

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 12 September 2023 00:13  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Application Comments - 3/2023/0424 FS-Case-546322534

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

**Planning Application Reference No.:** 3/2023/0424

**Address of Development:** Sunnyside  
Barker Lane  
BB2 7EE

**Comments:** I am writing to challenge an inaccurate statement made in the supporting planning document which is fundamental to the feasibility of the proposed development.

The following is an extract from the published document.

Extract from Planning Statement  
Site Location

1.1 The application site sits at the rear of two existing properties [Clementina and The Croft] and comprises an existing detached single storey dwelling situated within an extensive residential curtilage. The current property, together with the existing site curtilage, is in a semi-derelict state. The dwelling has been unoccupied for a period of time; it is neither sustainable nor would it be building regulation compliant to attempt to renovate the dwelling. There is a pedestrian access to the property directly from Barker Lane; vehicular access is gained from Long Row where there is an unfettered right for vehicular parking for the occupiers of the dwelling.

Area of Challenge

The above statement regarding vehicular access is factually inaccurate.

1) The property has access issues as there is currently ONLY pedestrian access along a narrow path of some distance leading directly from Barker Lane, therefore any construction would have to be undertaken via this footpath and contractors vehicles would have to park on Barker Lane which is a main road and bus route.

2) Sunnyside has NO vehicular access.

3) Sunnyside has NO vehicular or pedestrian access from Long Row. I am a [REDACTED] There is, as far as I am aware, NO 'unfettered right' for Sunnyside residents or indeed anyone else, other than Long Row residents or their visitors to park on Long Row, [REDACTED] The former long term resident of Sunnyside, [REDACTED] never parked on Long Row, [REDACTED] vehicle was parked on Barker Lane. Long Row is an unadopted single track road, which has recently been resurfaced at residents expense, therefore vehicles cannot park on the road without blocking access.

ALL of the land adjacent to, at the side of and below the access road on Long Row is privately owned and is utilised exclusively for those landowners and their visitors. There is NO public land. I have my land registry deeds proving ownership as do other residents. I do not believe that there are ANY rights of way over this land or any other means of ongoing access or parking for Sunnyside occupants. Had this been the case then searches would have identified this when the land was sold to the individual owners of the cottages on Long Row between 1997 /1998 and when

properties subsequently changed hands. It is implausible to envisage a situation where multiple solicitors have been negligent in identifying this claim of free access nor anyone on Long Row investing in a property with land for their own parking to which someone else has 'unfettered' access.

There is no doubt that the property itself would benefit from sympathetic redevelopment however it is situated in such a landlocked location that the extent of demolition and rebuild would necessitate serious and undue disruption to surrounding properties. The proposed methods of doing this via a pedestrian pathway need to be clearly stipulated and a feasibility study undertaken before planning consent is granted and it is understood that access or parking via Long Row is NOT an option. It is likely, given the type and date of construction, that the property has an asbestos issue which, given the access issues described, further exacerbates the problem for surrounding properties.

There have already been several instances where Long Row land owner residents have been prevented from parking on their own land as a result of vehicles belonging to visitors of Sunnyside and it has been clearly pointed out to them already that this is not permissible - on some occasions rather than being apologetic for causing an inconvenience to residents they have been obstructive and confrontational. We do not want this to become an ongoing problem in any residential setting parking on someone else's driveway whether it be attached to their property or not is simply not lawful.

I would urge that the RVBC planning team visit the proposed site to see the extent of the access issues, before any consents are given, in order not to cause further issues and conflicts for existing residents of neighbouring properties. And furthermore that the applicant makes a truthful statement with regard to the site location and how he intends to carry out works using the only access to which he is entitled to use.