

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 13 April 2021 20:37

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

Subject: Planning Application 3/2021/0275 Land behind The Dog Inn Market Place Longridge PR3 3RR

Response to the above planning application from [REDACTED]

As residents of [REDACTED] for over 34 years, our main objections to the current application are the use of land by the developer that is not within The Dog Inns boundaries. Also the height and density of the proposed buildings and the extreme close proximity to our boundary.

Re Ownership Certificates & Agricultural Land Declarations (Application Form)

Land directly to the east of the public footpath to Darwen Close was not purchased as part of The Dog Inn as this land was historically used as allotments, donated to the people of Longridge and is not within the boundaries of The Dog Inn.

Regarding the land between the boundary of [REDACTED] and the bowling green wall (now demolished), in 1990 following correspondence about boundary fencing, a letter was received by us from Bowland Inns stating that all land surrounding The Dog Inn which our property backs onto was sold to the local council by Duttons brewery in 1960. A copy of this letter is attached dated 5 April 1990. At this time Ribble Valley Council verbally enquired if we would like to take on the land but we decided to leave it as natural green space which has only been used by us since 1987 for disposal of green garden cuttings. At this time property owners on Market Place and King Street were offered land adjacent to this area which they have now fenced and maintained.

We feel it is the responsibility of Ribble Valley Council or the developer to investigate and confirm the exact boundaries and land ownership with Land Registry. The Dog Inn seem to have assumed ownership, clearing the land, knocking down clear boundary walls, dumping hardcore and changing the contours of the land . This work was done over a bank holiday weekends without permission from Ribble Valley Council. Any neighbouring boundary property owner could have equal claim to this land.

Re Planning Statement- Pre Application Advice 4.3

Although classed as 2.5 storeys by the developer, it will be 3 floors of windows looking onto the rear of Darwen Close properties which are at a considerably lower level.

The 3 storey proposal presented at pre application stage were considered to be bulky and an imposing addition from the pedestrian walkway. Therefore to have 3 storeys at the eastern side of the development which is at a higher ground level, approximately 1 metre from the boundary of [REDACTED] and angled to look directly at the rear of our property must be considered an even more imposing addition. Plots 7-9 will have living and kitchen areas on the first floor and will be looking directly into Darwen Close homes.

Re Planning Statement 5.10

Scale and Massing

Contrary to what has been stated, the proposed properties do overlook the properties on Darwen Close with the first and second floors looking directly into the properties.

G3 trees/hedging belonging to [REDACTED]

These were planted as boundary hedging 50 years ago and are well maintained at the owners side and were left to grow naturally at the western side as the land there has always been natural green space.

It is imperative that the G3 group tree roots are protected as this is an established boundary hedge to [REDACTED]. The canopy would look better if it was kept green and not cut right back.

Plot 9 is approximately 1 metre from the boundary of [REDACTED] and is 3 storeys high at this point, the highest point of the total development. Plot 9 is an encroachment to the privacy and available light of our property.

We strongly feel that the scale and mass of the development is totally inappropriate for this location. A much smaller scale development at a considerably lower overall height and much further away from the eastern boundary would be more appropriate.

[REDACTED]

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10