

Nicola Gunn

From: Planning
Subject: FW: Objection to planning application 03/2020/1015 Inglemead, Waddington Road, Clitheroe. BB7 2HN.

From:
Sent: 18 January 2021 17:07
To: Planning <planning@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Subject: Re: Objection to planning application 03/2020/1015 Inglemead, Waddington Road, Clitheroe. BB7 2HN.
Dear Mr. Kilmartin,

We spoke today in relation to the above application and you clarified that the amendment was now no provision for off street parking at all. I now wish to further **object** as this amendment makes the application even more unacceptable, may I also further reiterate the objections contained in the attached email sent to you on 22/12/20.

The fact that amenities are within a walkable distance from this property does not in any way mean that the occupants will not require a vehicle and are more than likely to have two. Parking is already at a premium here, it is not at all fair that existing residents should have to contend with even more competition for parking when provision could be made on this site. By not insisting that parking is provided where the conditions here are already congested will cause a negative impact on our residential amenity. By using the existing access it would cause less of a problem.

We also discussed that only a small number of objections could be viewed on the RVBC site under 'Neighbour response' and I noted that my original objection was not there. I understand that the planning office is unlikely to be running at full capacity and staff maybe working from home. You explained that redacting and uploading of documents does not take place daily. You also stated that my objection may have 'slipped through the net', I have experienced this previously when submitting objections to RVBC and it is for this reason that I asked for my objection to be acknowledged. Despite sending it on 22/12/20 I did not receive any acknowledgement and I now ask that you please acknowledge both my original objection and this further objection to this amended plan.

Yours sincerely,

On Tue, 22 Dec 2020 at 12:55,

Dear Mr. Kilmartin,

We wish to object to planning application **03/2020/1015**, Inglemead, Waddington Road, Clitheroe, BB7 2HN.

The reason for this objection is primarily on highway grounds and the access onto Hawthorne Place. This road is already congested, the terraced properties close to this proposed development have no off street parking and are forced to double park along the street.

Most properties have more than one vehicle, one of which would usually, where possible, be parked outside their own address and any additional parked opposite along the sidewall of Inglemead. Although the proposed property will have two bedrooms there is only one off street parking space, according to LCC guidelines two off street parking spaces are therefore required. I note that due to the proximity, close to the town centre, LCC Highways have stated that on this occasion this will be acceptable. However there is no guarantee whatsoever that the occupants of this property will only always have one car and choose to walk everywhere! Even though it is possible to walk into the town centre from here many still do not and the majority of people living in the area commute out of Clitheroe for work.

Although this property has one off street parking space, a parking space is lost on Hawthorne Place in order to access this space. As the occupants of this two bedroomed property are highly likely to have more than one vehicle which will then be street parked, this will cause the loss of two spaces for the current residents and this is wholly unfair.

LCC Highways rightly state the high walls at the driveway of this proposed property are a danger to road users and pedestrians. However to lose this old and visually pleasing wall that is typical of the area would be unacceptable to the residents here. There is already an existing entrance to Inglemead onto the service street, if this continued to be the access point, there would be less loss of parking to existing residents. The danger due lack of sight and visual amenity would remain as it stands at present and privacy would be maintained to the properties opposite.

On the application for the Persimmon development 03/2019/1104, land off Hawthorne Place, there is an expectation by Highways for each new property to provide the requisite number of off street parking spaces for each house. This is only a few hundred metres away from Inglemead yet this guideline has been relaxed, how can this be? If we allow this house to only provide one space then the future development, that is already far too dense with 58 houses, could scrap their plans and squeeze in more housing at the expense of parking spaces. Setting this precedent so close to another development would appear to be very unwise indeed.

If the Persimmon development was to go ahead I imagine that in order to ease access at this very narrow problematic junction, double yellow lines will be installed. This has been carried out at the entrance to Milton Avenue, where another similar development was permitted. This will result in even more loss of residents parking and as is often the case in these circumstances may lead to animosity and friction between neighbours. Currently we enjoy exceptional levels of community spirit and cordiality here, therefore what may appear to be a small matter of parking could have a massive negative impact on our residential amenity.

It should also be noted that Hawthorne Place is also used by workers and shoppers to park, avoiding payment on nearby car parks. It may only appear to be the loss of 2 parking spaces now but with the addition of yellow lines and visitors parking on top of existing residents the effects will be too much.

I would also be concerned that while this property is currently single story, so not overly imposing, over time a further story could easily be added to the flat roof and probably without the need for planning permission? This would cause the address to become more imposing and impact upon the privacy and light to surrounding properties.

May we kindly request acknowledgement of this objection, apologies if this is not usual protocol but we have previously experienced a problem with an objection not being received by RVBC.

Thank you for taking the time to consider our concerns.

Yours sincerely,