

Read
Burnley

13 January 2021

Mr. Adam Birkett
Planning Applications
Ribble Valley Borough Council
Council Offices
Church Walk
Clitheroe
Lancs, BB7 2RA
Email: planning@ribblevalley.gov.uk

Dear Sir,

Re: Planning Application No. 3/2021/0011

While we recognise the quality of the house design and proportions are in keeping with the local neighbourhood we would like to object to the above planning application on the following grounds:

1. Incorrect data on location maps – We again draw your attention to this matter as highlighted in my previous letter relating to outline planning permission on the 22 October 2019. The planning application submission is incorrect and uses out-of-date information. The location plan shows our property in the adjacent plot as it was, as a smaller dwelling, prior to extensive renovations and extension almost doubling the size of the property and taking it closer to the proposed development and boundary line following planning permission approval in late 2016. We do not believe the drawings show the proximity and scale of our property in relation to the proposed new development and would be concerned how a committee would be able to assess the impact on surrounding properties without this clearly shown. We suggest plans are resubmitted with the correct current information.
2. Plot extends into Hammond Ground - The plot length appears out of proportion with all other properties on George Lane with rear facing gardens onto Hammond Ground. It extends significantly beyond the 'normal' garden length and chooses to align itself with plots at the northern edge of the field, instead of more correctly the eastern fringe of the field. Given recent refusal of planning permissions relating to the Hammond Ground field we are concerned that the owners of this field are acting directly against the previous decision and are seeking to create a new boundary to the field that has already been through full discussion, has strong local opposition and repeated rejection of planning to the highest level. The proposed plot length also appears to differ to what was approved in the original outline planning application. We would be concerned that if building were allowed in one small part of this field then this would be used as precedent for building in another. We would suggest they think about moving the house closer to the road and working within the

established boundary.

3. Overlooking and loss of privacy – the proposed development is at a higher elevation than our property which in winter, when the trees lose their leaves, offers a direct vantage point into our garden, main reception room and master bedroom windows. We had presumed any windows adjacent to our property would be limited, or frosted for privacy if development took place?
4. Balcony – A stipulation of our own relatively recent planning consent when we extended our property and created a balcony which overlooks our neighbour's garden, in a much less intrusive fashion, was to screen visibility with opaque glass. While we recognise each planning application is considered on its merits we would be looking for some consistency in the planning departments decision making. As this particular solution doesn't appear possible with the current proposed balcony positioning, we would suggest that the proposed balcony in the master bedroom face directly into Hammond Ground through the other window rather than the side facing adjacent buildings and gardens with opaque glass being used on the side panels to provide us with adequate privacy.
5. Trees - we have eight very large deciduous trees on the edge of our property directly adjacent to the proposed development and mark the boundary. These trees are at least 60 ft high and the oldest amongst them I estimate at over 150 years. The canopy extends over 20 feet into the proposed build plot. I am pleased to see the tree survey results in response to my previously raised concerns and the protection suggested during building work, but I notice the plans now include tree planting directly adjacent to the already established tree line which would undoubtedly disturb the root system. We would suggest that this element of the design is revisited.

We thank you for the opportunity to comment on the application.

Yours faithfully