

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 17 December 2024 08:48
To: Planning
Cc: [REDACTED]
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.

Further objection following receipt of notification letter No 2

To be read in conjunction with my objection sent 27th November 2024

Notification letter No 2 refers to the application being for *"Proposed removal of existing shopfront and replacement with two windows. Installation of new ground floor door and window opening to side elevation.*

Location: 27-29 Bawdlands Clitheroe BB7 2LA", however, the application form on the councils web site describes the proposal as *"Proposed removal of existing shopfront and replacement with two windows"*?

The Planning Statement also states that *"The formation of the new doorway and window opening in the side elevation would normally be permitted development"*. If these specific building works would normally be permitted development, then why have they now been added to the application seeking approval?.

The reality is, that these two new openings are not, as the application documents, in particular the floor plans would suggest, into part of the building noted as "SHOP", but openings into the Bin/Cycle Store and Room 2 already constructed as part of the proposal for Change of Use of the building into a HMO, use class Sui Generis (App Ref 3/2024/0269) which was refused by the Planning Committee on legitimate grounds.

Section 3 on the Planning Application asks *"Has the building work or Change of Use already started?"*. The applicant has answered "No", however, in regard to this current application. building works forming the window and door to the side elevation have not only been started, but have been completed. It should also be noted that the works forming the change of use of the building from Class E and Class C3 to Sui Generis with the exception of the two new windows on Bawdlands are more or less completed.

I also note that the proposed side elevation added to the application is incorrect. The new door is shown extending down to the pavement level. The door as has been physically constructed, is actually 3 steps up from pavement level (a point raised in my initial objection to Application Ref 3/2024/0269) with regard to the unsuitability of the building for a HMO with regard to difficulty and danger of manoeuvring refuse bins in and out of the building up and down steps).

It should also be noted that in addition to the new window and door openings, new uPVC wastes and a stub stack (serving a min of 5 En-suites to the newly created rooms of the refused CoU proposal)

have been installed on the side elevation, none of which are indicated on the elevational drawings, the full impact therefore, of the alterations to the side elevation cannot be assessed by scrutiny of the submitted drawings. Had the applicant followed planning protocol the LPA could have conditioned any approval for the wastes to be run internally.

In the summary of the Planning Statement, the applicant suggests that the works will "*enhance the street scene and neighbouring community, with minimal impact on either visual or residential amenity*". As stated in the Planning Statement, the property "*is larger*" than those in the immediate area, as such, the gable (side elevation) is visually, highly prominent both on Corporation Street and along Bawdlands when travelling in a western direction.

With the exception some years ago, of a window being installed in part of an original first floor loading door opening, the existing side elevation of the building has remained unaltered since it was originally constructed and as the "proposed" works are now complete it can be clearly seen that the alterations do not as claimed by the applicant, "*enhance the street scene*", they significantly detract from it, nor do they present, again as claimed a "*minimal impact on visual amenity*". On a site inspection of the works carried out to such a prominent elevation, I suggest that it would be extremely difficult to conclude anything other than the street scene and visual amenity of the area have been severely detrimentally impacted and it reinforces the conclusion outlined in my initial objection, that the proposal is not in accordance with Core Strategy Policy DGM1.



Dated 17/12/2024