

From: Planning
Subject: FW: Planning Application Comments - 3/2023/0346 FS-Case-519819343

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: Monday, May 29, 2023 8:23 PM
To: Planning <planning@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2023/0346 FS-Case-519819343

Name:

Address:

Lancashire

Email:

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2023/0346

Address of Development: 21 Bright Street

Comments: I object to the planning application. It was my understanding that the side access to the rear was exactly that and is not owned by any of the properties on Bright Street.

It is certainly not vacant land as described in the application.

It is therefore hard to see how a planning application could be considered without clear ownership established.

Furthermore, it is hard enough with the number of taxi vehicles being parked on the street by the [REDACTED] (often three or four vehicles).

[REDACTED] usually parks one down the side currently so should the planning app go through this will mean an additional vehicle is parked on the street, thus increasing congestion.

From: Planning
Subject: FW: Planning Application Comments - 3/2023/0346c FS-Case-519928149

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: Tuesday, May 30, 2023 10:06 AM
To: Planning <planning@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2023/0346c FS-Case-519928149

Name:

Address:

Lancashire

Email:

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2023/0346c

Address of Development: Land to the side of 21 Bright Street Clitheroe BB7 1NW

Comments: Application 3/2023/0346- Land to the side of 21 Bright Street Clitheroe BB7 1NW

I would like to object to planning application 3/2023/0346- Land to the side of 21 Bright Street Clitheroe BB7 1NW.

Firstly, this track is far from 'vacant' and has been used by residents as access to the rear of Bright Street for over 50 years. Additionally, it provides the only vehicular access to the rear of Bright Street. Although there is rear access to the back of Bright Street from Taylor Street and the top of Bright Street, the road is too narrow to fit vehicles down. Plus, the access from the top of Bright Street is privately owned, so cannot be used freely by residents at the lower end of Bright Street.

Furthermore, the houses at the top of Bright Street own the back access road to the middle point of the track, and Trutex own the other half. It is likely that the homes at the bottom of Bright Street have a similar arrangement and own half of their access roads. Building over shared access tracks and alleys inconveniences other residents and businesses and if [REDACTED] is allowed to build over shared access, then where is the line drawn.

Another point I would like to make is that this development could result in highway safety issues. The rear access track and the 'vacant' access track are both used by children on their way to school. During school hours Bright Street is an extremely busy road, and the more 'off road' access paths children have the better. In terms of highways, this is also the access that emergency vehicles such as ambulances and fire engines would use to get to any incidents at the rear of Bright Street.

As there is no other access, any workers or vehicles associated with the building works will not be able to access the rear of the development. There is no vehicular access to the rear of Bright Street from Taylor Street or from the top of Bright Street because, as mentioned earlier, the access is too narrow and the rear access point from the top of Bright Street is privately owned. Therefore, any deliveries from builders' merchants, skips, builders vehicles etc, will have to park at the side of the road, adding further pressure to an already busy street and endangering children.

If this development were to go ahead, it would also have a detrimental effect on the residents of [REDACTED]

who would be [REDACTED] It would also disproportionately affect the value of their home.

Finally, just because somebody claims that the land is 'vacant' (which it isn't, it is used as access) does not mean that anyone who feels like it can build on it. This would set a precedent allowing people to build on any land they like, especially access roads and back alleys like this, denying people access to their homes and having a detrimental effect on neighbouring properties and residents.

Yours faithfully,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 30 May 2023 10:23
To: Planning
Subject: Application 3/2023/0346- Land to the side of 21 Bright Street Clitheroe BB7 1NW



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.

F.A.O Will Hopcroft,

I would like to object to planning application 3/2023/0346- Land to the side of 21 Bright Street Clitheroe BB7 1NW.

Firstly, this track is far from 'vacant' and has been used by residents as access to the rear of Bright Street for over 50 years. Additionally, it provides the only vehicular access to the rear of Bright Street. Although there is rear access to the back of Bright Street from Taylor Street and the top of Bright Street, the road is too narrow to fit vehicles down. Plus, the access from the top of Bright Street is privately owned, so cannot be used freely by residents at the lower end of Bright Street.

Furthermore, the houses at the top of Bright Street own the back access road to the middle point of the track, and Trutex own the other half. It is likely that the homes at the bottom of Bright Street have a similar arrangement and own half of their access roads. Building over shared access tracks and alleys inconveniences other residents and businesses and if [REDACTED] is allowed to build over shared access, then where is the line drawn.

Another point I would like to make is that this development could result in highway safety issues. The rear access track and the 'vacant' access track are both used by children on their way to school. During school hours Bright Street is an extremely busy road, and the more 'off road' access paths children have the better. In terms of highways, this is also the access that emergency vehicles such as ambulances and fire engines would use to get to any incidents at the rear of Bright Street.

As there is no other access, any workers or vehicles associated with the building works will not be able to access the rear of the development. There is no vehicular access to the rear of Bright Street from Taylor Street or from the top of Bright Street because, as mentioned earlier, the access is too narrow and the rear access point from the top of Bright Street is privately owned. Therefore, any deliveries from builders' merchants, skips, builders vehicles etc, will have to park at the side of the road, adding further pressure to an already busy street and endangering children.

If this development were to go ahead, it would also have a detrimental effect on the residents of [REDACTED] who would be subject [REDACTED] It would also disproportionately affect the value of their home.

Finally, just because somebody claims that the land is 'vacant' (which it isn't, it is used as access) does not mean that anyone who feels like it can build on it. This would set a precedent allowing people to build on any land they like, especially access roads and back alleys like this, denying people access to their homes and having a detrimental effect on neighbouring properties and residents.

I trust these responses have personal information redacted.

Yours sincerely,

[Redacted signature]