

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 09 September 2026 07:44
To: Planning
Subject: Additional information -Response to applicants [REDACTED] 3/2026/0629

⚠ 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.

Dear Mr Taylor,

In addition to my previous objection please add / also consider the following points:

Response to the Applicant's [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] . A
[REDACTED] .
and [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] .

Also, the applicant's submission that internal wooden shutters mitigate the loss of privacy is entirely flawed and legally unenforceable under planning.

-These are not a form of Permanent Control: Internal shutters are a temporary, movable fixture. They can be opened, closed, or removed entirely by the occupier at any time without the LPA's knowledge or consent.

-The LPA cannot effectively monitor or enforce the daily position of internal blinds or shutters behind closed door.

Long-established planning inspectorate precedent dictates that internal screens or layouts do not remedy a permanent, structural privacy [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Internal shutters are a temporary, movable fixture. They can be opened, closed, or removed entirely by the occupier at any time without the LPA's knowledge.□

It is also critical to note that the application property is a sideways-oriented bungalow built on a highly constrained, compact plot dating back to 1950. Because the bungalow extends substantially [REDACTED], [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] a
[REDACTED] n.
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] The elevated
position also gives [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

To reiterate my previous objection of the cramped nature of the applicant's plot and the [REDACTED], [REDACTED] has [REDACTED]. I respectfully request that Ribble Valley Borough Council **refuse planning permission** for this retrospective application.

I further request that the LPA robustly pursue its current enforcement proceedings to compel the applicant to reinstall permanent, external obscure glazing to all five openings in strict accordance with the GPDO. (3 openings to south elevation, no 31, and 2 elevations to the north, no 27.

Yours faithfully,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 08 September 2026 21:08
To: Planning
Subject: Objection to planning 3/2026/0629

⚠ 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.

To: Ribble Valley Borough Council – Planning Department

[REDACTED].
Re: Objection to Planning Application 29 Chatburn Park Drive
Planning application: APPLICATION NUMBER 3/2026/0629

Grid ref: 375064 442453

Dear Mr B Taylor,

cc Nicola Hopkins,

I am writing to formally object to the above planning application and to ask that the Council takes full account of the planning history and circumstances surrounding the [REDACTED].

The following chronology is particularly relevant.

In 2019, the previous owners incorporated obscure glazing as required by planning schedule 2; part 1; class B (B2), to the dormer extension.

[REDACTED]

These [REDACTED] 2
[REDACTED]. Because of the position and angle of the
houses in relation to each other, [REDACTED] now suffer from a detrimental level of
[REDACTED]. There are now [REDACTED].

The replacement of the obscured glass with clear glass has therefore created a significant and [REDACTED]

I quote the council findings:

“The introduction of the first-floor clear glazed windows in close proximity to the side boundaries of the land has resulted in unacceptable overlooking towards the adjacent neighbouring property to the south ...The resultant harm to residential amenity is in conflict with DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.”

Policy DMG1: General Considerations of the states in paragraph 10.4 (2) that in determining planning applications, all developments must (2) be sympathetic to existing and proposed land uses in terms of its size, intensity and nature as well as scale, massing, style, features and building materials. (3) requires consideration to be given to the relationship between buildings with particular emphasis on visual appearance as well as surroundings to include the effects of development on existing amenities.

The revised NPPF published in August 2026 also states in Policy P3: Living conditions and pollution that *‘development proposals should be appropriate for their location, taking into account the likely effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment, whether these effects are on or off-site; and whether this is as a result of the development itself or the product of pre-existing conditions in its vicinity. In assessing the potential effects of pollution, consideration should be given to the potential sensitivity of the site, and its intended occupiers and users, as well as that of the environment and population in the surrounding area.’*

Local and national planning policy are therefore clear [REDACTED] be protected from unacceptable harm from development which has a detrimental impact on living conditions.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

I find the argument that there has been insufficient time to comply particularly difficult to understand in the circumstances. During this same period, the occupants have had sufficient time to undertake considerable other works to the house and extensivelandscaping to the garden. This demonstrates that there has been ample opportunity to address the relatively straightforward requirement to [REDACTED].

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

I respectfully ask the Council, when determining this planning application and considering the associated enforcement and appeal circumstances, to consider:

1. [REDACTED].
2. [REDACTED]
3. [REDACTED]
4. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

I am concerned that [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] It should be noted that Section 55 (2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 states that works which affect only the interior of a building do not constitute development and as such, are not enforceable. A Local Planning Authority would not be able to enforce against the removal of the shutters as they do not require planning permission. Shutters are not a solution to the underlying problem. [REDACTED].

Please see map of position of houses.

I therefore respectfully request that the Council **refuse the planning application** as it is contrary to local and national planning policies in respect of ensuring living [REDACTED].

I would also ask that this objection is placed on the planning file and that the factual chronology set out above is considered alongside the occupants' appeal and the Council's enforcement records.

Yours faithfully,

[REDACTED]

07.09.2026

Sent from my iPhone