

## Nicola Gunn

---

**From:** planning  
**Subject:** FW: 170708 SB-PRVBC Re Weekly List App Ref 3/2017/0601.

---

**From:** Steve Burke [<mailto:sbcald@googlemail.com>]  
**Sent:** 17 July 2017 19:56  
**To:** planning  
**Cc:** 'R Michael Parkinson'; 'valerie grooby'; 'Janice Tolson'; 'Clegg Janet'; 'John Rowley'; 'Christopher Middleton'; 'Geoff'  
**Subject:** 170708 SB-PRVBC Re Weekly List App Ref 3/2017/0601.

FAO Victoria Walmsley

Having reviewed to this week's list of applications for w/e 170707 the only one Clitheroe Civic Society believe we need make comment on is the application at **50 King Street, Clitheroe, Lancashire BB7 2EU Application Ref: 3/2017/0601.**

From the 'Pre Application Process and Response Statement' it is clear that the Applicant and their Architect are at odds with the Planning Officer's observations and recommendations, the principle objection being that *'the height of the roof would increase by approx. 1.70m and due to the width of the building the roofline would appear prominent. ....the resultant changes would result in a disproportionately sized building which appears prominently within the public realm detracting from the visual appearance of the property it relates to and the wider Conservation Area. ... the height of the building as a result of the replacement pitched roof should be no more than 3 metres.'*

The applicant and Architect have considered this but, on the grounds that other external ancillary buildings along Back King Street have similar and higher elevations than the proposals in this application, have not accepted this advice..

Having considered both arguments, and visited the site, CCS **supports all of the proposed alterations as submitted** and for the following reasons:

It is vital that as many residential uses as practically possible are retained within the Conservation Area. Residential occupancy maintains vitality and security within historic town centres and, wherever practically possible, should be promoted and encouraged by the LPA. This well considered scheme will, in our opinion, clearly add to the amenity of this residence and with no significant detriment to either the applicant's own property or to adjacent properties within the Conservation Area. Though a compromise has been offered by both the Planning Officer, and the Architect, this is not considered acceptable by the applicant.

In this instance our recommendation is that permission be granted for this modest proposed development as submitted and for the reasons stated above.

With Regards

Steve Burke  
Vice Chairman  
Clitheroe Civic Society