



Ribble Valley Borough Council  
Council Offices  
Church Walk  
Clitheroe BB7 2RA  
FAO Mr Mark Waleczek  
01 July 2022

Dear Mr Waleczek

**Re: Planning Application Number 3/2022/0457  
94 Ribchester Rd Clayton le dale BB1 9HQ**

With regard to the above planning application and your letter dated 28 June 2022. I wish to object to the application on the following grounds:

- That the proposed development could have a negative impact upon highway safety.
- The there will be insufficient parking for the proposed development
- That access to the highway will be difficult from the proposed development.

### **Highway Safety**

Ribchester Road, B6245, is a high traffic flow road, with a speed limit of 30 mph, there is a traffic safety camera within 300m of the proposed development and a warning sign opposite the proposed development for a hidden dip.

Traffic travelling along Ribchester Rd, would appear to regularly exceed the speed limit of 30mph. This thought is reinforced by Lancashire County Council installing a temporary illuminated road sign reminding drivers of the speed limit and to exercise caution outside of the proposed development for several weeks, earlier this year.

The presence of the traffic safety camera, indicates that previously there has been a fatal collision in the area. Further development, of this size, could negatively impact upon traffic safety, with vehicles exiting the property, slowly, due to the restricted viability, caused by the siting of adjacent property and the hidden dip; causing drivers to take evasive action by excessive braking or having to swerve to avoid vehicle exiting the proposed development.

The hidden dip, just to the west of the proposed development, impacts upon driver visibility of traffic exiting the proposed development, both for drivers already on the road and those wishing to join it.

### **Insufficient parking.**

The red line plan, indicates the size of the demise available for development, and indicates that the land immediately to the front of the proposal does not form part of the development. Therefore, the land available is in the region of 6 metres (max) front to back. It is likely that a 4 bedroom development would have three cars associated with it, possibly more. Therefore, it is difficult to comprehend how such a development could be designed and constructed to be sufficiently large to accommodate 4 bedrooms

and sufficient parking for the vehicles associated with the property. On street parking should not be an option, due to the previously mention factors. It should also be noted that adjacent property is low rise, predominantly single or two storey, therefore , using height to lessen the footprint and increase habitable space should not be permitted as this would be out of character with the area.

### **Access to the development**

The traffic flow, and speed of traffic, can cause problems both in access and egress [REDACTED] is better than the proposed development, due to the houses being set back from the highway edge. The same cannot be said for properties on the same side of the road as the proposed development. Immediately adjacent to the proposed development are properties constructed almost to the edge of the highway, this is likely to have negative impact on visibility to the left when exiting the proposed development.

I would be obliged if you will consider my comments when drafting your recommendations to committee.

Yours Sincerely

[REDACTED]