

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 12 March 2024 15:22  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Application Comments - 3/2023/0659 FS-Case-594865788

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

**Planning Application Reference No.:** 3/2023/0659

**Address of Development:** Land on the south side of Ridding Lane (Broad Lane) Whalley adj Sewage Works

**Comments:** Ref Planning application 3/2023/0659.

I have just noticed that the applicant has amended their planning application by reducing the number of dogs from 50 to 30.

This is doesn't distract from my original objection as ANY increase in numbers will only exaggerate the already unbearable noise pollution this business creates.

I therefore ask that this application be refused on the following grounds;

Noise Pollution -

We already endure noise pollution from The Bark Park (quite an apt business name for all the wrong reasons!) in the form of barking dogs. Any proposed increase in capacity at the site will only increase the triggers that cause the barking and therefore the number of incidents we already have to endure as residents.

Increased Traffic Risk -

As a local resident, I am concerned about the increase in traffic that any increase in dog capacity will inevitably bring.

The so-called Road (known as Ridding Lane) is in fact recorded as a public footpath (ref FP0345020) whose management is under Lancashire County Council's Public Rights of Way team.

As there is no record of any public vehicular rights of way along Ridding Lane, any increase in traffic will only deteriorate the footpath further as well as increase the risk to pedestrians, as there are no passing places or verges.

It is also worth noting that the Risk to pedestrians cannot be mitigated by the Council applying a planning condition, or the Bark Park itself, as the footpath is unadopted and therefore outside of both their control.

**General Comment –**

The original planning letter attached to the application went some way to explain that an increase in dog numbers to 50 was the only way of sustaining the business.

This change of heart, no doubt linked to the numerous objections being shown on the council's planning website, only goes to show the original statement was indeed false as now they foresee 30 dogs will sustain the business.

This only raises concerns on how much of the remaining statement is also false and not based on fact.

**Conclusion -**

I do not consider this proposal to be in keeping with proper development of the local area and would ask that the application be refused.