

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 10 December 2023 20:55
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2023/0659 FS-Case-568355278

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2023/0659

Address of Development: Bark Park,
Ridding Lane
Whalley

Comments: The increase in dog numbers will create an excessive amount of noise. At present I can clearly hear barking dogs from the park .
Also, the access road is not suitable for an increase in vehicle movements.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 10 December 2023 20:41
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2023/0659 FS-Case-568352944

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2023/0659

Address of Development: Bark Park
Ridding Lane
Whalley

Comments: My concern relates to the amount of noise that an additional 30 dogs would generate at Bark Park. The current noise of barking dogs is clearly audible inside my house at times as it is. Being in the back garden is not pleasant at times.
Also, access is not suitable for the increase in traffic.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 10 December 2023 16:19
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2023/0659 FS-Case-568319419

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2023/0659

Address of Development: Bark Park
Ridding Lane
Whalley
BB7 9HW

[REDACTED]

5th December 2023

Ribble Valley Council Planning
Church Walk
Clitheroe
BB7 2RA

Dear Sir/Madam

Re. Objection to Planning Reference 3/2023/0659

I make reference to planning application number 3/2023/0659 Ridding Lane Whalley BB7 9HW by [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] and would like to register a formal objection to the planning application or any further expansion of the Bark Park.

The objection is raised by [REDACTED]
We are the [REDACTED] and the [REDACTED]
applicants land known as the "Bark Park". We have neither been notified or consulted of previous planning applications, and have either found out after permission has been granted or by accident.

The reasons for our objection are as follows:

- Single Track Road - Ridding Lane is a narrow unlit single-track road which is also a popular and busy public footpath

and is approached from Broad Lane and The Sands, again which are both unlit narrow single-track roads and not suitable for regular high volumes of vehicular traffic.

- **Volume of traffic** - Although previous planning permission was granted on the grounds that the Bark Park would accommodate no more than twenty dogs and have a collection and drop off service, this is not the case. I have concerned members of the public constantly complaining to me about the volume and speed of traffic using the public footpath, Ridding Lane, for the purpose of the Bark Parks clientele who are dropping off and collecting their own dogs throughout the day. It is clearly evident the number of dogs is far exceeding the numbers permitted in the original planning application and the noise from the large number of dogs is constant and upsets our livestock as well as the surrounding residential areas. [REDACTED] of the volume of Bark Park clientele dropping off and collecting their dogs.

- **Unauthorised additional business services** - The Bark Park website also offers dog grooming services, dog training, boarding and field hire. These services were not approved as part of the original planning application and increases the volume of vehicles by members of the general public dropping off and collecting their dogs.

- **Infringes rights of access** – The Bark Park owners are infringing rights of access. The only right of access by vehicle on [REDACTED] United Utilities, and the owners of the land known as the Bark Park. There is no permitted vehicle access by the general public. As we have proof that members of the public are dropping off and collecting their own dogs, the Bark Park is infringing rights of access. [REDACTED] we do not permit members of the general public to use the lane with vehicles and will not permit additional clientele accessing the lane in their cars.

- **Access to Bark Park** – [REDACTED] as such, the Bark Park has no legal right of way [REDACTED] access its main entrance [REDACTED] temporary access [REDACTED] When [REDACTED] ended, the temporary access was left in situ but the section of land in between the road and the Bark Park main [REDACTED] – please see accompanying plan. [REDACTED] Bark Park owners that they do not have right of way across this albeit small section of land.

- **Public footpath is unsafe due to volume of traffic** - With the significant amount of residential development over the past few years the amount of people using Ridding Lane for walking, exercising or taking the dog for a walk has increased considerably to an almost constant flow. Car numbers using the lane are in excess of twenty five at either end of the day and a regular flow in between. This lane is a public footpath and given the nature of the road it is completely unsuitable and unacceptable and poses a real danger to public safety, especially in hours of darkness. Ridding Lane is a footpath and is only suitable for occasional traffic. Ridding Lane runs in very close proximity, parallel to the banking of the river Calder. The significant increase in traffic has led to subsidence of part of the river banking, to the point where the road has had to be diverted, encroaching directly on to our field. Any further increases in weight of traffic poses a real risk of further subsidence and environmental damage to the river banking, natural habitats and the river itself.

- **Welfare of livestock** - The Bark Park is accessed by going [REDACTED] grazed by sheep and cattle and is secured by a gate which the Bark Park have to access to reach their premises. The clients of the Bark Park leave the gate open on a daily basis despite being told to close it and ignore all the signs. This has led to animals regularly escaping onto the lane and into residential areas causing a risk to animal welfare and public safety. The situation has become so serious [REDACTED] through an open gate and posing danger to people and property in the nearby residential areas. The noise from barking dogs is also causing [REDACTED]. Any further increase in dog numbers would just add to the problem. This is having a damaging and detrimental effect [REDACTED]

The area itself is one of the few remaining green spaces where people can enjoy the peace and quiet of the countryside, the land, lanes. The infrastructure cannot accommodate any further expansion of the Bark Park.

I would welcome a meeting with Ribble Valley Council to discuss my concerns further.

Yours faithfully



[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 10 December 2023 10:15
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2023/0659 FS-Case-568270368

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2023/0659

Address of Development: The Bark Park Ridding lane, Whalley

Comments: I would like to voice my concerns regarding the application to increase the number of dogs allowed from 20 to 50. Presently I can clearly hear the dogs barking from my house and when they are particularly noisy I have to shut the windows.

During the spring and summer months I like to sit out in the garden for meals, to enjoy the weather and when friends visit. On many occasions we are unable to do this because of noise from the barking dogs. The barking is a nuisance and intrusive.

If there are 50 dogs at the bark then the noise will be a real problem and will make certainly impact on my daily life. The only time we would have any peace is when the dog park is closed for the evening.

I appreciate that the dog park is a business but I would like to hope that you would also consider the impact of 50 dogs all barking in the park. You can not ask a dog not to bark .

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 09 December 2023 17:48
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2023/0659 FS-Case-568205628

[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: I have been made aware of the Planning application to change the use of agricultural land for an exercise / play area for dogs and the erection of wooden shelter rest area together with limestone gravel area for parking. This development has been here for a good few years so I am amazed that they did not apply for planning permission in the first place. They are also putting in to increase the number of dogs to 50. The access to this field is by a small private farm lane with very few passing places and is used heavily by walkers and dog walkers and has been used for many many years before the development of the Bark Park without any problems. With the amount of dogs that they have already I believe they are allowed up to 25 but say that I am sure there have been more than this number in previous times. The traffic up and down The Sands and Broad Lane is a nightmare with cars coming at excessive speed when they are late to pick up their dogs before the close time of 6pm and also early morning. I believe they open from 8am but there are quite often cars queuing down the lane from 7.30. You take your life into your own hands walking on the lane to the fields and quite often get sworn at and shouted abuse at when you ask people to slow down or have no room to move out of the way. The fields are also hired out at weekends so there is no respite from the traffic on these days. This lane is an accident waiting to happen with access from the new development at Monks Cross with children coming out of the side entrance on to the lane. Cars do not slow down and cannot always see pedestrians in the dark. If the number was increased to 50 dogs that could mean 50 cars coming up and down the lane four times a day ie 200 journeys up and down the lane past a private dwelling at the end. Whilst I do not wish to stop anyone earning a living I think the Council seriously need to consider the safety aspect of this application and the residents in close vicinity on The Sands and Broad Lane. The farmer has also had his sheep let out on a number of occasions with clients of the Bark Park being too lazy to close the gate on the field just to save them the time and inconvenience of having to get out their car twice. There have also been a couple of occasions when I have been [REDACTED] by the exercise day care area when dogs have come running out of the gates at me. This could cause a dog fight or cause the loose dogs to chase the sheep on the field. Could the council put a condition in that people walk their dogs down to the facility rather than driving on the narrow lane putting people and animals lives at risk? The way things are at the moment it will only be a matter of time before two cars collide on the lane or someone hits a person or someones pet.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 11 December 2023 20:00
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2023/0659 FS-Case-568654823

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2023/0659

Address of Development: Whalley Bark Park
Ridding Lane Whalley

Comments: Noise - the noise from 20 dogs is already intrusive, especially during the summer months or when we have windows open. Neither the A59 or the river Calder offer any camouflage. The dogs bark, the neighbourhood knows about it. The barking can be relentless & especially at quiet times travels a great distance.

Access - Ridding Lane/the access road was never meant to accommodate up to 20 cars or so twice each day. Increasing the traffic to potentially 50 cars is clearly unacceptable. The adjoining roads (Broad Lane, The Sands) already struggle to handle existing traffic (especially at school drop off/pick up times which often coincide with dog drop off and pick up times). There will eventually be an accident, of that I have no doubt.

Ignoring unacceptable noise it's difficult to understand how the Bark Park received planning permission given the limited/unsuitable access. Any expansion would simply compound existing problems.

As an aside dog dirt is an increasing problem in and around Whalley. It seems dogs take precedence to people & safety in the parish.

[REDACTED]

TO THE PLANNING OFFICER.

RE PLANNING APPLICATION 3/2023/0059.

THE "BARK PARK" RESIDING ON RIDDING LANE HAS SUBMITTED AN APPLICATION TO INCREASE THE NUMBER OF DOGS FROM 20 TO 50. THE APPLICATION DECIDED THE NOISE OF THE ASY PLUS THE RIVER WOULD DROWN THE NOISE OF THE DOGS. THIS IS NOT JUSTIFIED AND MORE DOGS WOULD CLARIFY THIS, EVEN MORE.

ON A COUPLE OF OCCASIONS [REDACTED] THE DOG PARK TO KINDLY ASK IF THEY COULD POSSIBLY DEAL WITH THE NOISE LEVEL. I ALSO NOTICED THERE WERE MORE THAN 20 DOGS ON SITE. I THEN INFORMED THEM THIS WAS AGAINST WHAT WAS GRANTED. THE REPLY WAS, THE DOGS DID NOT ALL BELONG TO THEM & BELONGED TO FRIENDS OF THEIRS. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] VEHICLES WERE ARRIVING FROM WEST BRADFORD & CLITHEROE LEAVING THE DOGS AT BARK PARK THEREFORE

BREAKING THE PLANNING ACCEPTANCE,
[REDACTED] WOULD BE GRATEFUL
IF YOU COULD CONSIDER THE OUTCOME
OF INCREASING THE DOGS ON BARK
PART.

