

**From:** Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 16 February 2022 20:31  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Application Comments - 3/2021/0789

**Planning Application Reference No.:** 3/2021/0789

**Address of Development:** 46 Eshton Terrace, Clitheroe, BB7 1BQ

**Comments:** Further to the notice of Amended Information Received: I understand that the amendments are shown on an amended proposed plan which now show (1) a conservation style rooflight and dormer window rather than x2 dormer windows (2) a door to the left side of the existing window rather than extending the window to close to ground level with a central door. Unfortunately these changes diminish the historical pattern of door and windows to a greater extent than the original proposed plans. In the case of (1) the windows in the rear facing roof - the twin dormers at least would be recognisable as being for the same property whereas mixing the types of rear roof windows will confuse the remaining appearance of the whole. Two dormers would match the property at [REDACTED]. Two rooflights would offer minimal disruption and might therefore be superior but aren't proposed. Two different forms offers the most disruption to the remaining historical appearance of the rear roof of this section of terrace. In the case of (2) the amended additional front door arrangement the impact is similar - the original proposal was clearly distinct from the existing pattern of front doors and garden paths and was both modern and visually attractive positively balanced against the impact to the existing rhythm of door ways. As there is no additional information added to the design statement I cannot understand the thinking behind the re-design of a doorway to the left of a window - presumably the existing window. The result on the plan looks irregular and jarringly discordant and creates the appearance of a door stuck into a building without any regard to the existing form of the terrace or its appearance. I believe both of these amendments proposed detract from remaining history in the appearance of this section of terrace. Please consider these comments in addition to my previous comments on this application.