

15 York Street - Statement of Case

This appeal relates to the recent refusal of our application to reinstate historic gates to the cart opening which forms the front elevation of our property.

The proposal is for the replacement of a gate of appropriate and traditional design for security and aesthetic reasons, restoring a key element of the building's past with no harm to its significance in heritage terms, or to the character and significance of any adjacent heritage assets or to the conservation.

We initially approached a local traditional gate fabricator who advised that the historic brackets, which can still be seen in situ, would have originally supported wrought iron gates. This local company specialises in the manufacture/fabrication of traditional gates.

With our local knowledge of Clitheroe, we agreed a traditional cast iron style gate would be most appropriate and submitted a Listed Building Consent application to RVBC planning department.

We were very surprised when the planning application was refused, in spite of us sending many photographs of local examples to the Conservation Officer. The reason for refusal and Delegated Report stated that the gates were inappropriate and that timber gates would be more acceptable, however this was not backed up by any evidence, and felt extremely arbitrary.

Following the refusal we approached a conservation specialist for their advice who, having inspected the property, advised that the original gates would have been wrought iron and that this style would be the most appropriate and supplied us with a Heritage Impact Assessment, setting out evidence for this, as well as some suggestions of very minor changes to simplify the design and suggested we resubmit the application with this additional justification and evidence.

Before the new application was resubmitted we understand that the RVBC Conservation Officer, Adrian Dowd, left RVBC - leaving the planning authority with no Conservation Officer.

The Case Officer, Stephen Kilmartin, stated on the phone that he too was going to refuse the application as "the design is too similar to the previously application that was refused".

The LPA appears to have taken no notice of the comprehensive HIA accompanying the application and its findings; the HIA is attached as an appendix to this statement. We would also question whether the planning department was in an adequate position to assess the additional justification and evidence at the time, given the lack of heritage expertise in the planning department.