

## Sharon Craig

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 22 September 2021 14:05  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Application Reference 3/2021/0686: FAO Ben Taylor  
  
**Importance:** High



This email originated from outside Ribble Valley Borough Council. Do NOT click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and are sure the content within this email is safe.

Dear Ben,

I am writing on behalf of [REDACTED] in respect of the above planning application. [REDACTED]

Whilst the above postal addresses are directly adjacent to the subject property and the Council website indicates those properties have been consulted, I do not believe we have received any formal letter of consultation and we [REDACTED]

Having reviewed the planning application details, we must regrettably object to the proposals as we consider they would be injurious to the private amenity and enjoyment of the above affected properties. [REDACTED]

The proposals will comprise a significant two storey rear and side extension. [REDACTED] is two storey and during the course of the determination of our application, officers took care to ensure that the plots on our site were sited to achieve a minimum 21m interface distance [REDACTED]. This was deemed important due to the change in levels between the properties.

We note that the application submitted has not included any information on interface distances to the above properties, despite that information being freely available. The proposals will result in additional two storey development situated closer to the properties on our site and it will have an unacceptable and overbearing impact on our future residents. Officers will be aware of the recent application to remove the dying ash trees that were once on this boundary, which will only serve to exacerbate this effect.

Further we note that the proposals include a fully balcony to the rear. Were this to be permitted, it would allow full and uninterrupted overlooking over the rear private amenity space, and also straight into principal habitable rooms of each of those properties, unacceptably harming privacy.

Whilst a somewhat aged document, the Council's Planning Guidance for Extensions and Alterations To Dwellings makes clear the 21m interface distance should be followed, except in special circumstances. No special circumstances have been demonstrated. Further it states, "*Balconies should be sited or screened so as not to cause loss of privacy to neighbours.*" The proposal to provide 2.5m high fencing on the boundary with our properties would do nothing to ameliorate the impact.

Taking this guidance into account, we consider the planning application is in conflict with Policy DMG1 of the Core Strategy.

We trust that you will take these comments into account in your report and decision. We would also be grateful if

