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

Sent: 11 August 2024 12:15

To: Planning

Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2024/0552 FS-Case-637772716

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2024/0552

Address of Development: 27 - 29 Bawdlands Clitheroe

Comments: Planning Application 3/2024/0552

I am a 27 - 29 Bawdlands and I have the following observations to submit regarding this second planning application. This would appear to be a resubmission of planning application 3/2024/0269 which came before the committee meeting on 30/5/24. The application was discussed at length and unanimously rejected by all councillors in attendance and therefore the original objections remain the same.

- ♣ The planning application proposes a HMO which shows 8 number self-contained single rooms to be created which could, therefore, accommodate up to 8 people and then the possibility of 8 additional cars, plus any visitors' vehicles, which may require car parking space adjacent to the building as no car parking facilities are shown to be provided on the planning application.
- \clubsuit It is indicated in the planning application that the property is readily accessible by foot without the need for use of a private car, although there is a long stay public car park located on Mitchell Street, 150m from the site. However, there is no mention that this car park charges £2.10 for up to 4 hours or £3.40 for up to 10 hours parking and what resident is going pay those amounts on a daily basis?
- ♣ There are 8 number self-contained single rooms detailed on the planning application and is this, therefore, a maximum number of people allowed to occupy the premises and if so, how and who will police the numbers? A development of this size could potentially cause noise and disturbance to the neighbouring residents.
- ♣ The ground floor plan shows a small kitchen/dining area which has no window and hence no natural light because it appears that there are no outside walls to this area. In view of the fact that there appears to be no outside walls then I wonder how ventilation is to be provided to the kitchen/dining area.
- ♣ Whilst I have no concerns about the residents I do have concerns about the standard of upkeep and maintenance of the property which are, presumably. the responsibility of the landlords. Surely the local authority have some control over the standard of the upkeep to maintain the local environment.
- ♣ I recognise that this property is larger in size than others but a development of eight units, sharing one kitchen area, seems to be excessive and have implications which could lead to considerable problems.

- ♣ Parking for existing residents is already extremely difficult when they arrive home from work and cannot always park outside of their property or even on the same street. This will, therefore, be exacerbated by any additional cars generated by a house of multiple occupancy.
- A Clients patronising the Ribble Dragon Martial Arts Centre attached to the proposed premises development already creates parking problems on Bawdlands and Corporation Street.
- ♣ Due to the lack of parking space, the back street to the rear of Bawdlands between Corporation Street and Henthorn Road is already frequently blocked by parked cars preventing access for emergency services etc, and also amenity access to the rear of residents properties and this may be further compounded by additional car parking requirements by this proposed development.
- ♣ There are already five business premises on Bawdlands and their employees and clients park their cars on Bawdlands and Corporation Street and thus not only affecting residents parking but also the ability of parking access for all the businesses customers.
- ♣ I anticipate that this sort of development with the parking and congestion problems is also going to affect the selling price of all the residential properties in the area as does the state of the frontage of the flats at 112 116 Bawdlands which is shambolic and wonder how planning permission was ever granted for such an eyesore.
- ♣ The plans of the proposed development shows four refuse bins which are assumed to be two red and two blue bins and wonder where the rest of the refuse will go when up to 8 independent people maybe generating more that the bins can handle on a weekly and fortnightly collection system. Who will be responsible to ensure the refuse bins are, in fact, regularly emptied and returned to the internal storage area and not block the already narrow pavement or left empty between collections to be blown over in the wind and block the pavement and road etc. There is a danger that waste could be left out on the backstreet behind Bawdlands in bin bags, attracting vermin and causing a health and environmental concern. There is already a problem with waste in bin liners, not in bins, continually being left out behind the houses to the rear of Bawdlands between Corporation Street and Henthorn Road. This waste is not situated at the point of the waste collection and, therefore, stays there for several weeks slowly rotting and distributing itself along the street and blowing about in the wind and, thus increasing the already rat problem in the area, which RVBC has been made aware of. As this is already a long term problem, and could therefore be intensified by the assumed lack of adequate refuse facilities shown in this development.
- ♣ What come back would residents have to the owner of this development as there appears to be little interest shown to the existing residents?
- A Considering all the above points of concern, I cannot imagine how such a planning proposal can be accepted and there must be many better suited locations throughout the local area for such a multi occupational development than a narrow, double parked residential Corporation Street and an extremely busy main road along Bawdlands where speed limits are mostly ignored.
- ♣ In conclusion as there are no basic changes to the original application, I strongly urge you to show due regard to the worries, views and concerns stated above and also show consideration and respect to the residents in the area who are trying to maintain their amenities and some quality of life, and reject this planning application entirely on the same principles of the rejection of the original planning application. A development of this kind would have a detrimental effect on the lives of residents and would not be in keeping with surrounding properties.



From:

13 August 2024 13:43

To:

Planning

Subject:

Planning application no. 3/2024/0552



External Email

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.

Sent from my iPhone

. The congestion, traffic and parking in this area is dreadful. Corporation Street is already a rat run. There is no available parking for this property.

This area always used to be a clean and well cared for area however some of the rental properties now are unkempt and rubbish and fag ends abandoned outside properties. The one room rentals seem to attract a certain type of client that has no care for the local community.

Where are all the bins from this property going to be kept? It is surely not a safe environment for the clients as there is no access to the back of the property. The large garage at the rear of the property is owned by a completely different person who runs a business that already causes more congestion, disruption and misery for the local residents.

The planning consent is just another ridiculous error in a long list of errors that have been passed at this address.

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

Sent: 14 August 2024 20:09

To: Planning

Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2024/0552 FS-Case-638737483

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2024/0552

Address of Development: 27/29 Bawdlands Clitheroe BB7 2LA

Comments: With regards this application it is fundamentally the same as previous application 3/204/0269 which was rejected by the planning committee earlier. With this comment in mind I should like to make the following comments

The current application suggests that there will be 8 residences without any indication as to how many people will be living in each. There is no indication as to whether there might be any restrictions on tenancy or sub letting.

It is suggested that the tenants will be young professionals who require good quality accommodation. Should this not be the case would the tenancies be open to numerous tenants in order to pay for the rent of the high quality rooms.

There seems to be the idea that because of the location of the properties that tenants might walk or use cycles, I think we have to live in the real world and accept that cars may be used by some and despite the somewhat blinkered view of the highway authority there is a problem with traffic and parking for existing residents in the area. A potential of at least 8 tenants could add to this problem. The building is to include, in their own words, a high quality kitchen with all the facilities that will be required. Is one kitchen for at least eight people adequate? The room will have no natural light as it will be surrounded by walls! What provision is suggested for the ventilation necessary in any kitchen I understand that a developer may be allowed to remove internal structures from a property ,but does it allow for new materials to be delivered which may well be used for development by contractors.. The site has had an agricultural trailer parked on double yellow lines which has compromised traffic at a busy junction. Little concern has been shown about how materials from the upper storey of the building have been placed in the trailer, sometimes to the detriment of the passing public or vehicles. It appears that concern for development outweighs concern for the local environment. With the concerns shown here, and from other local residents, it is hoped that this planning application is rejected for further considerations to be made.

1

From:

Sent: 15 August 2024 11:03

To: Planning

Subject: Planning Application No: 3/2024/0552

 Λ

External Email

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.

Dear Sir/Madam,

Re: Planning Application No: 3/2024/0552

Proposed Development: Multiple Occupancy House for 8 residents on Bawdlands

I am writing to formally object to the above-referenced planning application, which proposes the development of the property on Bawdlands planned for multiple occupancy. My objections are based on the following significant concerns:

1. Inadequate Parking Provision:

The proposed development does not include any parking facilities, which is a matter of serious concern. Parking around Bawdlands and Corporation Street is already extremely limited, with residents and visitors frequently struggling to find spaces. Introducing 8 additional flats without providing any parking will exacerbate this problem, leading to increased congestion and potentially dangerous parking practices, further diminishing the quality of life for existing residents.

2. Increased Traffic Congestion:

Corporation Street is already a busy thoroughfare, often used as a shortcut between Eshton Terrace and Bawdlands. The street only allows for one car to pass at a time, which means that vehicles frequently have to pull over to let others pass. This situation is already problematic, but with the ongoing construction work, it has become a nightmare. Construction workers' vehicles are often parked in ways that obstruct the flow of traffic, making it nearly impossible to navigate the street without encountering significant delays or safety risks.

3. Unaddressed Parking Violations and Lack of Enforcement:

In addition to the challenges posed by parking and traffic, I am also concerned about the apparent lack of enforcement regarding ongoing parking violations. Despite trailers being consistently left on double yellow lines at the end of Corporation Street and on Bawdlands, no action appears to have been taken by traffic wardens. These trailers are blocking the pavement and creating hazardous conditions, particularly at the junction with Bawdlands. This raises serious

concerns about pedestrian safety and the ability of emergency vehicles to access the area if needed.

4. Potential for Attracting Anti-Social Behavior:

I am also concerned that this type of development could attract individuals who may not have a strong regard for community standards or the law. This is a valid concern given the potential for high tenant turnover and the lack of amenities in the immediate area. The introduction of such a development could adversely affect the character of the neighborhood and lead to an increase in anti-social behavior.

5. Current Construction Issues:

The ongoing work related to this project is already causing significant disruption to the neighborhood. As mentioned earlier, a trailer has been consistently left on double yellow lines at the end of Corporation Street, blocking the pavement and creating a hazard at the junction with Bawdlands. Additionally, another trailer is now parked on double yellow lines on Bawdlands itself, making it difficult and dangerous to see oncoming traffic when exiting the junction. This situation is already a safety concern, and it's unacceptable that these issues are arising even before the construction has been completed.

6. Noise and Nuisance:

On a more personal note, by construction work taking place at unreasonable hours, such as at 1:20 AM, involving loud drilling and music. This has had a negative impact on the surrounding neighbourhood. Additionally, the pavement is often left in an unclean state at the end of the day, posing a risk to pedestrians, particularly those walking dogs.

Given the above concerns, I strongly urge the council to reject this planning application. The proposed development would have a detrimental impact on the local community, increasing traffic congestion, exacerbating parking issues, and potentially lowering the quality of life for residents.

Thank you for considering my objections.

Yours faithfully,