



Council Offices
Church Walk
Clitheroe
Lancashire BB7 2RA

Dear Sir / Madam

Regarding correspondence dated 12 January 2021:

Applicant:	Dunkenhalgh Estate
Planning App. No.:	3/2020/1103
Grid Ref:	370978 433702
Proposal:	Proposed replacement dwelling
Location:	Overdale York Lane Langho BB6 8DT

I live in one of the properties directly opposite the location of the proposal and have reviewed the information provided on line. I would like to make the following points that I would like to be clarified in respect of the proposal:

- Whilst I appreciate that the proposed plans aim to mitigate any height differential between the current dwelling and the proposals, I am not certain from the plans whether there would be an adverse impact to the light into my property. I would strongly oppose any loss of light and ask that the plans be revised to assure that this is not the case.
- I did not notice any information on the proposed boundary wall / fence / hedge from the property to York Lane. Whilst the existing hedge is overgrown and a little unsightly, I would expect that any replacement does not exceed the intended height of the existing hedge and that it is in keeping with the height of the wall of the next-door property, Petre View.
- Current times are of course unprecedented, and I am working from home full-time. I do have a concern that the rebuild could be disruptive from a noise perspective and would ask that this is considered as part of the rebuild plans. It would be helpful if the neighbouring properties could be appraised of the high-level timeline of activities so that we are prepared for any disruption.
- Parking on York Lane opposite the proposed rebuild tend to be taken by residents of the terraced cottages. I would ask that any skips or vehicles associated with the rebuild park on the site rather than cause congestion on York Lane or inconvenience to the residents.
- There are some points in the Design and Access Statement that are misleading:
 - o Section 4.27 – whilst there are some 1.5 and 2-storey properties adjacent to the proposed rebuild, all properties that are directly opposite to the row of terraced cottages are one-storey. The property photographed in section 6.20 does not face a property on York Lane.
 - o Section 5.6 – the proposed property volume of 694m³ and the previous property of 3471m³ must be a mistake. The proposed property is described as 47% greater in volume so the previous numbers are incorrectly documented.

To summarise, I am not opposed to the rebuild per se. The plans seem well thought through and considerate to the neighbourhood. My significant objection is relating to whether the proposal takes any light from my property and I would ask that the plans are revised to assure that this is not the case. I also ask that the work is carried out in a considerate way in respect of noise and congestion.

