

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 21 February 2025 18:01  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Application Comments - 3/2024/1016 FS-Case-689709053

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

**Planning Application Reference No.:** 3/2024/1016

**Address of Development:** 1-7 The Picture House George Street Whalley BB7 9TH

**Comments:** Objection to 1-7 The Picture House George Street Whalley BB7 9TH

I object to this latest application on the 'regularisation' of the above 'as built' development and would raise an initial comment over when the application was actually issued by the Agent and received by RVBC.

Mr Don Proctor states in his letter dated 22nd January 2025 that he writes 'on behalf of my clients to attach a revised full planning application'. RVBC reference this letter in 'Attached files' as '24 1016 Cover Letter'.

RVBC however state that as a 'Key date' they apparently were already in possession of the application, stating it as 'Received : 13/12/2024'. Oddly this application was seemingly received some 40 days before the Agent later claimed to have sent it.

This may be a simple administration error but worth noting as a possible indicator to other possible anomalies in the information provided.

As far as the 'as built' application is concerned it is accepted that 'post approval changes occur', but not accepted that they 'improve the design and the day to day practical workings of the scheme'.

It is re-assuring to hear that 'The applicants are aware that there are differences in the "as built" development which are inconsistent with the original approval', but simply incorrect that they 'believe that these are of a minor nature within the context of the overall scheme'. Changes made to the Rear Elevation are major changes.

If the 'as built' Rear Elevation is the result of 'The applicants and their architect, agent have spent some considerable time and effort including abortive application submissions in attempting to resolve this situation' then this surely cannot be accepted as an explanation for the resultant major omissions and alterations.

Mr Proctor states 'It has been agreed that a revised, full application is made in order to regularise this

situation providing additional drawings and information to explain changes to the approved scheme.’ Any such agreement must also however be assumed to be accurate and consistent in the provision of drawings and information. Unfortunately this has not been the case as has been fully explained in other objections.

This latest application agreed between the developer and RVBC to detail and ‘regularise’ an ‘as built’ development for the apparent purpose of ‘regularising’ has actually resulted in further deviation through the provision of inaccurate and inconsistent information to that which has actually been built.