

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 25 June 2022 17:06
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2022/0532 FS-Case-432271858

Categories: xRedact & Upload

Name: [REDACTED]

Address: [REDACTED]

Lancashire

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2022/0532

Address of Development: 39 The Rydings, Langho BB6 8BQ

Comments: The proposed extension is a significant development consisting of approximately 92m³ rear extension and 37m³ side extension. The total width is more than half the width of the existing building. It will be built within 2m of existing boundaries to 3 properties and have a maximum height of 4.5m.

[REDACTED] do not support this development.

The proposed extension goes against the open plan layout of the estate by:

- a) cramming in an rear extension all the way to the western boundary fence to 61 The Rydings and
- b) a side extension taking all the space between the garage to 41 and the northern boundary fence to 59 The Rydings.

Whilst this may look acceptable from the road fronting the property the crowded nature of the proposal will be unsightly from the rear. This impacts both the aesthetics and will be detrimental to the future maintenance requirements of the property. Throughout the estate open spaces have been provided between each of the properties.

The application form suggests there is no impact on parking for 39 The Rydings but it should be noted that the former integral double garage serving the property has already been converted into a larger kitchen and not useable for cars.

The plans do not show the conservatory extension that has already been constructed in the garden and this proposal will take up a significant proportion of the available land surrounding the property.

The application form suggests there is no impact on trees. However there is very likely to be damage during construction of the foundations to the roots of the tall mature tree next to the fence in the garden of no. 61.

Similarly ground works during construction so close to the fences may result in damage to existing fences and supports.

The roof of the proposed extension will be higher than the existing roofline of the garage to no. 41. The slope of the proposed store roof will contrast significantly with that of the adjoining garage especially when it is built immediately adjoining. Because no.59 is slightly lower in elevation it will be faced with a 5m high brick wall which will tower up to 3m above the existing fence.

A key consideration for any project is the impact on future maintenance. No mention is made in the proposal for rain water goods and dealing with water from the roof structures. Currently one of the downspouts to the existing gutter at the rear of 39 is blocked with weeds growing out. This leads to water cascading onto the existing hard flagged surface and ponding of water to the rear of no. 59 where the ground level is a foot or more lower. This standing water issue is made worse by the gutters to the rear of the garages to 41 and 61 also getting blocked and surcharging.

Because the house owners do not see the problems with their gutters they do not do anything to rectify any problems this may cause. At least the garage gutters to the rear of 41 and 61 are accessible. This begs the question of how the owners of 39 The Rydings will firstly notice a problem with the rain water goods for the proposed extensions and secondly how will they be able to access and rectify any issues. Certainly the lack of space will mean they will not be able to access the roof gutters from their own property.

Similarly no consideration has been given to existing boundary fences. As the fence posts are on the side of no.39 they have the maintenance responsibility. The existing condition of the fence behind the garage of no. 61 is poor with a number of fence slats loose, missing or not aligned properly. With the proposed extension so close to the boundary it will not be possible to maintain this fence from no.39 and would require the co-operation of the owner of no. 61 for access.

Similarly it will not be possible for the owners of no.39 to see nor to maintain the boundary fence to no.59. In this case should the proposed extension be built it will require a large garden shed to be dismantled and moved to allow access. [REDACTED]

As any boundary fence maintenance is minimal now it will be non-existing in the future when visibility and access to the fences become an issue.