

From: webmaster@ribblevalley.gov.uk <webmaster@ribblevalley.gov.uk>

Sent: 25 February 2021 20:38

To: Planning <planning@ribblevalley.gov.uk>

Subject: Form completion: Planning Application Comments Form

FORM DETAILS

Web Ref No: 24063

Form: Planning Application Comments Form

Completed: 25/02/2021 20:37:46

Status: Pending

USER DETAILS

Site user email: Unregistered user

USER INPUTS

title: [REDACTED]

LastName: [REDACTED]

firstName: [REDACTED]

numberName: [REDACTED]

postAddress: [REDACTED]

postCode: [REDACTED]

refNo: 3/2021/0112

addDev: 2 St Johns Close, Read BB12 7RL

comments: I write with reference to my residence [REDACTED] which appears on each of the site plans as the closest dwelling to 2 St John Close and is sited due North from the proposed 2 storey residence and between 2 and 3 metres from the proposed building. I believe my property was built in 1963 (the same year as 2 St Johns Close). I would respectfully ask you to consider the following points associated with granting this application. 1. Effect on the local area a. What can't be easily appreciated from the plans I viewed online is the character of the buildings around the proposed 2 storey house. All residencies around the proposed site to its north, south, east and west are all bungalows or dormer bungalows. This 2 storey house is out of character in it being disproportionately high, has a 2 storey frontage forward by position to all the other dormer frontages of the other properties on the odd numbered side of George Lane and its design visually has no sympathy with the neighbouring bungalows. This planning proposal creates a disproportionate building to its neighbours creating overshadowing of the bungalows ([REDACTED] 2 St. John's close), as well as it not being in character. b. Loss of green space and openness due to building on a current garden. The proposed building would be over the entire garden of 2 St Johns Close. My feeling is that this is overdevelopment on a small plot. Creating 2 properties with a poor ratio of outside space (most easily seen in comparison with its neighbours plot sizes). c. Possibly due to the small plot size the proposed house is only 1.8m from 2 St Johns Close (a bungalow). The 2 storey building would hugely effect light, view and overshadowing on the west side of 2 St Johns (at ground level). Whilst the current occupiers

(planning applicants) obviously accept this reduction in their light and space, future occupants will have a building with reduction in light to the tune of 1 window and French doors with window, and a 2 storey building overshadowing them 1.8m away.

2. Loss of light and amenity a. A 2 storey building on our south side would almost totally obscure all daylight into the south side of our house and obscure the entirety of the view as a by-product, as our home has only has 1 window on the entire south side of our building. There is currently an uninterrupted sight of the whole horizon (reference point 3a). This proposed development seriously overshadows by proximity, creating an effect of enclosure and would produce zero outlook from our master bedroom affecting our "right to light" and amenity. This would certainly have an impact on our feeling of well-being due to loss of light, view and space into our Master bedroom. As far as I'm aware [REDACTED] has had an unobscured view/light since its build in 1964 b. The plans named "existing street view" indicate a hedge that already obscures the window. In fact this is not to scale and the current hedge is well below window sill level allowing currently for no obstruction of daylight at all. I only highlight this to illustrate the correct current unobscured light/view as opposed to a misrepresentation that may lead planners to feel there would be little impact by the proposed 2 storey building. c. The retaining wall to the property appears to directly abut to the building proposed. Again I highlight a plans inaccuracy (on the "Proposed Site Plan") as the distance from [REDACTED] resistance to the boundary appears visually bigger than the distance between 2 St Johns Close and the proposed building (measured at 1.8m). In fact the distance of [REDACTED] to the current boundary wall is 0.89m min to 1.3m max. This is a much smaller distance than is implied on the plans (creating a small distance between [REDACTED] and the proposed building) and whilst I appreciate that the agent drawing the plans will not have entered my property boundary to measure this I still feel this inaccuracy should be mentioned. This inaccuracy is represented once again in the lower drawing of the "proposed street view" where the distance of the [REDACTED] dwelling is only 89cm from the existing boundary wall. On the same "Proposed Site Plan" the measurement from the proposed building to the boundary line is stated as 110cm making the distance between the 2 buildings only 199cm between a bungalow and a new 2 storey high property. This would certainly create an overbearing presence by its close proximity and maximal blockage of light, view, space and solar exposure.

3. Resultant loss of income from the loss of light, and loss of Green Agenda Support a. [REDACTED] has 12 solar panels on our due south facing roof elevation at single storey (ground floor roof) level that would greatly be affected by the lack of light from a proposed 2 story building whose height would obscure parts of the day they are exposed to sun currently. The sun is due south at noon and this would be the most income generating portion of the day. This solar light reduction would be particularly aggressive during the winter months due to sun angle and aggressive in summer due to volume of sun in summer months. In Summer the sun rises to an elevation of 67 degrees dropping to a level of just 14 degrees above the horizon in winter. I'm sure you can imagine the effect of a 2 storey building due south of solar panels. The lack of light would greatly effect our ability to generate green energy and would of course have an ongoing financial impact upon our income [REDACTED] per year, for which I can supply evidence of course and constitutes a baseline for income generation that would form a historical level for future likely income). b. Equally importantly the shadowing from the proposed building would cross the entire South roof elevation of [REDACTED]. Effectively ending the ability to support the future green agenda as it would preclude our

ability to add further solar panels on our due south roof elevation denying the ability to further support the Green Agenda that is needed and inevitable in the UK and around the world. 4. Safety (road/access) I noticed the Highways Authority have "grave concerns about the lack of visibility from the proposed driveway" and have calculated the reasons for this concern. It's worth pointing out some safety aspects that exiting the proposed property may have from my own experience exiting onto George Lane from the neighbouring property. Exiting onto George Lane as per the outlined plans and looking right is impeded by the curvature of the road, [REDACTED] wall and hedge being forward of the current hedge of 2 St Johns Close (not represented on the "Proposed Site Plan" but is represented on the "Proposed Street View") and the angulation caused by the properties being on a hill. The exit is also very close to the junction/corner of St Johns close. George Lane is a well used thoroughfare for all properties in the area to get onto the main road (at the bottom of George Lane). Traffic travelling down George Lane will have an extremely poor view of any car exiting the 2 St Johns Close proposed driveway. Its worth noting that the road limit is 20mph but my experience is that cars travelling up and especially down the hill exceed this limit much more commonly than they keep it. Whilst cars will have an extremely poor view of the proposed driveway exit from their position sat in a right hand drive car, a cyclist or horse rider will be even more restricted due to their more left hugging position on the road. George Lane is a very well used cycle route due to its route leading to the more rural aspects of Read and beyond. The area indicated on the "proposed site plan" indicates an area 2.5m beyond the hedge. This area I assume is to illustrate where a car exiting the site would pull up to. Studying the Title Plan for 2 St Johns Close however shows that this 2.4m line in fact falls outside of the straight edge of the Land Registry Title Plan and onto the public highway. I cannot imagine with my experience of exiting my own driveway several metres further up George Lane and with a straight line of sight up George Lane and no obstructions to view other than the hill incline, that there would be enough stopping distance for a car coming down the hill to see a car exiting the proposed driveway, or indeed a car leaving the driveway to see a car coming down the road such that either vehicle had the required distance to stop a collision. This would be further effected if any visitor cars to the current residents on George Lane were parked on the road reducing the ability to take a more central position on the road. Summary Whilst the principle of opposing the ability of a neighbour to use his and her land for what they wish goes against my personal beliefs I believe in approving this particular application the council planning department would be -on a personal basis for my property it would have a severe impact or abolish completely, the light into the only window on the south side, our solar income, and well-being via oppressive space reduction and overshadowing. -as a parish adding a building not in keeping with its neighbours and with no other properties similar in design in vicinity plus reducing the green space via a garden removal. This would seem to set an unacceptable precedent for future development. -as a county and country reducing its ability to support green energy production to support climate change both now and for any future increase in production necessary to achieve this by greatly reducing solar energy production. We consider the council has a responsibility to protect current residents and safeguard our light, space, and green agenda. We would welcome a planning officer visit for internal and external inspection to validate all of the above. [REDACTED] [REDACTED] during a pandemic I appreciate this may not be possible but I am happy to supply full PPE and maintain all the high standards of distancing and Covid

protocols that I apply stringently at work and home. Many thanks for your time and consideration.