

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 22 October 2024 14:32
To: Planning
Subject: Planning application 3/2024/0802

 **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.

I am objecting to the proposal of the proposed industrial unit on Warwick street.
The road is already at full capacity for vehicle parking.
The noise, disturbance and possible pollution will be very close to the retirement bungalows and will be detrimental to the living standards of neighbouring residential buildings

Kind regards

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 20 October 2024 16:48
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2024/0802 FS-Case-656102671

[REDACTED]

Address:

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2024/0802

Address of Development: Warwick Street Longridge PR3 3EB

Comments: I object to this new planning application for the following reasons:

1. Traffic on Warwick Street, is already bad enough with cars parked on both sides of the road. This potentially, would cause additional problems with larger vehicles requiring access to the site.
2. This is a predominantly residential area and it would be disputed that there is a need for this type of commercial premises, in this particular location. There is already a very large site at Shay Lane and then one on Queens Street and on Preston Road at the corner junction with Kester Lane.
3. A previous proposal for this site was submitted in 2023, that provided the dimension of the proposed building to be 10.5m long x 7.1m wide (74.55m²) with minimum 1m clearance of the boundary fence to the south. The new proposal is given to be 8.5m long x 7m wide (59.5m²) with minimum clearance of 1m from the boundary fence to the south. Although this has been significantly reduced in length, this has only altered 0.1 in width from the previous planning application. This would, given the way the site is positioned be questioned. The existing building is place on the site at an angle, as can be seen from Google maps and Bing maps and also the proposed ground floor plan. This significantly restricts the spacing between the existing building and the boundary fence to the south. It would be disputed that, there is sufficient spacing, to place a building that is 7m wide, with a minimum of 1m on either side of the proposed building, between the boundary to the south and the front corner (east) of the existing building.
4. It is noted that on the original proposal there is WC facility provided, which sits in the middle of the north wall of the building. The new proposal, the WC facility is now situated in the back corner of the southern wall of the premises. It would therefore, be questioned as to where the soil pipe for this would be placed? This gives rise to serious concern that this could lead to issues for those resident in the bungalows nearest to this and their quite enjoyment of their rear gardens, that abut the southern boundary, in the summer months.

Overall, I do not believe that this proposal, is a viable proposition and would in fact, be to the detriment of both the residents of Warwick Street and those of Auction Court.