

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 31 October 2022 08:35
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application No 3/2022/0923 - 3 Knowsley Road West, Clayton-le-Dale



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.

Subject: Planning Application No 3/2022/0923 - 3 Knowsley Road West, Clayton-le-Dale ("the Property")

Dear Sirs,

[REDACTED]

I have looked at the plans available online and it appears that the proposal is that a large raised decking area be constructed to the rear of the Property. In addition there appears to be a ramp created in the rear garden at the side of the Property [REDACTED]. It is my understanding that planning permission is needed because the intention of the applicant is to raise the level of the decking 0.6 m above the current ground level across the whole of the decking area. It is not clear from the application why the existing ground level is to be raised by 60 cms. I believe that this will be unduly intrusive and impact [REDACTED]. The planning application submitted makes reference to erecting a fence where the Property adjoins [REDACTED] Knowsley Road but there is no indication that the [REDACTED] will be increased in height which would help to reduce any [REDACTED].

I wish to object to the proposal on the following grounds:-

1. The proposal would have an adverse environmental impact in general terms as an area including shrubs and lawn will be removed and replaced with a decking area (an impermeable surface) covering a significant portion of the external rear garden at the Property. I note that the applicant states that no trees will need to be removed to create the large decking area (an area. Whilst this might the case as of mid-October 2022 [REDACTED] I can confirm that the current owners of the Property have removed trees before submitting the planning application referenced above.
1. What cannot be fully appreciated from the submitted plans is the fact that the Property is below the level of the road to the front of the Property. This can cause water to run off from the road when there is rain. I am concerned about the impact of the proposed development on drainage at the Property which, as far as I can see, has not been considered or addressed in the planning application submitted. The application significantly increases the area of impermeable surfaces which will result in an increase in the volume of surface runoff during and after times of rainfall. The previous owner of the Property [REDACTED] she had an issue with the level of the flags at the rear of the Property, these had become uneven over time and she thought that this may be related to drainage issues and water ingress generally. I refer to policy DME6 of the Core Strategy 2008-2028 a Local Plan for Ribble Valley ("the Strategy"). At page 101, paragraph 10.17 it states that "Development will not be permitted where the proposal would be at an unacceptable risk of flooding or exacerbate flooding elsewhere". The Strategy goes on to state that applications for

development should include appropriate measures for, amongst other things, "management of water, such that development contributes to reducing the risk of surface water flooding." There is reference in the Strategy as follows, "all applications for planning permission should include details for surface water drainage and means of disposal based on sustainable drainage principles.... Development proposals will be expected to investigate and identify more sustainable alternatives to help reduce the risk of surface water. flooding and environmental impact." if the application for planning permission submitted is approved then [REDACTED] will be significantly lower than the Property. This will increase the risk of flooding to [REDACTED] unless there are improvements to drainage issues at the Property. To approve the submitted application would be contrary to the requirements of the Strategy. I am extremely concerned that a consequence of this development, if approved, will be flooding [REDACTED]

2. Policy DMG1, General Considerations, of the Strategy sets out the requirements of development when determining planning applications. The first subheading of this policy is "Design". I do not consider that the proposed construction of a large decking area at the Property is compliant with the requirement to be sympathetic to existing land uses in terms of intensity, scale, massing and style. Additionally there has been no consideration of the density, layout and relationship between buildings nor has any emphasis been placed on visual appearance or relationship to surroundings including the impact on landscape character all of which are required to be considered under DMG1. However of particular importance is the fact that there doesn't appear to have been any consideration of the effect of the proposed development on existing amenities. As indicated above the proposed decking area will cover a significant area of the external rear garden necessitating the removal of shrubs and some of the lawn area. In my view this is out of keeping with the other gardens in the vicinity which do have outside seating areas but are not predominantly hard standing/decking or other impermeable surfaces nor has the ground level at other properties locally been artificially raised. There is a further sub-heading in policy DMG1 of the Strategy in respect of "Amenity". This clearly states that the development must not adversely affect the amenities of the surrounding area and must provide adequate... privacy distances. The proposed development includes raising the entirety of the area which is to be decked by 0.6m. This would impact significantly [REDACTED] and I am unsure why there is a need for such a great increase in what would essentially become "ground level". Similarly this will impact on other properties in terms of overlooking and loss of privacy.
2. The introduction of decking can create problems associated with rodents if there are voids beneath the decking. [REDACTED] keeps poultry which of itself will be an attraction for such pests.

I spoke to a Planning Officer at the Council as I did have concerns that a precedent may have been set by [REDACTED] whom have constructed a large decking area at the rear of their property. I am unsure whether this operational development does benefit from planning permission but believe it may be exempt from enforcement in any event. I was assured by the Planning Officer I spoke to on 17 October that no precedent will have been set in terms of the current application by the development at [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

In all the circumstances set out above I ask that the current planning application submitted be refused.



Application 3/2022/0923

Development address: 3, Knowsley Road West, Wilpshire BB1 9PW

[REDACTED]

The plan of the proposed raised deck side view is not comprehensive enough and does not show the same side elevation as the existing elevations do, in relation to:

- The exact location of where the fence and retaining wall will be situated as measurements are not provided
- The side view of regraded slope to lawn, how high the current land boundary level will be raised to allow the regrading of the slope, and how close this is to the existing boundary, and its measurements.
- The new 1500mm fence; will this then go on top of the new retaining base wall? If so, how high will the new retaining base wall be?

Regrading the existing slope and subsequent extension of the lawn towards the boundary will significantly increase the potential [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] and adds to the already existing drainage issues [REDACTED] resulting in excess land water [REDACTED]. The natural lie of the land is downhill from the development address, [REDACTED]

The estimated height of the existing patio level above the boundary level is approx. 1000 mm. A further increase of this height of 600mm for proposed decking would potentially make a 2000mm boundary fence become, in effect, 400mm high, reducing it to knee height resulting in significant privacy issues by being overlooked.

In summary, we have concerns that the proposed plans will result [REDACTED] [REDACTED] which will significantly have an impact [REDACTED] addition, add to existing land drainage issues.