

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 13 December 2024 13:07
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2024/0879 FS-Case-670373740

Name: [REDACTED]

Address: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2024/0879

Address of Development: 27-29 Bawdlands BB72LA

Comments: We have here a further example of attempting to make a plan fit an earlier application which has already been rejected and has gone to appeal. The work has already been carried out with the potential for problems which has been previously highlighted. The new door and window are not sympathetic with the original building. The door has 3 steps down to the public footpath; this would make it difficult for people with mobility problems to get in or out. If this door is to be an exit to have refuse bins emptied then 3 steps may present a problem. It could also lead to bin been left on the street permanently to save the bother of taking them in and out. This of course has implications. If the bins are inside then it may be difficult to exit in the case of an emergency. A door at this point could have further traffic implications at a site which is heavily used by traffic leaving and entering town. This also has the potential for further parking difficulties. A retrospective application which is of great concern.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 15 December 2024 16:33
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2024/0879 FS-Case-670701654

Name: [REDACTED]

Address: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2024/0879

Address of Development: 27-29 Bawdlands

Comments: Yet again during this debacle the planning rules have clearly been disregarded with a carry on regardless attitude. Disruption to residents continues on a weekly basis.

The door which has been installed on the side of the building appears to be a regular domestic style door, it is not apparent that this is any type of fire escape door...surely there ought to be some form of fire escape in this building. My second concern is that the door is above three significant steps, if this is to be the door beside the bin and bike store there is now a manual handling issue, anyone residing there would have to carry bins over the door step and then down three steps every week for collection, will this happen or will bins just be left permanently on the pavement? The alternative is purple bags but again will they be emptied from one bin outside or will it become common practice to just put them out on the street or on the floor of the bin store room raising another issue of vermin attraction. Recent work appears to have been done on the drainage system, the demand of 8 additional toilets, sinks and showers as well as kitchen utilities surely has a much larger demand on a small section of the sewer, yet no additional man hole has been installed. It is my belief that the only man hole access is under the garage, a separate entity which is a business teaching children and adults martial arts, sewage issues could also destroy this business, any back up from the drains would be directly affecting children.

Work vans continue to be parked on double yellow lines on Corporation street and it strikes fear that this will be the pattern when the developer rents out his apartments due to the side door, i believe from as soon as January according to the website. This whole experience since its beginning has caused disruption, upset and annoyance to local residents and as previously stated the developer just seems determined to carry on regardless with no care for anything or anyone aside his pocket. I urge you to refuse and insist on the restoration/ retention of the previous front and side aspects on practical, sanitary and health and safety reasons due to moving and handling issues and fire safety, has Lancashire fire brigade been consulted during this process for the safety of upstairs flats without a fire escape?.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 15 December 2024 09:16
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2024/0879 FS-Case-670642940

Name: [REDACTED]

Address: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2024/0879

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

Comments: I object to the application on the following grounds.

The original planning statement relates to an eight roomed HMO. As I understand a previous application for the HMO was rejected by RVBC. (3/2024/0552) I suggest that this current application should be considered alongside the rejected application. If the lower floor of the property is now not to be used as an HMO under the revised planning statement, why would there be a need to change the front profile of the property. Furthermore, the application removes an external exit from the building (fire safety which I will address later in this letter.) and the proposed ground floor plan suggests that this part of the building will remain a shop it makes no sense to remove this doorway and suggests that the space will be utilised for some this more than the proposed plan.

Removal of the shop front would be at detriment to the character of the building and surrounding area whilst unsympathetic out of keeping and inappropriate to the original historic design of the building. Furthermore, as suggested earlier not in keeping with proposed intended use.

The amended plan suggests a door in the gable end of the building and a small new window. It is noted that this change to the building has already been done, despite planning not being passed. The doorway is small with steps.

Building regulations 2010 (M1) BUILDINGS OTHER THAN DWELLINGS states
Reasonable provision must be made.
for people to—

- (a) gain access to; and
- (b) use, the building and its facilities.

The application to change the ground floor is more suggestive of the original refused application (3/2024/0552). The amended drawings still bear no resemblance to the internal structure of the building in 27 or 29 Bawdlands and more in keeping with a bin and cycle store suggested in the former application. I believe this doorway would not meet fire safety standards for the proposed use of a shop.

Having a doorway in the side of the building be it for domestic or commercial use, but especially commercial use, encourages unsafe, illegal, and over subscribed parking. With additional cars parked in this area it could lead to overspill on to roads in the surrounding area leading to loss of

parking availability for residents. This could also lead to safety concerns already raised regarding safe highways and pedestrian safety in the residential area.

I would urge RVBC planning committee to reject this application and order the reinstatement of the previous gable end to its original form.