



Sarah Heppell
Planning section
Council Offices
Church Walk
Clitheroe
Lancashire
BB7 2RA

Ref. FS-Case-570018056

18/12/2023

Dear Nicola,

We, the residents of [REDACTED] object to the proposed planning amendment 3/2023/0903 on the following grounds:

1. it increases the overlooking and loss of privacy to our rear windows and garden area*;
2. our concerns on the original application, which we believed to have been amicable addressed without objection, have been subsequently ignored by the applicant*;
3. the roof works and additional rooflights are already well progressed although planning permission has not been granted for the variation;
4. the application states that we were consulted on 12/12/23 . We were not and, but for a chance check on the planning portal due to noise nuisance on a Sunday afternoon, would have been utterly unaware;
5. *we wish to retrospectively raise a formal complaint regarding the earlier planning approval of application 3/2022/0130, as statement in the findings below is wholly inaccurate and, with hindsight, may have been deliberately misrepresented.

"Residential Amenity:

The proposed extension to the dormers will be considered to have a minimal impact to neighbours situated to the front and to the rear of the property as this aspect of the development features alterations to existing dormer windows found on the dwelling. As such, the proposal would not be considered to create new opportunities for overlooking or loss of privacy by implementing the dormers, as it would be fairly similar to the existing situation within the street. "

Prior to the applicant's original submission, the property did indeed have a single rear dormer for a bathroom only, with obscure glazing to ensure there was no overlooking and loss of privacy.

The same is true for all modified bungalows on Moor Field

Our comments on the original application stated we would obtain assurances from the applicant to satisfy our concerns, withholding objection subject to suitable resolution. We believed this to have been resolved, with assurances of being overlooked by non-habitable rooms and obscure glazing.

We note there is a 12 week period following grant of permission during which further objections may be raised. The applicant did not commence meaningful work on the property for many months afterwards, effectively gerrymandering this avenue for raising concerns.

The latest application / amendment will take the property from **1 obscure window** [REDACTED] **to 5 new windows and rooflights**, hardly reflected in the planning report findings *the proposal would not be considered to create new opportunities for overlooking or loss of privacy*

We no longer have confidence in the applicant's due regard for our privacy and object in the strongest terms to the latest amendment.

It is of grave concern that the application states we have been consulted, when we categorically have not. It seems an improbable coincidence that, with the obvious impact on our privacy and ignorance of previous representations, such consultation has slipped by. We will be contacting the other neighbours shown as having been consulted to see if this is a wider issue, since, with the festive closures, the deadline for comments is only 7 working days away.

Should evidence be required we are able to provide suitable photographic evidence to substantiate all representations herein.

We may withdraw this objection only if all glazing to the first floor rear elevation are fitted with obscure glass as was the case with the original property and remains the case for other altered bungalows on the same road.

This would allow the development to continue, albeit without permission granted as yet, per the latest planning amendment, providing the fully extended space and design with little or no impact on the applicant.

Your sincerely,

[REDACTED]

C.c. Nicola Hopkins, John Machole, Planning office, Ribble Valley
7 Moor Field
11 Moor Field
18 Moor Field
94 Mitton Road
96 Mitton Road