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Application for Listed Building Consent
ANALYSIS OF THE ORIGINAL BUILDING PRIOR TO COMMENCEMENT OF THE WORKS

Higher Lickhurst Farmhouse is a Grade II Listed dwelling situated in the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), between Chipping and Whitewell.

Access to the site is from a lane to the East.

The site is elevated above the bottom of a valley containing a tributary of the River Hodder, which flows to the East. Land in the vicinity is predominantly of agricultural use and interspersed with woodland.

To the South of the site is Lower Lickhurst Farm, which has a right of access through the existing farmyard to Higher Lickhurst Farm. The site boundary, and therefore the proposal, of this application does not affect this right of access.

The site at Higher Lickhurst Farm is occupied by a number of different buildings. As well as the farmhouse, there are three traditional barns and other small ancillary buildings.

The listing description of the farmhouse is described as follows:

House, late C.18th. Squared watershot sandstone with slate roof. Double - pile plan with central entry end stacks. 2 storeys, 2 bays. Windows of 3 lights with square mullions. Door surround has Tuscan pilasters, a narrow pulvinated frieze, and a moulded pediment. The right-hand (East) chimney now has a brick cap, and the left-hand gable is slate hung. At the rear is a stair window with plain stone surround and segmental head.

Current access to the farmhouse is via a porch on the North elevation of the building, although historically the South elevation would have been the frontage to the house.

There is a single storey stone building attached to the East side of the building. Historically it is not clear what this was used for, but it is believed that it had some form of domestic purpose as part of the farmhouse.
STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE SUMMARY (FROM AUGUST 2011)

Stephen Haigh summarised the significance of the farmhouse as follows -

"...As a grade II listed building since 1983, Higher Lickhurst Farmhouse is nationally important and is a well preserved example of a small, late 18th century farmhouse whose elevations and plan form survive very little altered; together with a number of original external and internal features, including stone masonry (such as the surrounds to the front doorway and stairs window) and joinery (such as internal doors – the window frames all appear to have been replaced.)."

He gives the following summary description for the two elements of the dwelling which are the focus of this application as follows -

The House -
"...The house has a direct entry into the living room or housebody, with a heated parlour in the west side, and a central rear dog-leg staircase between scullery and pantry at the rear. The first floor has four bedrooms, the front two heated, and the stairs continue to an attic floor, not underdrawn, but with a fully boarded floor and clearly originally intended for regular use, although the staircase is now sealed off on the first floor, with only a small access hatch for occasional use."

Existing Outbuilding -
We quote the buildings archaeologist on this matter -

"...The conversion of the existing outbuilding will have no effect upon the interior of the structure which the Heritage Assessment describes as - "conversion of the addition at the east gable to form part of the domestic accommodation would have a minor impact on what is a relatively late and architecturally undistinguished part of the building."

The pre-application response from Ribble Valley Borough Council also indicates that this is an acceptable change. (Email dated 25/6/2013)

Ground Floor -
The introduction of a ground floor WC within the utility space as shown in previous applications has been omitted to appease the concerns raised regarding the subdivision of the ground floor plan form. This has resulted in a sacrifice of the desire for modern standards for disabled access and facilities. However, the double pile plan, as determined by the stair enclosure and the surrounding structural walls, will be maintained unaffected.

First Floor -
The new entirely necessary sanitary facilities at first floor level will be integrated within the shell of the historic plan form so that the structural arrangement of the building is maintained. The new partition will be constructed off the existing floors and scribed around any existing historic features such as cornices, skirtings etc. in order to maintain the historic fabric intact. This work will therefore be completely reversible in the spirit of the NPPF. Past applications, as mentioned previously, have been turned down on grounds of harmful impact on the plan form. As a result, the comparative scale of alterations proposed to the house in this application have been reduced to only the most essential work. The applicant also wishes to add his view that the suggestion in the pre-application advice, as offered by Mark Baldry, to use the available space in a single 'Jack and Jill' bathroom arrangement is not workable in a 3 bedroom family home.

Second Floor (Attic) -
The existing attic space is completely boarded in its historic state, and it has been confirmed in the Historic Assessment that it was used as habitable accommodation at some point in its history:

"...the stairs continue to an attic floor, not underdrawn, but with a fully boarded floor and clearly originally intended for regular use, although the staircase is now sealed off on the first floor, with only a small access hatch for occasional use."

The current proposal makes no alteration to either the existing attic space or the existing access difficulties. As a result there are also no plans to introduce rooflights to the building, as proposed in previous applications.

Only like for like essential repair work is proposed in the attic space.

Historic Interior Elements -
Paragraph 180 of the HEPPG makes reference to retention of existing fabric where it is now redundant -

"...Where new work or additions make elements with significance redundant, such as doors or decorative features, there is likely to be less impact on the asset's aesthetic, historic or evidential value if they are left in place."

This has particular relevance to some existing historic doors within the structural 'shell' of the double pile plan. Where new partitions are to be inserted within the shell it is the intention to retain all the existing doors within the historic structural floor plan.

Historic Plan Form -
Paragraph 182 highlights the importance of the plan form to the significance of the building. It is the double-pile plan which this scheme seeks to retain in its complete form with rooms centred around the main staircase. Where a new partition is introduced these are all contained within the structural walls of the plan (constructed off the historic floor level). This will not have a detrimental impact upon the significance of the historic plan form as outlined in the listing description and heritage statement.

New Services -
The scheme responds positively to the need for considering the impact of services upon the historic fabric as outlined in paragraph 189 - "new services, both internal and external can have a considerable, and often cumulative, effect on the appearance of a building and can affect significance...".

The approach adopted in the scheme for integrating new water feeds, waste pipes and heating pipes, particularly within new bathroom areas, is to introduce a series of 'false walls' set around 250 - 300mm in front of the historic walls to suit the existing cornices, skirtings etc. This sets up a series of service ducts which will allow all new services to be run within the voids without the need for chasing out plaster, walls etc. or having new fixings into the existing structure. Where services are required to run horizontally they will be contained within the existing historic floor or ceiling joists where existing floor boards can be removed and reinstated once work is complete.
Further to receiving Planning Permission on 17th September 2013, the Discharge of Planning Conditions on 20th December 2013 and Building Regulations approval on 24th March 2014, work began on site in early April 2014. The proposals included rebuilding the North East corner and lower sections of the North wall of the single storey outbuilding and provide underpinning where required, knocking through from the existing Kitchen and conversion of the outbuilding to form a new Kitchen, repairs where possible or replacement of existing windows and doors, according to a Schedule prepared as part of the Discharge of Conditions, creation of an En Suite and Bathroom at First Floor Level and general decorative works to bring the building up to the standards expected of a modern family home.

Initially IWA Architects were not engaged to provide on-site monitoring of the works, however in May 2014, the Building Contractor contacted IWA Architects to say that whilst underpinning of the North wall of the outbuilding, there had been a sudden collapse of the North East corner, only moments after an operative had been working nearby. A site visit was made to document the condition of the building it was suggested that a Structural Engineer was asked to prepare a report, before any further work took place.

IWA Architects met John Reid of Reid Jones Partnership on 20th May 2014 at the site and the following observations were made:

• The attached outbuilding is a former shippon and has an earth floor, partly cobbled. The walls are built directly off the clay with only a nominal foundation close to ground level. Underpinning has been proposed to avoid undermining the walls when levels are reduced for construction of the new floor. During underpinning, the North East corner of the outbuilding collapsed.

• What remains of the North wall is reasonably straight and vertical, and shows no sign of foundation movement.

• The East wall of the outbuilding leans outwards but is reasonably straight. An older, wider opening has been partly in-filled with stone. There are some vertical cracks on the inside face of the wall.

• The South wall of the outbuilding is severely distorted and bulges significantly. It contains a former door opening, now in-filled with stone. There are a number of vertical cracks on the inside face of the wall.

• The inside of the main farmhouse was inspected. There is separation between the internal dividing wall and the front wall.

His recommendations were as follows:

• No further underpinning should be carried out. The walls are too fragile for this to be done safely. The depth of excavation could be minimised by raising the floor level or reducing the thickness of the slab, hardcore and insulation. Any excavation taken deeper than the existing foundations should be carried out in short lengths and the excavated material replaced immediately with compacted hardcore or concrete.

• The existing east wall should be married into the re-built north east corner, with new and existing stonework bonded together as much as possible. The wall should be shored when the roof is removed to prevent possible collapse when horizontal support is lost.

• The north wall is in extremely poor condition and may collapse when the existing door opening is unblocked and a new window opening is formed. The wall should be fully shored on both sides during this operation, and extreme care taken when the shores are removed on completion of the work. Localised re-building may be inevitable.

• Vertical cracks on the inside face of the stonework should be repaired by stitching with metal ties, either face-fixed to the wall, or grouted into the bed-joints where possible.

• The front wall is separating from the internal return wall as there is no bonding between the two.
In accordance with the Structural Engineer’s recommendations, the Building Contractor shored up the walls of the outbuilding, immediately prior to any further work taking place, particularly to the roof structure. However, due to the ‘fragility’ of the walls and the fact that they were not constructed off adequate foundations, IWA Architects were contacted to say that further, more substantial collapse had occurred, in the process of attempting to strengthen the existing walls. Any remaining masonry was not physically attached to the main house and deemed too unsafe to remain standing - it was therefore carefully dismantled, to at least retain suitable stone for use in the rebuild.

IWA Architects recommended to the Client that Ribble Valley Borough Council’s Conservation Officer, Adrian Dowd was involved and was contacted by email on the 2nd September 2014, to arrange a suitable date to visit the site. A meeting on site was eventually made for the 4th November 2014, by which time work had continued, to the extent that commencement of rebuilding of the single storey outbuilding had taken place and work to the ground floor of the main house had been done. Adrian Dowd followed up his site visit with the attached letter on the 10th November 2014.

Images showing shoring to existing outbuilding walls, the rebuilding of the North East corner and the start of the roof works.
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5. The Design and Access Statement quotes the Borough Council’s pre-application advice where it was recommended that: “such works (repairs to bulging gables) could equally have the potential to cause serious harm to the building if undertaken poorly, significantly altering the character of the building. It may be of benefit therefore to undertake structural surveys of the building to fully determine the precise nature and extent of the works that are required.”

In respect to the latter point and presumably mindful of no structural assessment having been submitted, condition 5 of both the listed building consent and planning permission request precise details and specifications of the extent of any repairs and repairing to the existing walls of the dwelling including the materials and methods to be used.

The discharge of condition application 3/2013/00850/P (relating to planning permission 3/2013/00835/P only) concerns condition 5. No information was received in respect to the initially proposed repair works (ie only repainting works mentioned) and the condition was discharged on this basis.

An email from Ivan Wilson on the 2 September 2014 advised that: “we received a call in May to ask for our advice on the structural weaknesses being encountered on the existing single storey section of the house. Our Structural Engineer provided proposing and foundation recommendations which I understand they have followed. However, the engineer’s recommendations have not prevented the front elevation of the single storey section collapsing.”

Another email received from Ivan Wilson on 2 September 2014 includes a structural assessment from Reid Jones Partnership. This is dated 27 May 2014 and includes: “underpinning has been proposed to avoid undermining key walls when levels are reduced for construction of the new floor. During underpinning, the north-east corner of the building collapsed.”

At the site meeting on 4 November 2014, it was found that:
(i) the historic single storey element was no longer in existence;
(ii) the ground floor has been excavated to 3 of the 4 extant rooms (2 rooms have subsequently been re-floored in concrete). This excavation work has presumably been undertaken in the knowledge of the existing minimal foundation found to the historic single storey addition and the consequences of excavation work to it;
(iii) the removal of ground floor has led to some wall collapse around the interior doorway between the front 2 rooms;
(iv) some historic wall plaster has been removed to the ground floor, and
(v) the “Cold-Stairs” to the utility have been removed.

These works are not in accordance with the listed building consent and planning permission (including condition discharge) and have resulted in the loss of important and irreplaceable historic fabric. I am therefore referring this matter to my enforcement colleague Paul Elms.

Continued ......
COMMENTS IN RESPONSE TO CONSERVATION OFFICER’S LETTER OF THE 10TH NOVEMBER 2014

It was obvious from initial visits to the property at the start of IWA Architects’ involvement in February 2011, that the fabric of the building had suffered from dampness, due to it not being occupied on a regular basis and therefore being heated, to prevent deterioration to the internal finishes and structure. In the intervening period of time that it took to obtain Planning and Building Regulations Permission, the general state of the building will have deteriorated further and this was evident once the contractor began his work. A number of substantial internal cracks in the walls were apparent (see top left Photo below, showing wall between Proposed Lounge and Dining Room, abutting South external wall). Most of the ground floor internal walls were wallpapered (see bottom two photos) and despite the contractor’s best endeavours, the ‘historic’ plaster finishes behind, crumbled and came away with the paper in the process of it being stripped - exposing further areas of damaged stonework and cracking. This will probably be the case at first floor level also.

The existing ground floors, which were found to be a mix of concrete, asphalt and stone flag, had subsided in places, with a noticeable low spot observed in the South East corner of the Proposed Dining Room - possibly due to water ingress, where the external ground level was higher than the internal floor level on the South side of the building. It was necessary to excavate the existing floors, to allow new concrete slabs to be laid, which will receive a layer of insulation and a screed finish, set at a height to allow natural reclaimed stone flags to be laid as required.

The existing stone cold slabs were removed to allow the new floor to be laid, with an understanding that they will be reinstated in their original positions.

Once again the assistance of John Reid of Reid Jones Partnership was sought in respect of dealing with the various structural issues and he has produced a drawing detailing the required methods of repairing and strengthening the existing cracks, etc.

The work has progressed, including the casting of new ground floor slabs, only in order to prevent the building falling into further dis-repair.

APPEARANCE

Although additional structural issues in the condition of the property have only become apparent since the work began, necessitating the rebuilding of the single storey outbuilding, the proposals intend that the appearance of the ‘new build’ will reflect that of the original, with much of the former’s stone and roof slate having been salvaged for re-use. There is no intention to increase the size of the outbuilding or alter any of it’s window and door positions.

The work has progressed, including the casting of new ground floor slabs, only in order to prevent the building falling into further dis-repair.
APPENDICES

Higher Lickhurst Farmhouse, Leagram, Chipping
December 2014 (rev. d)

Application for Listed Building Consent
Higher Lickhurst Farmhouse, Leagram, Chipping

Repairs & Renovation

December 2014

IWA Architects

Gutters on brackets.

New 75mm Ø Cast Iron

and insulation to be inserted between and membrane and refit original flags,

below. Overlay with new breathable

WEST ELEVATION

SOUTH ELEVATION

EXISTING STONE FLAGS TO BE CAREFULLY REMOVED

INSPECTED FOR CONDITION / DECAY, ETC., AND EXTENSION.

EXISTING PURLINS AND RAFTERS TO BE INSPECTED FOR CONDITION / DECAY, REQUIRED.

INSERT INSULATION BETWEEN AND BELOW RAFTERS.

Overlay with new breathable

W E S T E L E V A T I O N

O S S E R L A Y W I T H N E W B R I T H A B L E

E A S T E L E V A T I O N

S O U T H E L E V A T I O N

N O R T H E L E V A T I O N

RE-HANG ROOF MATCHING STORED SLATES.

BEHIND LOOSE RAKED SLATES REMOVED.

Re-hang out.

STONE 4 OF STORED SLATES.

Re-hang.

ALLOWANCE FOR RE-GLAZING.

EXISTING DOOR RETAINED WITH

NEW 75MM Ø CAST IRON

TO BE REPLACED WITH MATCHING SECTIONS AS REQUIRED.

ON NEW 50 X 38MM TREATED S.W. BATTENS.

Supplemented with matching reclaimed natural slate on new 50 x 38mm treated s.w. battens.

Existing fixed light casements repaired, as Window and Door...
TYPICAL DETAIL B THROUGH ROOF
CONSTRUCTION - 1:10

Existing stone flags to be carefully removed and stored. Existing stone flags to be replaced and re-glazed. Existing slate flags to be carefully removed and stored. Existing slate flags to be replaced and re-glazed. New opening to be formed between existing flags and slate. New 75mm Ø Cast Iron RWP new/old stack pipes to be inserted below rafters. Overlay flags to be carefully removed and stored. Existing purlins and rafters to be inspected for condition / decay, etc., and replaced. Existing stone flags (North side) and natural blue slate (South side), to be carefully removed and stored. Mineral wool insulation packing to be inserted between and below rafters. New 50 x 38mm treated s.w. battens at gauge to suit pitch and size of flags / slates. Verges to be pointed in lime mortar to match original appearance. (Scale 1:100)

TYPICAL SECTION THROUGH FARMHOUSE
(Scale 1:100)
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