



John Macholc
Head of Planning Services
Ribble Valley Borough Council
Council Offices
Church Walk
CLITHEROE
BB7 2RA

Phone: 07847 200073

Email: Lancashire.archaeology@gmail.com

Your ref: 3/2018/0510

Date: 2nd June 2018

FAO S Kilmartin

Dear Mr Macholc,

Planning Application 3/2018/0510: Construction of one block of six flats and associated parking. Land adj Black Horse Inn, Pimlico Road, Clitheroe.

Thank you for your consultation on the above application. The proposed development site appears to have been in industrial and domestic use since the mid-19th century and it seems improbable that earlier archaeological remains would survive there.

A lime kiln is shown alongside Pimlico Road within the proposed new parking area on the OS 1847 1:10,560 mapping (sheet Lancashire 47), with a second possibly under the site of the present 'Coach House'. These were served by a limestone quarry to the east, outside the development area. The kilns had been lost before the publication of the OS 1886 1:2,500 sheet (Lancashire 47.10), and areas of what appear to be spoil tipping and a rectangular building now occupy the proposed development site. A circle, possibly (even probably) a new lime kiln is also shown to the rear of the future site of the 'Coach House'. To the south of this 'Rockmount' appears to have been constructed, but the 'Coach House' has not yet been built.

The 1912 edition of the 1:2,500 mapping is the first to show the Coplow Hill Lime Works to the east of the development site and its railway link across Pimlico Road. The railway runs through the plot immediately north of the proposed building and through the centre of the proposed parking area. The boundary and revetment walls around the site all appear to have been constructed by this time, as does the 'Coach House' but not its rear extension.

Photographs within the Structural Survey (Rose Consulting Engineers, 2018) and on the cover of the Heritage Impact Assessment (Storah Architecture 2018) suggest that a light structure or structures have previously been built up against retaining wall 'A', possibly storage shed(s), greenhouses or similar. A two-cell structure is seen in this position in the 1932 edition of the 1:2,500 map and two structures appear on the 1960s aerial photography held by LCC. The railway link and bridge were still visible on the 1960s photography, but apparently disused. A building can also be seen spanning the

northern tip of the development plot. It appears to have a mono-pitch roof and to have small pens or runs in front of it and may represent a pig sty. The remainder of the proposed development plot appears to be in use as gardens and similar, presumably serving 'Rockmount'. The exact date of demolition of the railway bridge is unknown, but it was removed before 2000.

It seems probable that the revetment wall identified as 'E' in the Structural Survey (SS) represents the southern side of the former mineral railway and that the exposed masonry to revetment wall 'F' see on the right side of SS photograph 5 represents the start of the bridge structure. Both of these walls appear to be retained by the proposed development. Whilst it is possible that buried remains of the lime kilns or post-1847 buildings exist on the proposed development site, these are not considered to be sufficiently important as to require any archaeological response. A section of a pre-1912 retaining wall (wall 'A' in the SS) is required to be removed as part of the development and land to its south excavated. This wall is likely to be contemporary with wall 'F', which contains the former bridge abutment, and is presumably jointed into wall 'E'. Wall 'A' is considered only to be of local significance, and given that the bridge abutment and northern section are to be retained, we would not object to its removal and would not consider any archaeological recording to be required.

We are somewhat concerned that the proposals to remove all of wall 'A' do not match the assumptions made in the Structural Survey:

"... As part of the development of the site it is proposed to remove the upper section of the retaining wall to allow access, the removal of the upper section of wall should not adversely affect the stability of the retaining wall" (SS page 3) and the council should be satisfied that its complete removal will not adversely impact the stability of former bridge abutment and the southern wall to the former railway line (walls 'E' and 'F'), or that appropriate mitigation proposals are in place before granting consent.

Yours sincerely

Peter Iles