

8th June 2026

Dear Sirs,

Re: Planning Application Number 3/2026/0340

I would like to submit an **objection** to Policy Number Application 3/2026/0340 on the following grounds;

- The addition of a second floor over the existing footprint represents an over-large addition that fails to respect the scale of the original dwelling, and is not subservient and set down from the main roof ridge. It also fails to respect the established character and spacing of the local area. By introducing significant upper-level massing into the side gap, the development will close a critical visual void between the properties.
- The increased height of the extension will [REDACTED]. The development clearly fails the Council's [REDACTED] horizontally and vertically [REDACTED] [REDACTED]t, causing an unacceptable loss [REDACTED] and for 20 years this [REDACTED] and therefore I [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
- The doubling of the extension's height will significantly increase [REDACTED] [REDACTED] away from [REDACTED] will have an unacceptable overbearing, oppressive and domineering impact. It will also ruin the pleasant [REDACTED] and fails to satisfy Policy DMG1's requirements for protecting [REDACTED] and will block [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
- The applicant is using a common loop hole called twin tracking by securing a large single storey foot print under permitted "larger home extensions prior approval" and then applying for the first floor addition separately. The cumulative impact of both elements combined creates an overwhelming dominant massing that would fail standard planning rules if submitted together.

Regards

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 08 June 2026 20:38
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2026/0340 FS-Case-845365459

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Lancashire

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2026/0340

Address of Development: 53 Riverside
Clitheroe
BB7 2NS

Comments: Dear Sirs,

Re: Planning Application Number 3/2026/0340

I would like to submit an objection to Policy Number Application 3/2026/0340 on the following grounds;

The addition of a second floor over the existing footprint represents an over-large addition that fails to respect the scale of the original dwelling, and is not subservient and set down from the main roof ridge. It also fails to respect the established character and spacing of the local area. By introducing significant upper-level massing into the side gap, the development will close a critical visual void between the properties.

The increased height of the extension [REDACTED]. The development clearly fails the Council's [REDACTED] causing an unacceptable loss of [REDACTED] 20 years this [REDACTED] therefore I have a [REDACTED] policy.

The doubling of the extension's height will significantly increase [REDACTED], this [REDACTED] will have an unacceptable overbearing, oppressive and domineering impact. It will also [REDACTED] area and fails to satisfy Policy DMG1's requirements for protecting [REDACTED] and will [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]

The applicant is using a common loop hole called twin tracking by securing a large single storey foot print under permitted "larger home extensions prior approval" and then applying for the first floor addition separately. The cumulative impact of both elements combined creates an overwhelming

dominant massing that would fail standard planning rules if submitted together.

Regards

[REDACTED]