the service could continue to be provided.
69. The legal agreement also makes provision for monitoring fees for the commuted sums, communal areas and affordable housing. The requirement for monitoring fees is consistent with the CIL Regulations and the Council's most recent Infrastructure Funding Statement 2023-24.
70. The obligations contained in the signed legal agreement are necessary, directly related to the development and fairly and reasonable related in scale and kind to the development. They meet the tests set out in Framework paragraph 58 and the CIL Regulations.

Traffic, access and parking

71. A number of local residents have objected to the proposal. Access and parking are particular issues of concern, with comments made about the suitability of the proposed access, as well as the effect of additional traffic on surrounding roads, and increased demand for parking.

72. Hardman Avenue is a fairly narrow, residential road. Like many of the surrounding streets, Hardman Avenue is steep in places, which can present extra challenges for drivers. On the two occasions that I visited the area, traffic in the surrounding area was light, although I appreciate that the situation might be different at other times.
73. The proposed development of an addition 43 (net) houses would generate additional traffic. Applying a widely used, standard methodology for predicting vehicle trips, the appellant has calculated that there would be around 21 additional trips in any one hour at peak time. The Local Highway Authority (LHA) has not disputed the predicted traffic levels, and I have no reason to take a different view.
74. Whilst I note the concerns raised by local residents, based on my observations and the evidence provided, I have no reason to doubt the conclusions of the LHA that the additional traffic would be of a level that could be accommodated on the local road network, without causing unacceptable risks to highway safety. I also note that the proposed access from Hardman Avenue is acceptable to the LHA.
75. Many of the houses on Hardman Avenue do not have driveways, so residents park their cars on the street. Whilst there was no obvious shortage of parking spaces on the street when I visited, I note residents' comments about difficulties in parking at times, and the practice of moving vehicles further down the valley in icy weather.
76. The development would provide at least one parking space per dwelling, with 68 off-street spaces in total. Compared with the adopted parking standards in the local plan, there would be a shortfall of 16 spaces.
77. Many households do have multiple vehicles, and if future residents had more vehicles than the available number of spaces, there may be pressure to park on internal estate roads. Even if that were the case, I have no compelling evidence to indicate that the proposal would result in unacceptable parking problems either within or outside the site. I note that the LHA has not objected to the level of parking provided, given the proximity to regular bus services and the affordable nature of the housing.
78. Construction traffic and works can be disruptive for the period during which they take place. In order to minimise noise and avoid access and safety issues resulting from works traffic, a construction management plan would need to be agreed and implemented. The LHA has also suggested that construction delivery times be restricted to avoid coinciding with local school traffic. I agree that this is necessary to safeguard road safety and have imposed suitable conditions.

Effect on neighbouring occupiers

79. The proposed houses on plots 1-10 would be sited behind the terrace at 150-164 Hardman Avenue, and concerns have been raised about the effect of the development on those neighbouring occupiers.
80. The site slopes up behind the existing houses, but the levels would be altered as part of the scheme. By re-grading the slope and incorporating retaining walls as proposed, the existing height difference between 150-164 Hardman Avenue and plots 1-10 would be reduced. This would help to ensure the new buildings would not be overbearing. The back gardens of the new houses would be of a reasonable length, and I am satisfied that there would be sufficient distance between the

existing and proposed houses to safeguard the privacy of existing residents, and to maintain a reasonable amount of sunlight to their gardens.

Drainage

81. The appeal site is located on a hillside, and I understand that there have been problems in the past with water running down the hill causing flooding of nearby properties. An outflow along the eastern boundary of the site was installed some years ago to address this problem, but residents are understandably concerned that development of the appeal site could result in future flooding.
82. Based on the information provided as part of the application, including the updated flood risk assessment and drainage strategy (Betts Hydro, February 2024), both the Local Lead Flood Authority and United Utilities are satisfied that the development is acceptable in principle, subject to a number of conditions. These include, amongst other things, submission, agreement and implementation of final detailed surface water sustainable drainage strategy for the site, with measures in place for the long term maintenance of the drainage system. Measures to manage surface water during the construction phase would also be required.
83. I am satisfied that, subject to the implementation of the additional information and measures required, the proposed development would be safe from flooding, and would not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere.

Public Rights of Way

84. The site is crossed by several public rights of way (PROW), although in places the situation on the ground does not reflect the definitive PROW map. Footpath FP1404259 crosses the site, but to accommodate the proposed site layout, it would need to be diverted. The submitted plans show how this could be achieved.
85. During the hearing, it was noted that FP1404260 does not currently follow its definitive route, the line of which runs just inside the eastern boundary of the site. This footpath is not fully shown on the submitted plan, so to rectify this, a revised drawing was provided after the hearing (drawing ref MCI-096-DR-A-514 Rev C). As part of the development, the footpath would need to be either reinstated along its definitive route within the site, or formerly diverted to retain its existing line. The County Council's PROW Manager has advised either option could be taken.
86. Diversion of the footpaths would require an application for a Public Path Order under s257 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. Such an application, which would involve a period of public consultation, would need to be undertaken prior to development commencing. Details of the exact alignment of the route/s, details of surfacing and any associated works would need to be agreed with the PROW team as part of that process.

Biodiversity

87. The appellant has provided baseline ecological information including details of surveys for protected species including bats, barn owls, great crested newts and badgers. Subject to conditions requiring an ecological enhancement plan, precautionary checks for protected species and the implementation of measures to avoid harm to birds and mammals, I am satisfied that the proposal is acceptable in terms of biodiversity.

Housing supply

88. At the time of writing, the Council was undertaking its annual monitoring of housing delivery and supply. In advance of finalising and publishing this information, and in light of evidence provided by the appellant for this appeal, the Council has accepted that it is unable to demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites.
89. According to the Council, a housing supply of 4.9 years is available, whereas the appellant calculates the figure to be 4.2 years. Whilst there is disagreement about the extent of the shortfall, the differences relate to uncertainty over delivery timescales for a small number of sites, and the number of units involved are not large.
90. Notwithstanding that, the housing supply situation needs to be addressed. I also note that the most recent housing delivery test (HDT) results for Rossendale Borough indicate an undersupply in the number of homes delivered over the 3 year period. As delivery has fallen below 85% of the housing requirement, the Council is required to produce an action plan, and an additional 20% buffer is applied.
91. The lack of a five year supply of housing and HDT results means that footnote 8 of Framework paragraph 11d)ii. is engaged. Planning permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.

Planning policy

92. For the reasons set out above, the proposed development would not fully comply with LP policies HS2 and H15, which allocate land at Carr Farm and Carr Barn for 25 homes. There would also be a minor conflict with LP policy ENV3, owing to the effect on landscape character. In addition, the proposed development would fail to comply with LP policies ENV1 and ENV2 with respect to the historic environment. For the purposes of Framework paragraph 11d), these policies are the most important for determining this appeal.
93. The housing figure of 25 units in LP Policy HS2 and H15, based on a density of 20dph, reflects the specific circumstances of this site and the need to safeguard the historic environment and landscape character. These are also objectives of the Framework. However, owing to the housing land supply situation, additional flexibility over the housing requirement figure set out in LP policies HS2 and H15 is justified. I therefore give moderate weight to the conflict with these policies.
94. LP policies ENV1, ENV2 and ENV3 are also consistent with Framework objectives of achieving well-designed places, and conserving and enhancing the natural and historic environment. I afford full weight to the conflict with these policies, albeit the extent of that conflict is minor, for the reasons previously set out.

Planning Balance

95. The principle of residential development here has already been accepted through the LP, but the appeal proposal is for more houses. Compared with a lower density scheme with a smaller number of houses as supported by the LP, the proposed development would result in greater harm to the character and appearance of the area, and to designated and undesignated heritage assets.

96. However, as described above, the additional harm over and above that already established through the LP would be modest, and the development of 44 affordable homes would make a greater contribution towards meeting identified local housing needs than LP policy H15 provides for. Given the extent of the housing and affordability problems, both locally and nationally, this is a very important consideration.
97. As previously explained, I have found that the social and economic benefits of the scheme would be sufficient to outweigh the less than substantial harm to the setting and significance of Carr Farmhouse, and the loss of significance of Carr Barn. The benefits of the proposed affordable housing would also outweigh the modest harm to the character and appearance of the area.
98. The proposal would provide satisfactory living conditions for future occupiers, and would be acceptable in terms of access and parking, drainage, ecology and public rights of way. These matters are neutral in the planning balance.
99. Overall, I find that when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole, the adverse impacts of the scheme would not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. The appeal should therefore succeed.

Conditions

100. A list of agreed conditions has been provided, and was discussed at the hearing. I have imposed the conditions with minor wording changes in places, to avoid repetition and improve clarity. A number of pre-commencement conditions have been suggested, requiring actions to be undertaken prior to development starting. The suggested pre-commencement conditions are listed in the signed General Statement of Common Ground, and have the appellant's agreement.
101. The standard implementation and plans conditions are required in the interests of certainty. I have included the revised PROW plan, provided after the hearing, in the list of approved plans.
102. A condition requiring the submission, approval and implementation of a detailed habitat management and monitoring plan is required to protect and enhance biodiversity, as required by LP policy ENV4 and Framework paragraph 187 d). To ensure that a net gain in biodiversity can be achieved, this needs to take place before development starts. In order to protect birds, a condition is needed which restricts works to trees and shrubs during nesting season.
103. To avoid harm to protected species, conditions are needed which require precautionary checks of the site and the buildings to be demolished. Details of any external lighting strategy needs to be agreed in advance, to protect bats and other nocturnal creatures. In the interests of protecting biodiversity, it is also necessary to ensure compliance with the approved Precautionary Method of Works for amphibians and mammals, and to ensure that invasive species are appropriately dealt with. I have imposed the Council's suggested conditions which deal with these matters.
104. As part of the application, Phase 1 and 2 Geo-Environmental Investigation Reports were submitted. No significant contamination was found, and no remediation measures recommended. The site was identified as being of generally low risk of contamination, but the Council's Environmental Protection officer has identified

some additional investigations, which I agree are necessary to ensure that any risks are identified and suitably mitigated. To ensure that the development safeguards health and the local environment, I have imposed the suggested contaminated land conditions.

105. To ensure that the site is safe from flooding and does not increase flooding elsewhere throughout its lifetime, including during construction, pre-commencement conditions are needed which require the submission and approval of a detailed surface water sustainable drainage strategy and a construction surface water management plan for the site. A condition requiring verification that the surface water sustainable system is fit for purpose prior to occupation of the development is also necessary.
106. In the interests of highway safety and to safeguard the living conditions of nearby occupiers, a pre-commencement condition is needed requiring the submission and approval of a construction method statement, and adherence to it throughout the works. For similar reasons, conditions limiting the hours of construction working and deliveries are needed.
107. Details of the proposed site access and off-site highway works are needed to ensure that satisfactory, safe and timely access is achieved, both into and within the site. I have imposed suitable conditions to that effect, along with a condition requiring agreement of the arrangements for construction, drainage, lighting and future maintenance of the proposed new streets.
108. To ensure that areas for parking vehicles are constructed to a satisfactory standard, and to support sustainable travel, I have imposed conditions requiring the provision of cycle storage and details of the materials used for driveways. To ensure that the cycle storage is a satisfactory standard, I have amended the suggested condition so that it requires that the storage be provided in accordance with details previously agreed by the Council. In the interests of precision, I have amended suggested condition 23 to require that the driveways are constructed in accordance with the approved details.
109. To avoid unnecessary duplication, I have combined suggested conditions 26 and 27, which are needed to ensure that trees to be retained on and adjacent to the site are adequately protected.
110. To ensure a satisfactory appearance and to minimise the visual impact of the scheme, conditions are required specifying the colour of the retaining walls and the approval of materials to be used in external surfaces of the houses. For similar reasons and to enhance biodiversity, a condition requiring the timely implementation of the approved landscaping and planting scheme is needed, as well as providing for the replacement of any trees or plants which die or become diseased or seriously damaged.
111. Finally, to provide a full understanding of the historical importance of the building to be demolished, a condition requiring a programme of building recording is required, for inclusion within the Lancashire Historic Environment Record.

Conclusion

112. The proposal would result in a higher density development than the LP provides for. This would result in some additional harm to the character and appearance of

the area, as well as to heritage assets, compared with that which might result from a development of fewer houses. The LP figure is an important consideration, but other factors must also be taken into account, including the need for more houses and more affordable homes.

113. Having taken account of the concerns raised and the evidence provided, both in writing and at the hearing, I have found that the benefits of the proposed development are significant, and outweigh the harms. The appeal is therefore allowed, subject to the conditions set out below.

R. Morgan

INSPECTOR

Hearing Appearances

For the appellant:

Alex Greaves (Francis Taylor Building Chambers) – Counsel
Eram Watson (Ward Hadaway) – Appellant's Solicitor
Olivia Pemberton (Eden Planning) – Planning Witness
Donna Barber (Eden Planning) – Planning Witness
Phil Wooliscroft (Eddisons) – Highways
Anthony Hanna (Wardell Armstrong) - Heritage
Jamie Irving (MCI Developments)
Craig Murphy (MCI Developments)

For the Council:

Cllr Marilyn Procter - Chair of Planning Committee
Cllr Liz McInnes - Ward Councillor
Mike Atherton - Head of Planning
James Dalglish – Principal Planning Officer
Anne Storah - Forward Planning team

Local residents:

Jon Howard
Katie Delaney

Schedule of Conditions

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following drawings and documents, unless otherwise required by the conditions below:

Location Plan (MCI-096-DR-A-509-D)
Site Layout (MCI-096-DR-A-500-AD)
General Arrangement Plan (UG_1980_LAN_GA_DRW_101 P15)
Hard Landscape Plan (UG_1980_LAN_HL_DRW_201 P13)
Soft Landscape Plan (Full Site) (UG_1980_LAN_SL_DRW_301 P14)
Soft Landscape Plan (1) (UG_1980_LAN_SL_DRW_302 P12)
Soft Landscape Plan (2) (UG_1980_LAN_SL_DRW_303 P11)
Soft Landscape Plan (3) (UG_1980_LAN_SL_DRW_304 P13)
Retaining Wall Proposals
Boundary Treatment Plan (MCI-096-DR-A-501-M)
Hard Surface Plan (MCI-096-DR-A-503-G)
Drainage Appraisal (559-E104 REV. F)
The Coniston Special Working Drawing Pack (Hardman 1110 Rev. 2)
The Hawkridge Working Drawing Pack (Hardman 3010 Rev. 2)
The Kentmere Working Drawing Pack (Hardman 1070 Rev. 3)
The Leadmill Working Drawing Pack (Hardman 1320 Rev. 2)
The Lockwood Working Drawing Pack (Shakerley 2010 Rev. 2)
The Saltburn Sp Working Drawing Pack (Hardman 1400 Rev. 3)
Welfare Plan (MCI XX DR A 506 WELFARE REV. E)
Longitudinal Sections A-1 (559-E400)
Longitudinal Sections A-1 (559-E401)
EV Charging Plan (MCI-096-DR-A-505-G)
Materials Plan (MCI-096-DR-A-508-L)
Parking Provision Plan (MCI-096-DR-A-510-D)
Site Section A-A (MCI-096-DR-A-511.2-D)
Site Section B-B (MCI-096-DR-A-511.2-A)
Interface Plan (MCI-096-DR-A-512-D)
M4(2) House Types (MCI-096-DR-A-513-D) 35
PROW Plan (MCI-096-DR-A-514-C)
PV Plan (MCI-096-DR-A-515-D)
Renusol Dachhaken Eco Basic (019755 REV. 1)
Renusol solar PV certification details (06)
Renusol Eco hook mount details and solar PV mounting rail details
Variosole installation details and manual
Demolition Plan (MCI-096-DR-A-517-B)
Refuse Plan (MCI-096-DR-A-520-E)

Fire Appliance Plan (MCI-096-DR-A-526-D)

Biodiversity Net Gain Design Stage Assessment (Feb 2024 REV. 07)

Arboricultural Impact Assessment (UG_1980_ARB_AIA_01_REV_06_FINAL)

Arboricultural Method Statement (UG_1980_ARB_AMS_01_REV_01_FINAL)

Precautionary Method of Works (UG_1980_ECO_PMoW_01, April 2024)

Application form

- 3) No development shall take place until a detailed habitat enhancement, management and monitoring plan (covering the entire site and any related watercourses) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The development shall thereafter be implemented in accordance with the approved details, and all agreed management and monitoring measures shall be implemented for the lifetime of the development.

- 4) No development shall take place until a further precautionary check of the site for badger setts has been carried out by a qualified ecologist, and the results submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Should evidence of badgers be found, appropriate mitigation measures shall be agreed in writing by the Council and the development implemented in accordance with the approved details.
- 5) Prior to any above ground works taking place, an external lighting strategy shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The strategy shall:
- Identify retained features on site that are potentially sensitive to lighting for bats;
 - Identify proposed features for bats and;
 - Through appropriate isolux plans, demonstrate clearly that any impacts on bats is negligible.

Any external lighting shall thereafter be installed in accordance with the agreed details.

- 6) No works to trees or shrubs shall occur between the 1st March and 31st August in any year unless a detailed bird nest survey by a suitably experienced ecologist has been carried out immediately prior to clearance and written confirmation provided that no active bird nests are present, which has been agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- 7) The development shall be implemented in strict accordance with the Reasonable Avoidance Measures Method Statement for Amphibians and Mammals contained in the approved Precautionary Method of Works (ref: UG_1980_ECO_PMoW_01).
- 8) Prior to any earthworks taking place, a method statement detailing eradication and/or control and/or avoidance measures for Himalayan Balsam and Rhododendron shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The agreed method statement shall be adhered to and implemented in full.
- 9) Prior to any demolition works taking place, a further survey of the building(s) to be demolished for bats and bat roosting potential shall be carried out by a qualified ecologist. The results of the survey (along with any proposed mitigation measures

if necessary) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and any necessary mitigation measures implemented before demolition takes place.

- 10) Notwithstanding any information submitted with the application, no development (other than demolition) shall take place until an investigation and risk assessment has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Where potential risks are identified, a Phase 2 Site Investigation report shall also be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, prior to development (other than demolition) taking place. The Investigation shall address the nature, degree and distribution of land contamination on site and shall include an identification and assessment of the risk to receptors focusing primarily on risks to human health, groundwater and the wider environment.

Should unacceptable risks be identified the applicant shall also submit and agree with the Local Planning Authority in writing a contaminated land remediation strategy (including verification plan). The development shall thereafter be carried out in full accordance with the duly approved remediation strategy or such varied remediation strategy as may be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

- 11) Pursuant to condition 10 and prior to first occupation of any part of the development, a verification report, which validates that all remedial works undertaken on site were completed in accordance with those agreed with the Local Planning Authority, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- 12) During the period of construction, should contamination be found on site that has not been previously identified, no further works shall be undertaken in the affected area. Prior to further works being carried out in the affected area, the contamination shall be reported to the Local Planning Authority within a maximum of 5 days from the discovery, a further contaminated land assessment shall be carried out, appropriate mitigation identified and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be undertaken in accordance with the agreed mitigation scheme.
- 13) No development shall commence until a detailed, final surface water sustainable drainage strategy for the site has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority.

The surface water sustainable drainage strategy shall be based upon the submitted site-specific flood risk assessment (HYD836_CARR.FARM_FRA&DMS, Rev 4.0, February 2024, Betts Hydro) and indicative surface water sustainable drainage strategy (Drawing 559-E104 F, Feb 2024, Mono Civil Design Consultants), and the sustainable drainage principles and requirements set out in the National Planning Policy Framework, Planning Practice Guidance and Defra Technical Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems. No surface water shall be allowed to discharge to the public foul sewer(s), directly or indirectly.

The details of the drainage strategy to be submitted for approval shall include, as a minimum:

- a) Sustainable drainage calculations for peak flow control and volume control for the:
 - i. 100% (1 in 1-year) annual exceedance probability event,

- ii. 3.3% (1 in 30-year) annual exceedance probability event + 40% climate change allowance, with an allowance for urban creep,
 - iii. 1% (1 in 100-year) annual exceedance probability event + 45% climate change allowance, with an allowance for urban creep.
- b) Final sustainable drainage plans appropriately labelled to include, as a minimum:
 - i. Site plan showing all permeable and impermeable areas that contribute to the drainage network either directly or indirectly, including surface water flows from outside the curtilage as necessary,
 - ii. Sustainable drainage system layout showing all pipe and structure references, dimensions and design levels,
 - iii. Details of all sustainable drainage components, including landscape drawings showing topography and slope gradient as appropriate,
 - iv. Drainage plan showing flood water exceedance routes in accordance with Defra Technical Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems,
 - v. Finished Floor Levels (FFL) in AOD with adjacent ground levels for all sides of each building and connecting cover levels to confirm minimum 150 mm+ difference for FFL,
 - vi. Details of proposals to collect and mitigate surface water runoff from the development boundary,
 - vii. Measures taken to manage the quality of the surface water runoff to prevent pollution, protect groundwater and surface waters, and delivers suitably clean water to sustainable drainage components.
- c) Evidence of an assessment of the site conditions to include site investigation and test results to confirm infiltrations rates and groundwater levels in accordance with BRE 365.
- d) Evidence of an assessment of the existing culverted watercourse to be used, to confirm that these systems are in sufficient condition and have sufficient capacity to accept surface water runoff generated from the development.
- e) Evidence that a free-flowing outfall can be achieved. If this is not possible, evidence of a surcharged outfall applied to the sustainable drainage calculations will be required.
- f) Phasing plan for the construction of the surface water sustainable drainage system.

The sustainable drainage strategy shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

- 14) No development shall commence until a Construction Surface Water Management Plan, detailing how surface water and stormwater will be managed on the site during construction, including demolition and site clearance operations, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The details of the plan to be submitted for approval shall include method statements, scaled and dimensioned plans and drawings detailing surface water management proposals to include for each phase, as a minimum:

- a) Measures taken to ensure surface water flows are retained on-site during the construction phase(s), including temporary drainage systems, and, if surface water flows are to be discharged, they are done so at a restricted rate that must not exceed the equivalent greenfield runoff rate from the site,
- b) Measures taken to prevent siltation and pollutants from the site entering any receiving groundwater and/or surface waters, including watercourses, with reference to published guidance.

The plan shall be implemented and thereafter managed and maintained in accordance with the approved plan for the duration of construction.

- 15) The occupation of the development shall not be permitted until a site specific Operation and Maintenance Manual for the lifetime of the development, pertaining to the surface water drainage system and prepared by a suitably competent person, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details of the manual to be submitted for approval shall include, as a minimum:

- a) A timetable for its implementation,
- b) Details of the maintenance, operational and access requirement for all SuDS components and connecting drainage structures, including all watercourses and their ownership,
- c) Pro-forma to allow the recording of each inspection and maintenance activity, as well as allowing any faults to be recorded and actions taken to rectify issues,
- d) The arrangements for adoption by any public body or statutory undertaker, or any other arrangements to secure the operation of the sustainable drainage scheme in perpetuity,
- e) Details of financial management including arrangements for the replacement of major components at the end of the manufacturer's recommended design life,
- f) Details of whom to contact if pollution is seen in the system or if it is not working correctly, and
- g) Means of access for maintenance and easements.

Thereafter the drainage system shall be retained, managed, and maintained in accordance with the approved details.

- 16) The occupation of each phase of the development shall not be permitted until a site-specific verification report for that phase, pertaining to the surface water sustainable drainage system, and prepared by a suitably competent person, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The verification report must, as a minimum, demonstrate that the surface water sustainable drainage system has been constructed in accordance with the approved drawing(s) (or detail any minor variations) and is fit for purpose. The report shall contain information and evidence, including photographs, of details and locations (including national grid references) of critical drainage infrastructure (including inlets, outlets, and control structures) and full as-built drawings.

The scheme shall thereafter be maintained in perpetuity.

- 17) No development shall take place, including any works of demolition, until a construction method statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period. It shall provide for:
- i. The parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors,
 - ii. The loading and unloading of plant and materials,
 - iii. The storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development,
 - iv. The erection and maintenance of security hoarding,
 - v. Wheel washing facilities,
 - vi. Measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction,
 - vii. A scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works,
 - viii. Routing of delivery vehicles to/from site.
- 18) Construction-related deliveries to the approved development shall only be accepted between the hours of 9.30am and 3.00pm Monday – Friday, to avoid peak traffic on the surrounding highway network.
- 19) Construction works shall not take place outside the following hours:
- Monday to Friday: 08:00 to 18:00
 - Saturday: 08:00 to 13:00
 - Construction works shall not take place on Sundays or Bank or Public Holidays.
- 20) Prior to commencement of any development, but excluding demolition works, a scheme for the site access and off-site highway works shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The works shall include the following and shall be implemented prior to the first occupation of any dwelling:
- i. New site access with parking restrictions for junction protection,
 - ii. Dropped kerb crossing points with tactile paving,
 - iii. Street lighting and surface water drainage alterations where necessary.
- 21) Prior to commencement of any development, but excluding demolition works and site surface clearance works, details of the proposed arrangements for future management and maintenance of the proposed streets within the development shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.
- The streets shall thereafter be maintained in accordance with the approved management and maintenance details until such time as an agreement has been entered into under Section 38 of the Highways Act 1980 or a private management and maintenance company has been established.
- 22) Prior to commencement of any development, but excluding demolition works, full engineering, drainage, street lighting and constructional details to adoptable standards (LCC specification) of the internal estate roads shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall, thereafter, be constructed in accordance with the approved details, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

- 23) The internal estate roads shall be constructed in accordance with the approved engineering details (pursuant to condition 22) and to at least base course level prior to first occupation of any dwelling, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.
- 24) Prior to the occupation of each dwelling, the materials to be used in the construction of the driveways and parking areas associated with the dwelling shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The driveways and parking areas shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details, and shall thereafter be maintained and retained for the parking of vehicles for as long as the development is occupied.
- 25) Prior to first occupation each dwelling shall have a secure cycle store provided, which provides 1 cycle space per bedroom, in accordance with details previously agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- 26) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Arboricultural Impact Assessment (UG_1980_ARB_AIA_01_REV_06_FINAL) and Arboricultural Method Statement (UG_1980_ARB_AMS_01_REV_01_FINAL).

No development shall commence until all the trees to be retained within the site have been protected in accordance with the specification described in the approved AIA and AMS, in the positions as shown within those documents, and shall remain in place until all development is completed. No work, including any form of drainage or storage of materials, earth or topsoil shall take place within the perimeter of such fencing.
- 27) The Lock and Load retaining walls to be constructed as part of the development shall be faced in 'charcoal' colour stone as shown on submitted drawing MCI-096-DR-A-RW (Retaining Wall Colour Options).
- 28) No development shall take place until physical samples and trade literature of all materials proposed to be used in the construction of the elevations and roofs of the dwellings have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be implemented in accordance with the approved details.
- 29) The approved scheme of landscaping and planting for each phase of the development shall be carried out in full in the first planting and seeding season following the first occupation of any dwelling within that phase, in accordance with the approved details. Any trees or plants which within a period of 15 years of being planted die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of the same size and species.
- 30) No site preparation, clearance or demolition works shall take place until the applicant or their agent or successors in title has secured the implementation of a programme of building recording, analysis and reporting work. This must be carried out in accordance with a written scheme of investigation, which shall first have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The programme of works shall comprise the creation of a Level 3 archaeological record of the buildings to be demolished. The Level 3 record should be as set out in "Understanding Historic Buildings: A guide to good recording practice" (Historic England 2016).

The work must be undertaken by an appropriately qualified and experienced professional contractor to the standards and guidance of the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists. A copy of this record shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority and the Lancashire Historic Environment Record.

Richborough