

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 27 November 2024 11:18
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: Planning
Subject: Objection to planning application Ref 3/2024/0879 27/29 Bawdlands Clitheroe

 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.

There are a number of issues relating to this application which are incorrect and/or in conflict with the proposal as described on the application form and indicated on the drawings. The application form states that the development is for "*Proposed removal of existing shopfront and replacement with two windows. 27-29 Bawdlands Clitheroe BB7 2LA*". However, the Planning Statement states that, "*The proposed works relate to change of use from planning use class E at ground floor level and planning use class C3 private dwelling unit at first floor level to an 8no room House in Multiple Occupation, which is a Sui Generis use class*". ?

Also, the existing and proposed ground floor plans submitted with the application are incorrect. As the Planning Department are fully aware, works have been ongoing since before the sending out of Neighbour Consultation letters in regard to the refused application Ref 3/2024/0552, with much of the work with regard to that application being well advanced, including the formation at ground floor level (Class E) of the 3 dwelling units, the bin store, communal dining/kitchen areas, new soil and waste pipes and new door and window openings to the gable elevation on Corporation Street. It could be concluded that despite the refusal (Ref 3/2024/0552) the applicant has continued the works to such a degree as to prejudice favourably the outcome of the appeal now submitted against that refusal. The plans and application submitted with this current application would suggest that the two new windows are to replace an existing shop front in a Class E unit, when in fact the new windows would be in an already formed dwelling unit, indicated as Room 1 on the Proposed Ground Floor Plan of the refused application.

Notwithstanding the foregoing,

I note below my objection to the current proposal in the context of the specific description as stated on the application form and indicated on the plans as submitted, ie: *Proposed removal of existing shopfront and replacement with two windows. 27-29 Bawdlands Clitheroe BB7 2LA*

The existing windows and door form the front to a unit of Class E (commercial /retail use) and are of a typical design from when the building was originally constructed ie; central entrance door opening sided by large windows, encapsulated with timber pillasters, timber pedestals (now removed), stone/rendered plinth, timber fascia and timber cornice.

The condition of the shop front described as 'dilapidated' in the Planning Statement, is not a material consideration with regard to justification of this proposal and would only be relevant should the building be in a conservation area or the building be listed and a relevant approval was sought for replacement for 'like for like' or 'similar'.

The Planning Statement also makes reference, that in the Planning Officers report to Committee for the proposals outlined in the earlier refused application Ref 3/2024/0552, it is stated that the "*alterations would not be harmful to the character of the property*". this again is irrelevant, as the

Planning Officers view related to that part of proposal (the two new window element on Bawdlands) being formed as part of a proposal for a Change of Use of the ground floor from Class E to Sui Generis (HMO).

As this current proposal is not associated with any Change of Use, and no Change of Use from Class E, to either Class C4 or Sui Generis is allowed under "Permitted Development", the current application can and must only be determined in the context of what it is, a traditional stile shop front to a Class E unit being replaced by two windows, the design of which is unsympathetic, out of keeping and inappropriate to the original historic design to a unit of Class E use. Therefore, the proposal is in clear conflict with Core Strategy Policy DGM1 which states that the development must, *"BE OF A HIGH STANDARD OF BUILDING DESIGN WHICH CONSIDERS THE BUILDING IN CONTEXT PRINCIPLES (FROM THE CABE/ENGLISH HERITAGE BUILDING ON CONTEXT TOOLKIT"*

I therefore ask that the application be rejected.

