

Sharon Craig

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 06 November 2024 12:23
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2024/0812 FS-Case-660317342

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2024/0812

Address of Development: 14 Castle Street Clitheroe

Comments: I understand that Body Care wish to update the front of the shop. This shop has the original architrave shop and I feel this should be retained. Castle Street still has some remaining shop fronts from the same era, and with some alteration to the doorway, although that also is within the character of the building, this feature should be kept.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 31 October 2024 13:08
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2024/0812 FS-Case-658838700

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2024/0812

Address of Development: 14 Castle Street, Clitheroe

Comments: I submit comments here [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] supports the eventual re-opening of Bodycare and recognise that remedial works are required to facilitate that, we so have some notable concerns about this application. The property sits in the heart of Castle St conservation area and the proposals will, we believe, be detrimental to it. Changes to the building need to respond sensitively to the conservation area and ideally should enhance it. As RVBC's own Clitheroe Conservation Area Management Guidance states: 'On listed buildings and in conservation areas the Council will seek a high standard of design which should conserve or enhance features of architectural or historic interest.'

One of the major contributing factors to the significance of Clitheroe's Conservation Area are the high-quality, traditional 19th and early 20th century shop fronts. The loss of the shopfront at 14 Castle Street will cause harm to the significance of the conservation area by the total loss of a traditional, characterful shop front and its replacement with a modern alternative. This is one of the better surviving historic shop fronts on Castle Street, where many others have suffered from the continuing loss of original architectural details and use of inappropriate modern materials and signage.

The submitted Heritage Statement doesn't adequately assess the significance of the existing shop front, nor provide any detail on the condition of the different elements of it, and is therefore not compliant with paragraph 200 of the NPPF. There is no clear and convincing justification for the harm caused by the removal of the historic material (Para 206). For example, there is no justification for why the recessed door and doorway and its top light, and the pilasters, can't be retained. Castle St has many recessed doorways and removal of this would be regrettable - the existing door and placement of it can surely be retained in the refurb of the shopfront?

We would also highlight paragraph 202 of the NPPF: Where there is evidence of deliberate neglect of, or damage to, a heritage asset, the deteriorated state of the heritage asset should not be taken into account in any decision. We would not suggest deliberate neglect here, however its clear that the building has seen a lack of maintenance and this has contributed to its accelerated decay. Wooden window frames of course require regular repair and maintenance.

For all of these reasons, we would like to see retention of the recessed doorway, original door and other shopfront features, with sensitive repair where required. Wholesale removal of the shopfront and loss of the recessed entrance do not seem appropriate at this key location in the Castle St Conservation Area and could set a precedent for other properties.