Also received by email 22/5/23

[illegible]

By Post and Email
[illegible]@ribblevalley.gov.uk

[illegible] May 2023

Dear Sir or Madam

Planning Application No: 3/2023/0301
Grid Ref: 360510 437370
Proposal: Replacement Guide Hut with lowered floor level and ramped access
Location: Longridge Guide Hut Irwell Street Longridge PR3 3NA

We refer to the above application and your letter of 4 May 2023.

We are [redacted] Quest House (the **Property**) [illegible] small retail unit currently occupied by [redacted] and forms [redacted]. Your letter dated [illegible] May 2023 has been brought to our attention by [redacted] and we have set out [illegible] concerns that have been raised below as we believe that [redacted] including [redacted] are severely affected by the application.

In the Design and Access Statement, the agent has attached a plan, enclosed in Schedule 1. The plan does not include the Property and it appears as though the existence of the Property has been ignored (omitted) in the preparation of the above Planning Application. The Planning Application also appears to have omitted reference [redacted] and the [redacted]. The plan shown in Schedule 2 shows the location of these items.

The importance of the accessway referred to above is significant to the [redacted] which is run from the Property. The Property relies on the [redacted] and relies on access from the pavement to the front of the Property.

The retail units [redacted] also use the gate in the accessway to the rear during the day at regular intervals. The businesses store their goods in the rear of their properties and rely on continuous and uninterrupted access via the rear of their properties. The current Planning Application fails to acknowledge this and has not taken into consideration the use of the adjoining properties in any way.

The Design and Heritage Statement, page 4, shows a photograph of the gate and entrance to the Guide Hut. This clearly shows the [redacted] and the boundary wall to the [redacted]. However, the plan shown in Schedule 1 clearly fails to acknowledge the existence of the Property, [illegible] a discrepancy between the drawings and underlying data used.

[illegible] Construction Method Statement, at point 5.1 there is a proposal to [illegible] approximately 1 metre. We are unaware of any surveys that have been undertaken [illegible] will affect the structural integrity of the Property and adjoining units at [illegible] [illegible] the proposed excavations are due to be carried out down the [redacted]

[redacted] We have received [illegible] [redacted] affected after the excavation. We have [illegible] [redacted] and the boundary walls. We have [illegible] Statement [redacted] [illegible] Guide Hut. You will see that it is not possible to construct a temporary [illegible] to the Guide Hut. The drawings and plans fail to acknowledge the [redacted]

In summary, the adjacent retail properties to the proposed replacement Guide Hut have never [illegible] from the applicant to acknowledge the impact these proposed works will have on the [illegible] these premises nor any form of consideration as to how the businesses will be affected by the [illegible] and design proposals. Neither have any of the owners of occupiers been given a timescale of [illegible] when will be undertaken.

We are not, in principle, in opposition of a replacement Guide Hut being constructed. However, [illegible] that the proposed Planning Application fails to take into account the impact of the proposed [illegible] [redacted] and that the design of the proposals fails to even acknowledge the [illegible] [redacted]

We request that the drawings and plans are re-submitted to take into account the existence of [redacted] and the other retails units [redacted] We also additionally request that [illegible] forward to set out how the adjoining businesses will be affected during the construction [illegible] Hut and to consider the impact on footfall and access for these businesses.

We await hearing from you.

Yours faithfully

[redacted]

[redacted]