



Laura Eastwood
Principle Planning Officer
Ribble Valley Borough Council
Council Offices
Church Walk
Clitheroe
Lancashire
BB7 2RA

7th February 2022

Planning Application 3/2022/0046
42 Knowsley Road

Dear Laura,

I am relieved to see that this breach of PA 3/2021/0555 has been bought back to the planning department and that we, the residents of Knowsley Road and Woodcrest, together with the Borough and Parish Councils, have another opportunity to scrutinise the actions of our new neighbour.

It is clearly stated in the conditions of the approval by Ribble Valley Borough Council that no amendments to the layout of the building are allowed, yet the applicant has decided to ignore this. Within condition two the Council stated, *"For the avoidance of doubt and to clarify which plans are relevant to the consent hereby approved"*, these plans show the garage as a garage, not a cinema room

Had the applicant acted on his own I could have understood that *"the applicant was under the impression that permission was not required"*. However, he has employed the services of a planning consultant who I would have expected to understand the terminology *"Unless explicitly required by condition within this consent, the development hereby permitted shall be carried out in complete accordance with the proposals as detailed on drawings: Location Plan, Existing Plans and Elevation"*. As such this construction is a clear breach of the conditions set out by Ribble Valley Borough Council.

Equally, I would have expected that the same planning consultant would have looked at the planning history of the property and seen that the previous owners had been advised that permission was required for their similar, but lapsed, plans for the house.

Why would a planning consultant not advise their client to include their plans for the garage within the change of use application? Could it be because they referred to it as a parking facility in the document *"Parking Amenity Shifts"* that was part of the previous application? I suspect that had these plans for the

garage been included within the original application there would have been much greater scrutiny of the highway's and parking issues by Lancashire County Council. The business will have at least one "company" vehicle based at the home and four staff on duty each day, if - as proposed - there is a shift change at 10pm all four staff will have to arrive by car as there is no public transport provision at that time. This gives a potential for at least five vehicles on a site that can, as a result of this breach, only accommodate three 2.4 x 4.8 metre parking spaces and a turning facility for those vehicles.

If the Council do not enforce this breach, how can they enforce the same condition should the applicant, or a subsequent owner, decide to divide one or more of the bedrooms, to increase capacity and thence income. If the applicant is allowed to "get away" with this action, what happens if they choose to ignore condition five, which relates to the number of children and the location that they come from, which the Council clearly stated was *"In the interest of a community cohesion and safeguarding residential amenity"*?

After the planning meeting the proprietors of the company promised the assembled residents, who had filled the public gallery, that they would engage and consult with the community – there has been none.

Having spoken to the Planning Committee on behalf of myself and my neighbours, which I believe helped gain the conditions attached to the planning consent, I feel that Ribble Valley Borough Council should use this breach as due cause to rescind the entire consent granted under PA 3/2021/0555 and request a full resubmission of the change of use application, with this change of layout as part of that new application.

Yours sincerely

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the signature of the sender.