

Nicola Gunn

From: Planning
Sent: 20 July 2021 16:46
To: Planning
Subject: REDACT AND UPLOAD Planning Application Comments 3/2021/0661

Categories: Info, xRedact & Upload

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 20 July 2021 16:21
To: Web Development <webdevelopment@ribblevalley.gov.uk>; Planning <planning@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2021/0661

Title: [REDACTED]

First Name: [REDACTED]

Surname: [REDACTED]

Is your address in Ribble Valley?: Yes

Enter a postcode or street: [REDACTED]

Choose Address: [REDACTED]

Selected address: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Locality:

County: Lancashire

uprn: 10022972465

usrn: 31802240

ward: E05005312

Planning Application Reference Number: 3/2021/0661

Address of Development: Mark Hill Section of UU project - [REDACTED]

Your Comments: These comments relate to the various applications made by UU in relation to the above.

The way this process has been approached and UU's conduct throughout, has been devious, calculated, tactical, down right dishonest, and very unprofessional. UU have used covid has an excuse for not performing proper

inspections or in person studies/surveys, nor hold any kind of public consultation, nor visit / speak to (despite being invited) individual residents like us who's homes and lives will be devastated if this goes ahead as planned, and for not being able to share key information earlier in the process. Yet, unsurprisingly, when it comes to delivering a multitude of documents to their initial timetable, covid has no impact. The only reasonable thing UU could have done would be to give us all additional time to go through a proper process with proper evidence and proper consultation, yet no, they have found a 'way' to get around this and no doubt make out they have done everything by the book. They most certainly have not

[REDACTED] The land affected by the project and the road are [REDACTED] No one from UU has written to me, attempted to visit, survey the impact, I could go on. Having spent nearly 2 years working through a difficult and robust process to secure planning permission to renovate my house recently, I am appalled that UU pay lip service to one to one consultation. My garden will be rendered unusable, the views and surrounding fields will become a building site / eye sore, and the road will become even more dangerous than it already is. Surely any reputable organisation would show some sympathy and attempt to ease the concerns and worries of locals

I am deeply concerned that UU's case is founded primarily on desk top studies as opposed to accurate real life information and data - this extends to the impact on wildlife (this is an area with outstanding wildlife particularly rare birds) noise and pollution and of course the roads. UU have gone on record to say they have not been able to perform surveys on individual properties / sites / roads but refer to base cases and other general information. For this project to go ahead it has to follow a prolonged period of studies to properly understand the consequences and develop proper mitigations. UU's general responses give me no reassurance whatsoever that any understands the impact on the local area and environments

UU claim to have consulted, there is a full document apparently setting out what they have done - I dispute this is the strongest possible way. They have not consulted. They have not made any attempts to address the concerns and impact on individuals, e.g. my family and my property, nor the general public. What they have done is publish high level general information on their website and hold a small number of webinars. On these the depth of any information shared is a joke, so high level it tells the public nothing of interest. They invite questions but then ignore them all and don't answer specifics. All i have had (and i have attended all the calls) is the response, please see the Q&A section of the website. When i have asked for what basis they can claim the impact on say noise at my property is within the legal limits, all i get back is we have used general studies that are available and baseline data. In other words no on site, property by property, impact assessment has been done. This is not acceptable.

[REDACTED] This is all down to the area that is supposed to be 'an area of outstanding beauty' and protected, but is now going to be completely ruined for a period of 6 years (and potentially beyond).

I will now move onto the situation regarding the roads - slaidburn road has already been deemed to be a dangerous road such that school children are not allowed to move up and down it, but instead are picked up and dropped off house by house. This must have been an easy decision to make given the volume of traffic, the speeds, the additional use by the quarries wagons, plus cyclists, etc etc. Each day there are a number of different school buses stopping and starting on the road between about 8 and 8.45am, and then again between 3.30 and 4.30 (and on certain days earlier 2.30-3.30 when different schools have an early finish e.g. for CRGS its a wed). During these times the road is already very dangerous as there are no proper bus stops or laybies. The road simply cannot take any more vehicles during these times which render UU's plan impossible as they do not understand what this road is actually like. Additionally the condition of the road is already very poor and a danger to cyclists. With the volume of extra lorries predicted this will only get worse. I have told UU this already but the road implications by my property alone are a serious threat to life and i genuinely do believe loss of life is a real possibility as the network is insufficient.

Finally i would like to share my own thoughts regarding the conduct of UU - throughout this process they have said one thing and then done another. On most occasions this has been say one thing and then do nothing. [REDACTED] was apparently given the job by UU to liaise and consult with us, local residents. We invited him to join calls with our local fellside action group. On these he made commitments to get information, write to us, respond to our points

and formally respond to concerns we have raised. He failed to deliver on any of these. As an action group we have written evidence that UU lie, they say one thing and then do another. We also have evidence that they cannot be trusted. This project, if it has to go ahead in an alternative form (this proposal is impossible) has to be led by an organisation that will do things in the right way, a balanced way, follow proper process, take into account the views of others (not just their own) and absolutely follow due process and fulfil all commitments made. Whilst UU make a number of big commitments as to how they will operate through the project and what they will leave behind at the end, the reality is that they will be reliant on contractors and therefore i challenge strongly what evidence any of us have that they can be trusted and will do what they commit to. UU have said they will respond to our action group, they have said they will respond to me and the concerns of my family and made commitments on calls and in writing that simply they haven't. I have no confidence whatsoever in them as an organisation or a project team based on my interactions with them. If they are allowed to proceed the consequences will be far greater than their so called 'studies' suggest, yet they will not be the ones living with the impact.

The villages of Waddington and Newton [REDACTED] Waddington will be unrecognisable. Currently local businesses are booming, it is a tourist destination, access roads are busy at weekends / holidays, but it is beautiful part of the world enjoyed by many. Compare that to a village totally jammed by a combination of lorries, other traffic, traffic lights and parking restrictions. When i have challenged UU on access through the village again they refer to historic information of daily averages. Any contemplation of this project surely would have observed the village at peak times, whether school run time of day, or when tourists swarm to the village. Newton again is a lovely village with one road in and one road out. Once this project commences Newton will effectively be cut off as the access roads will not cope with the additional volumes. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] including UU in the past. I know how business works and especially a PLC, its all about making money. Does the UK need this massive infrastructure project to go ahead - i don't know but assume the answer is yes. Are there alternative ways of delivering the outcome that will address my concerns and others, absolutely yes. Will these alternatives cost more, absolutely yes. All we have been presented with here is the best option for UU to deliver the outcome and a return to shareholders. If the criteria for proceeding also takes into account the impact on the environment, noise, air pollution, the roads, local businesses, local residents, then the answer has to be to look at less invasive and less damaging alternatives.

If this project is allowed to go ahead as currently planned it devastates the ribble valley, the local area and the road networks will simply fail. Locals residents like me will have their lives dominated throughout, which cannot be fair, just nor legal. I encourage, support, and beg the people that have the power to govern and not be bullied, do exactly that, govern and ensure a proper process is commenced and that UU are requested to go away and consider realistic alternatives that are less damaging for all the reasons set out.

Thank you for your time and for reading my thoughts. I'd be delighted to expand if that would be helpful. [REDACTED]