

## Harriet McCartney

---

**From:** Planning  
**Sent:** 12 October 2020 11:22  
**To:** Harriet McCartney  
**Subject:** FW: OBJECTION TO PLANNING APPLICATION 3/2020/0723  
**Attachments:** DSC\_0033.JPG; DSC\_0034.JPG; DSC\_0035.JPG; DSC\_0036.JPG



**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 10 October 2020 14:31  
**To:** Planning <[planning@ribblevalley.gov.uk](mailto:planning@ribblevalley.gov.uk)>; [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** OBJECTION TO PLANNING APPLICATION 3/2020/0723



9th October 2020

Harriet McCartney  
Planning Dept, RVBC  
Clitheroe  
[planning@ribblevalley.gov.uk](mailto:planning@ribblevalley.gov.uk)

### **OBJECTION TO PLANNING APPLICATION 3/2020/0723** **6 SOUTHFIELD DRIVE, WEST BRADFORD, CLITHEROE BB7 4TU**

Dear Harriet McCartney

We live adjacent to the proposed extension and are writing to request that RVBC refuse the above planning application from Mr Michael Devenney.

Listed are our comments and objections relating to this application:

- The proposed extension, due to its size, depth, width and height, would be visually overbearing and have an unacceptably adverse impact on the residential amenities of the neighbouring properties.
- The proposed double-storey extension would create shading and exacerbate the existing wind-tunnel effect between properties No 6 and No 5, given the proximity at the closest point, with the potential to cause damage to buildings, trees and plants.

- The scale, design and proposed material would be completely out of keeping with neighbouring properties creating an unwanted precedent.
- The wooden cladding that is proposed, if not correctly and regularly maintained, has the potential to become extremely unsightly as it weathers.
- Wooden cladding to the front and rear aspects of the proposed extension has been specified on the application. These plans do not show the wooden cladding recently attached to the front aspect of the property, pre-empting planning permission.
- Wooden cladding has been specified on all aspects of the existing extension. But no cladding has been specified in the new application for the side aspect of the proposed upper extension, as was shown in the original plans, suggesting the possibility of it being added at a later stage.

We therefore ask that you refuse this planning application.

Photographs are attached to illustrate our objections but you may feel that a visit to the property would provide further clarification.

Yours sincerely

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]



