

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 19 May 2023 12:48
To: Planning
Subject: RE: Matters of concern wishing to be noted for application 3/2022/0317 - re. Reserved Matters application in respect of Phase 5 and 6



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.

Dear Sir / Madam

Further to [REDACTED] comments sent via [REDACTED] (18th May) for application 3/2022/0317 we have discovered that the illustrative plan we referred to in our previous email has since been superseded. For a different illustrative masterplan was approved under application 3/2015/0895. This different illustrative masterplan was submitted as part of an application which stated that its primary purpose was to request approval to commence phase 1 before constructing the roundabout on the A59 and request a change in the siting of the school and the business / retail area. It was not made clear in this application that the buffer zone width and layout would also be changing for phase 6.

When this application (3/2015/0895) was consulted upon there were relatively few official and third-party responses. The planning officer's report for this application shows that, like us, no one picked up on the fact that the phase 6 construction and buffer zone layout was changing significantly compared to the first illustrative masterplan – the one which was approved after much public consultation (application 3/2012/0942). The covering letter submitted by the developer's agent just mentions that they have prepared "*a new illustrative master plan to show what it considers to be a significantly improved layout across the whole site, and has prepared detailed plans for phase 1 which tally with the new masterplan*". With no mention that there has been a fundamental change to the width and layout of the phase 6 buffer zone and construction layout (siting of houses, roads etc).

[REDACTED] by the developers into allowing a fundamental change to take place to the width and layout of phase 6 without stating it clearly in their application. The new illustrative plan shows it but they do not highlight the changes compared to the previous illustrative masterplan. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

We would appreciate if these comments could also be brought to the attention of the planning committee when they consider application 3/2022/0317.

Thank you

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Sent: Thursday, May 18, 2023 3:25 PM
To: Planning <planning@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Subject: Matters of concern wishing to be noted for application 3/2022/0317 - re. Reserved Matters application in respect of Phase 5 and 6

Dear Sir / Madam

Please could the following matters of concern be brought to the attention of the planning committee when they consider application 3/2022/0317.

1. The application shows a significant change in the width and layout of the buffer zone compared to the one shown in the illustrative masterplan which was approved at outline stage (3/2012/0942). The illustrative masterplan shows a much **wider** buffer zone and one that is bordered firstly by a road and then houses; whereas this latest plan shows that the buffer zone is bordered by gardens and not a road. To propose that the use of the rear gardens of the new houses somehow provides a “true buffer” seems to miss the point of what a buffer zone is for and how it is best achieved.
2. The now planted buffer zone adjacent to 1-15 (odd) Littlemoor houses differs in planting detail compared to the buffer zone adjacent to Standen Hall (condition 20 of application 3/2012/0942). The Standen Hall buffer zone was planted up soon after the start of the development and planted with trees in a tight, uniform and consistent manner in order to create a “true buffer” zone with a noticeable physical break between the development and Standen Hall grounds and wood. Whereas the one by 1-15 (odd) Littlemoor houses is mainly planted with shrubs rather than trees. This will undermine the original purpose of the buffer zone which was to separate 1-15 (odd) Littlemoor houses from the development both visually and distinctly – not integrate Littlemoor into the development as these proposed plans suggest. We were assured at the first public consultation meeting that the buffer zone would be put in place to protect the historic (Grade II) houses (village) of Littlemoor and so be a distinct separation both to provide privacy [REDACTED] and reduce sound from the new development. Therefore, may we request that the buffer zone next to Littlemoor should be more akin to the one adjacent to Standen Hall in both its width and the detail of the planting (with much greater density of trees than what has so far been planted). For the conditions of planning approval regarding the buffer zone do not differentiate the planting detail between what the buffer zone adjacent to Standen Hall should be planted with compared to the one adjacent to 1-15 (odd) Littlemoor houses. See conditions of approval 20-22 of application 3/2012/0942 for the full details.
3. The illustrative masterplan approved at outline stage (3/2012/0942) shows no houses adjacent to Littlemoor Road; to the left of the proposed new entrance (if one was standing on the road looking into the development area). This latest plan shows that houses are now going to be built on this area which was previously approved at the outline stage as being only grassland.
4. Limited number of affordable rented home. May we request that the number of **affordable** rented homes on the proposed development is increased to provide provision of housing to those much in need of a home and who are unable to afford a shared ownership property due to an increase in interest rates affecting affordability criteria for approval of personal mortgages. For instance, out of the 138 homes proposed on the plan for phase 6 there are only 18 properties which have been designated for affordable rented homes – this represents only 13% for this phase of the development. It is also worth noting that new homes are also more efficient to heat and light and so older homes may be available in the area to rent but when heating costs are factored in the overall cost to the tenant is not affordable; hence the need for more affordable rented homes.
5. Impact on existing sewage processing facilities. May we request that the developer is asked to make a payment to United Utilities (say, under a Section 106 agreement) which would be designated solely to help fund the enlargement of sewage processing facilities in Clitheroe. United Utilities would also have to sign to a binding agreement that this money would be used for the purpose of enlarging processing facilities. For presently United Utilities are discharging excess sewage into the local rivers at a significant cost to the environment. More houses will only add to this issue and so please could adequate provision for sewage processing facilities be factored into the planning approval process for this and all new developments.
6. Concern for pedestrian safety sharing Littlemoor road with vehicles. May we request that a **full-length** foot path is provided for along Littlemoor road – from the proposed new Littlemoor entrance leading down to Whalley Road – as currently the footpath stops and leaves pedestrians having to walk on the side of the road leaving little room for cars to safely pass each other. The main reason for this request is that there will be an increase in the number of pedestrians walking on this road and so a safe footpath is required to link it up with the existing

footpath network. Otherwise, it will mean people having walk on the road, as at present, sharing it with cars and so increasing the risk of pedestrians being hit by cars; especially at peak traffic times.

7. No provision of allotments. May we request that land is set aside within the development for allotments to be established and rented out to residents of Clitheroe. According to the Clitheroe Town Council website there is waiting list for an allotment in excess of 3 years. So there is clearly a lack of supply but a great demand for them. The allotments could be owned by the developer but managed by the Town Council. Providing a means for people to grow their own food as well as provide an activity which is good for people (both physically and mentally). They would be a good addition to this development as well as help with establishing a community. May we also request that all new developments should provide a percentage of their land for allotments until supply equals demand.

Thank you

