

9 May 2025

Planning application 3/2025/0227  
Grid reference 369398 433094

The [REDACTED] not in support of the above application due the orientation of the property and has suggested an alternative option could be reconfiguring the existing side and rear extensions to the south of the property. There are concerns about the [REDACTED]

Please note the following comments regarding this application:

1) Please see the attached location plan from the 1935 Deeds, showing the original footprint of the semi-detached dwellings, regarding surface area of the existing extension, to assist in the calculation of the current planning application. In addition to this, please see the Land Registry document received by the [REDACTED] when digital services were updated in 2014.

2) The proposed extension is positioned [REDACTED] which will have a qualitative impact [REDACTED] in the [REDACTED], which both have [REDACTED] to [REDACTED] [REDACTED] because of [REDACTED]

3) The proposed pitched roof at 3350mm will significantly add to the restriction of [REDACTED] It is understood that this is also higher than the norm of 3m, within 2m of the boundary.

4) This rear extension proposal is for 3500mm, it is understood that 3000mm is the norm. The depth of this proposed footprint, with its [REDACTED] [REDACTED] in addition to the proposed sloping roof will completely block light [REDACTED]

5) The depth and height of the proposed extension would impact on the light to the [REDACTED] vastly extending the [REDACTED], including the [REDACTED] which is unlikely to [REDACTED] and the [REDACTED]

6) The addition of a door through to the garage from the house will enable access from front to back of No10 for all garden and building supplies, including a mini digger if necessary, if the proposal is given permission. This will stop disruption [REDACTED] for these purposes, since the current side and rear extension do not provide such access. This is a welcome improvement.

7) It is understood that a [REDACTED] needs to be in place if building work is [REDACTED]. This will need to be in place, should the application be granted, prior to work commencing.

8) There is no confirmation of the location of the keying in point in the plans. If this application is given permission, it has been agreed verbally that it would not be [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] These plans do not evidence this.

[REDACTED]

**From:** Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 09 May 2025 14:55  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0227 FS-Case-713264306

Lancashire

**Planning Application Reference No.:** 3/2025/0227

**Address of Development:** 10 Hollies Road, Wilpshire, BB1 9NA

**Comments:** We would like to make the following comments on the above application:

No10 was significantly extended to the side and rear prior to the current owners buying. Is the property already extended to the full extent allowed by planning?

The proposed extension, rather than maximising the current footprint of No10, which does not impact [REDACTED] will affect the [REDACTED] because of the orientation of the property and proposal.

The current depth and height of the proposed extension will significantly increase the effect on [REDACTED]

The proposal adds direct access from the garage to the rear of No10 which will be helpful for the [REDACTED] as it will mean deliveries for garden and building supplies for any work that is permitted can go through their own property, rather than using [REDACTED], owing to the lack of access through the existing side and rear extension.

The proposal will create significant disruption [REDACTED] the building process, if it is permitted.