

[REDACTED]

---

**From:**

**Sent:**

[REDACTED]  
05 February 2024 12:42

**To:**

Planning

**Subject:**

Objection to increase in dogs at the aptly named Bark Park Whalley. 3/2023/0659 refers



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.

---

I am aware that an application to increase the amount of dogs from the original 50 to the lower figure of 30 has been submitted.

I objected for the original 50 and submit that 30 dogs barking and yapping is just ridiculous.

As I understand it, the site is permitted up to 20 dogs at any one time .... the barking & yapping is intolerable as things stand.

I am at a loss as to how the original planning was agreed.

Of note I have seen more than 20 dogs on site which has grown exponentially with solar panels, water butts and a wind turbine .... could this application for further dogs be a ploy to obtain the status quo ?

We object in the strongest terms to a further increase in dogs on site.

Regards

[REDACTED]

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 05 February 2024 15:29  
**To:** Planning  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Application 3/2023/0659



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.

To whom it may concern

I am wishing to put forward my objection for planning Application 3/2023/0659

My concerns regarding the planning application are as follows

- Increase in traffic. [REDACTED] works. The volume of traffic even now is horrendous. I regularly take [REDACTED] with me [REDACTED]. It is nearly impossible to get down Ridding Lane to the water works without having a car coming down and I have to either run to a passing place or ram him into the hedge. I only have [REDACTED] it [REDACTED]. I have also received abuse from drivers, and what I believe [REDACTED] saying I should not be walking [REDACTED]. During the school run is like dicing with death. I don't think it will be long before a child is knocked over. Fingers crossed I am wrong.
- Affecting wildlife, again the increase in traffic has already damaged the hedgerows etc. We are already losing so much wildlife with the new housing developments in the area. It would be a shame to lose more just for greed. There are various doggy day cares in the area so I fail to see the need to increase the number of dogs allowed at The Bark Park due to the area it is located. Maybe if it wasn't so close to housing etc.
- The owner has already been [REDACTED] having more dogs than she should, I believe the [REDACTED] counted over 50 dogs, the original planning permission was only granted for 15 /20. If planning permission is granted for 30 dogs, I believe they will soon be up to 70-80 dogs. Surely this would invalidate any insurance etc. A dog's welfare needs to come first and foremost.

- There is now dog grooming available at the site, again this has caused another increase in traffic, I don't believe planning has been applied for?
- The site itself is not actually suitable, it is full of broken glass and dogs have been injured because of this.
- The site is not secure. Before Christmas a dog got out and was missing for over 8 hours, sadly the [REDACTED] as the Bark Park where doing nothing to help, actually lost their own dog as it got hit by a car. If they cannot look after the dogs they have now, how can they look after another 10+ dogs.

- Noise levels. It is already extremely loud when walking past. Those living on the Monks Cross housing estate will also suffer greatly. I am unsure if this increased volume would be affecting the wildlife.

I urge you to reject this planning application for the reasons stated above.

Please do not hesitate to contact me should you require anything

Yours sincerely

A large black rectangular box used to redact the signature of the sender.

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 05 February 2024 17:25  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Application Comments - 3/2023/0659 FS-Case-584091472

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

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

**Address of Development:** Bark Park

**Comments:** Already noise issue with 20 dogs, previously reported. Intrusion into peaceful quiet to enjoy outdoors in garden. Already traffic movement from 6am through to 6.30pm at bottom of field behind Whittam Road and Crescent. Increased license will increase noise and traffic congestion, particularly on Broad Lane and passed Whalley Primary School. Wrong location all together for more dogs

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 05 February 2024 18:36  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Application Comments - 3/2023/0659 FS-Case-584115908

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

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

**Address of Development:** Bark Park Whalley

**Comments:** The increase in capacity will cause more traffic on the single-track lanes around the park. There is nowhere to pass when walking and two cars cannot pass. Noise levels from barking dogs are also an issue as they bark when walkers and walkers with dogs pass by. I was surprised to see that the council agreed for a dog bark, other businesses trading there and steel wood cladded structures to be erected in this rural spot. It would have been better suited to an area with better access and away from houses.