



12th April 2021

Dear Sirs

Ref. Planning Application No: 3/2021/0275

We write to express our extreme concern regarding the above building application that we feel is imposing, an invasion of our privacy, and will restrict the light to and affect the amount of drainage passing through our property.

Issues with the proposal.

1. Viewing the plans from the properties on Darwen Close, they show that the proposed development will be imposing to the extreme, due to the height difference of the land. We have estimated (not possible to determine the exact distance from the plans) the distance from the boundary hedge to the front elevation to be approximately 15m. This is too close for a building on land significantly higher than our property.
2. The dormer windows in the proposal of Plot 5 and 6 are significantly higher than the first floor windows of [REDACTED]. The height differential is approximately 5.5 to 6m and is in a direct line of sight, very imposing and will remove our privacy. Plot 5 and 6 first floor windows to are approximately 3.2 to 3.7m higher than ours which is still imposing and will remove our privacy.
3. Loss of light – The height of the proposed properties, especially those at the southern end of the west terrace, will have a significant effect on the amount of daylight to our property especially in the afternoon/evening.
4. Drainage – The proposed use of a soakaway is insufficient for this development and the drains should be connected to the sewer. Currently if there are five or six hours of steady rain there will be water running down onto the paved patio area at the rear of our property for the following 3 or 4 days. When there is heavier and more prolonged rainfall this can continue for many weeks. The change of use of the land will only increase the amount of water flowing through our property and down the hill thereafter.
5. Lighting from traffic – The proposed road access and parking for the west terrace means that there will be car headlights shining into both the ground and first floor of our property. With 12 parking spaces, so close, it could well become unbearable especially in the winter months when it is both darker and the beech hedge has less foliage.
6. Access road – We are extremely concerned about the access road that has a sharp bend on an incline when it is to be used by heavy vehicles such as the refuse wagon and if required the emergency services. We fear for our safety, especially in icy conditions, if a heavy vehicle loses control and ends up in our property.
7. The application includes a piece of common land (South east corner) that was bequeathed to the people of Longridge and possibly common land on the north side of the plot. The land on the south east corner should not be used for providing car park spaces so that the applicant can take more profit from the development, it should be used for the good of the

community as intended. In order to ensure that by the applicant only uses land that he owns, please could RVBC request a copy of the title deeds from the applicant.

8. The planning statement refers to the "Longridge Conservation area" on a number of occasions and appears to dismiss it as irrelevant. In 7.3 Heritage "The statement found the site currently asserts a localised negative impact upon the Longridge Conservation Area and a negative impact on the Dog Inn's setting. The site's former historical interest as a bowling green is now limited and has been eroded by the degraded condition of the site". It should be noted that when the Dog Inn was sold by the brewery, the bowling green and adjacent building was clearly visible although not in use. The reason it has been eroded by the degraded condition of the site is due to purposeful/intentional degrading by the Applicant and others when they set about destroying the bowling green by the use of heavy plant, irreversibly churning the land and knocking down boundary walls. They went on to dump hardcore and other building materials to construct what they now describe as the access road and left the rest to become the eyesore they describe. All this started over a bank holiday weekend and occurred without permission or knowledge of RVBC. As the Dog Inn bowling green was part of the heritage of Longridge it could have been restored to its former glory when they purchased it from the brewery.
9. With reference to the last planning application for the Dog Inn made by the applicant, the majority of the work was completed prior to approval. Parts of the application were rejected but the changes were still carried out. Therefore, we feel this application requires strong and decisive management by RVBC.

If any planning permission was to be granted for this land, we feel the only appropriate option would be a small number of bungalows. This would minimise the imposing nature, invasion of privacy and loss of natural light by construction on the site. That said, the remaining issues of drainage and safety on the access road would still need to be overcome. If the bungalows were designated as "over 55" then this would also reduce the requirement for the amount of parking and in turn the volume of traffic.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] We don't expect to receive the information before the closing date for comments but may ask to add additional comments at a later date before the planning committee meeting.

Yours faithfully

[REDACTED]