

A Lawful Development Certificate (LDC) is granted as a means of ascertaining whether a proposed development is lawful for planning purposes. Before this application was made, advice should have been taken along the lines that most local authorities would have offered in this matter and summed up as follows:

*'Residents often think that as they both own and pay for the upkeep of their unadopted street they have a right to obstruct it as they choose, eg by putting a gate across the street. However, **it is just as much an offence to obstruct an unadopted highway as any other highway**' (Pendle Borough Council).*

To add insult to injury, in their statement Messrs Sloane and Brown offered up only a cut and paste job from the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 literature under the section '**making changes to a dwelling house**'. The very least you could have expected them to do in an application like this is to find some, any relevant reference to their proposed installation.

As a further observation on lawfulness, working on the presumption that all that is needed is a majority of residents in Knightcroft Avenue to vote for the installation of a gate as was pursued here, is totally misguided. Whether designated a highway or not all the households in Knightcroft Avenue have an individual right, either written in their deeds or by long established use, to unimpeded access to the road, a narrow majority is totally irrelevant it has to be unanimous. But of course many others further afield than Knightcroft Avenue can claim the same established unimpeded rights.

The Lawful Development Certificate is a means of avoiding having to make a planning application, which hopefully in view of the resulting road safety and chaotic traffic implications of such a proposal would stand little chance of being approved. The idea of vehicles or delivery lorries faced with a barrier and then attempting to turn with cars behind them, or worse still reversing out into a very busy main road with parked cars all down the eastern side seems unconscionable. For disabled drivers the process of having to get out of their cars to open the gate in such pressurised circumstances would prove very distressing.

To say that the proposed new gate, as depicted in the plans, is located a suitable distance from the junction with Sea Lane where as in fact the space would barely accommodate the average delivery van is completely misleading. This together with the fact that the gate will narrow the road to a single lane for the combined accessing and exiting of Knightcroft Avenue will further exacerbate a volatile and potentially dangerous set of circumstances.

However, lawfulness, planning, and majority votes aside, the only household such a proposal really affects is mine. The proposed gate is situated directly outside my house, which means every temporary roadblock, traffic altercation and road accident throughout the day and night will impinge on my quality of life. Turning in the road will inevitably churn up the grass verges and the proposed gate will mean family and friends will not be able to park by the curb

outside my house. Automatic gates also provide a great recreational opportunity for drunken revellers; a not unusual occurrence in Sea Lane having a pub at both ends, and is the last thing you would want to encourage outside your house.

On every possible consideration, lawfulness, planning, safety, environmental, this is an unsubstantiated, unacceptable and divisive proposal.