212 1 Carol Fill

11 ch June 30 34.

To. Mr. Emily Pickup.

Re: Planning App. 3) 2024/0361. 2. George Street Winshing.

With reference to the about must fist state that wan no objection to the proposed development.

However have grove textimes agains and obstruction to vinicular access to Back king struct at its junction with george struct, whilst the work is being undertaken. This entrance to Back King struct is the only identified access for service vehicles, namely. Fin, Ambulana, Police and Refuse Wagons as with as other whicles accessing or braving properties II to an King direct and nos I to 4 Green Bank (senior Wieters).

Obviously any type of obstruction at this point would prove to be extermely dancerous should an incident occur. In fact, at the identified

entrance) exit there is already a small sign which states "No Parking 24 hour Access Required".

It is important when considering this application that the above facts should be given very serious consideration.

your faithfully

To. Emily Pickup.
Planning Dipt.
Ribble Valley B.C.

From: Sent: To: Subject:	12 June 2024 17:42 Planning Planning application 3/2024/0361
	Ribble Valley Borough Council. Do NOT click links or open attachments unless you the content within this email is safe.
Good Morning Emily,	
extension at 2 George Street,	formal objection to planning application 3/2024/0361 for the proposed Whalley. , Whalley have g the impact this extension will have on not only and that of other residents in the area.
objections are as follows	:
seems to be some misrepres which proposed extension is being sventilation to a habitable room the actual impact the extension	are located above and directly against where the suggested to be constructed. These windows provide natural light and m. The omission of these windows in the plans not only misrepresents on will have but also undermines a proper assessment of posals. Feel it is imperative that the planning department takes this
amount of sunlight which ent functionality of a room which	has been in use continuously
extension, which is planned t foundations could have a sub potential to result in structura Although not a planning matt	Due to the close proximity of the proposed edge of the single storey, the excavation for the estantial impact on the structural integrity of all damage and deterioration that may not be immediately apparent. er, this would fall under the purview of the gning off on such an agreement.
Proposed Garage: According	g to the submitted plans the rear wall of the garage will be on the . The building of the garage as currently proposed could

necessitate significant disruption affecting utilities.	to facilitate the laying of foundations. This would cause and potentially damaging underground
is the only way large vehicles can access multiples severely restrict access to and from these presency vehicles especially ambulances as in critical delays for emergency response time feel that reliable access for emergency see	action will impact the road leading to Green Bank which liple properties and any closure or disruption would operties. The road in question is frequently used by and any disruption to this road has the potential to result es, putting the safety and well being of residents at risk. ervices is a fundamental necessity which cannot be indary of the conservation area, is also used weekly for Green Bank and King Street.
excessively large and out of character for the have to agree with this. There are no exist size and this preserves the area's cohesive and	oted by others that the scale of this extension is neighbourhood, which borders a conservation area, and ing properties that have double story extensions of this and harmonious appearance. Allowing such a large disrupting the architectural balance and negatively ity of the community.
Thank you for taking the time to consider the will take them into account when making a do	
Regards,	

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>

Sent: 12 June 2024 22:08

To: Planning

Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2024/0361 FS-Case-622478784

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2024/0361

Address of Development: 2 George Street, Whalley BB7 9TH

Comments: I have a copy of the INDENTURE OF LEASE made between John Hargreaves (THE LESSOR) of Whalley Abbey and Elizabeth Birtwell (THE LESSEE) of the De Lacy Arms Public House, Whalley, dated 23rd April 1894 for two plots of land known as Crow Park & formally the Rope Walk along with the plan including the land measurements that it refers to and details of 14 dwellings to be built on said land.

I also have the original wax sealed & signed copy of the Indenture dated 29th June 1906 by the Personal Representatives of the Late Mrs Elizabeth Birtwell to Mrs Annie Birtwell which is the assignment of the leasehold piece of land then known as 'PARK VILLAS' which are now numbered 71 – 97 King Street, Whalley. The plan on this Indenture shows a scaled plan of the dwellings and their plots. It shows the intended street to be built adjacent to 71 King Street which is GEORGE STREET and the width being 12 Yards wide. It shows two passageways each 10 feet wide one between 77-79 King Street the other between 89-91 King Street. It also shows a new road is to be built at the side of 91 King Street (where the POST OFFICE has been built) to be 12 yards wide. It shows on the plan and states in the Indenture that all the properties numbered 71 – 91 King Street own the first 3 Yards behind each property.

The Indenture states that whilst there is free passage over the passageways between 77-79 & 89-91it is not the case for the first 3 yards behind each property (see image).

It would appear number 2 George Street has already built over what was known as Back Street (4 Yards wide as it appears on the plan) and up to the 3 Yard Boundary line.

Therefore, it should be concluded that there is no right of access along the back of the properties 71-91 King Street.