

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 04 August 2024 15:35  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Application Comments - 3/2024/0552 FS-Case-636033435

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

**Planning Application Reference No.:** 3/2024/0552

**Address of Development:** 27 Bawdlands, Corporation St

**Comments:** Objection on the grounds of increased traffic now using Bawdlands due to already excessive housebuilding at the bottom of Henthorn Rd. The junction at Ruffus Car is now a danger and a hmo in that location is an accident in the planning.

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 04 August 2024 19:42  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Application Comments - 3/2024/0552 FS-Case-636068974

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

**Planning Application Reference No.:** 3/2024/0552

**Address of Development:** 27-29 Bawdlands Clitheroe BB7 2LA

**Comments:** I am writing for the second time to register both my objections and concerns regarding the proposed development above. The history of which I find confusing. To the best of my knowledge planning permission was previously refused (Planning ref No: 3/2024/0269) on similar grounds to the refusal of an AirB&B on Castle View with the same level of occupation suggested. As a result of the decision on Castle View, I was under the impression Planning had decided to review its entire approach to both Air B&B and H.M.O.'s. Yet, on examining the Officers Report 30052024 on the previous application, approval was recommended ? Despite numerous objections from the public, the Parish Council and the town Council itself ! I also note the earlier application was withdrawn, which I assume wasted a lot of time and money but it did result in the Officers apparent approval ! I am aware work has begun in earnest on the conversion a number of weeks ago, obviously in the expectation of the application being now accepted.

Looking at the new proposal. Lancashire Highways are again on "Cloud 9" regarding the amount of parking which will, inevitably be required and the use of bicycles. Two spaces provided on Corporation Street (a terrible junction!) I assume and the rest will end up on Bawdlands and in the surrounding area where there is little enough safe parking as it is and exactly when a young person was recently involved in an R.T.A. some 20 metres from the property which needed the Air Ambulance to attend. Will there be a stipulation in the 8 residents contacts that only 2 can own a vehicle and the rest have to cycle everywhere ? I think not.

The development itself is totally unsuitable for such a large number of residents with no outside space, inevitably people will end up literally spilling on to what is a very narrow pavement (smoking/vaping?). The area is populated by young families and elderly residents, a development of this type is totally unacceptable for such an area. If a HMO is required for the area there is a property opposite the Crown public house which I believe is owned by the Council which would fit the bill far more appropriately than Nos 27 - 29. It has been unoccupied for at least four years !

I feel the previous planning proposal in 2013 to convert in to two self-contained flats, which was accepted but I assume never acted on, would be a far more appropriate development of both properties and would create very few objections from the local community, the Parish Council or indeed the Town Council.

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 07 August 2024 11:52  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Application Comments - 3/2024/0552 FS-Case-636848272

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

**Planning Application Reference No.:** 3/2024/0552

**Address of Development:** 27/29 Bawdlands, Clitheroe

**Comments:** I submit comments [REDACTED]. Whilst [REDACTED] does not object to development per se at this site, [REDACTED] do hold concerns about the scale of works that will result in high occupancy levels at this location with inadequate refuse storage (particularly in relation to the need to house bin storage within the property itself). Works already appear to be underway at the site pre planning permission. There is a concern that approval here will lead to further developments in the town centre. Parking is already an issue around this site and whilst provision is recommended for cycle storage, this will not adequately remove the actual risk of cars picking up and dropping off individuals for e.g. work or appointments (notwithstanding if any of the intended residents themselves own cars that they will also seek to park nearby). This in itself may cause detriment to the surrounding neighbourhood. If the development was in line with surrounding properties e.g. creating 2 residential units, this would be more in keeping with the surrounding area and whilst there is no 'cap' on how many individuals would reside in the properties, it is unlikely to result in 8x adult individuals as at the intended development. The creation of this number of individual units will result in increased noise and movement of people at this site which can only be detrimental to the surrounding area. The application does not adequately conform to the general principles of DMG1, to DMG3 (transport), or DMB1 (Loss of new employment potential at this site).