

From: Planning
Subject: FW: Planning Application Objection 3/2024/0658

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 25 March 2025 22:02
To: Planning <planning@ribblevalley.gov.uk>; Building Control <Building.Control@ribblevalley.gov.uk>; Contact Centre <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>; jonathan.hinder.mp@parliament.uk
Subject: Planning Application Objection 3/2024/0658

 **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.

FAO Emily Pickup Re - Application 3/2024/0658 objection.

Hi Emily,

This is the third formal objection to the planning application detailed above.

Our stance on this remains the same.

I can see from the amended plans submitted on the 21st March 2025 that the proposed boxing has been further reduced in size and a material has been specified. The material proposed is a commercial material used for the sides of highways, not for a residential area.

The proposed boxing still does not meet the manufacturers requirements for the installation and I refer you to our previous objection which details the spatial requirements detailed in the installation instructions. We feel that by boxing this unit in, it would then be an environmental health hazard and would contravene building regulations. The acoustic fencing proposed will further reduce any ventilation requirements the unit requires.

Our main frustration is that this unit is installed [REDACTED]. The occupiers of this property could have installed this unit on the rear of their property or other side elevation where this wouldn't have directly affected anyone else. We are surprised that this matter is still unresolved since 27/08/2024. This has caused a lot of stress to us over the last months and [REDACTED]
[REDACTED].

I have also attached a screenshot from the planning portal which states - Sited, so far as is practicable, to minimise its effect on the external appearance of the building and its effect on the amenity of the area.

We do not feel that the above has been adhered to and this unit has simply been installed in the quickest and most cost effective way without consideration and thought [REDACTED]

█████ The occupiers clearly don't want to look at the unsightly unit █████ to this.

We believe that this unit was left off the initial planning application for the extension of the property as this would have reduced the size allowed for the build and undermined the application. This is an underhand tactic to get past planning.

I would like to urge you to meet with us and █████ so that you can see what █████

We look forward to a resolution to this matter asap.

Thank you,
█████