From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>

Sent: 03 June 2022 13:20

To: Planning

Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2022/0449



Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2022/0449

Address of Development: Lower Abbott House

Abbott Brow Osbaldeston

Comments:

3/6/22

Regarding Planning Application 3/2022/0449

Lower Abbott House

The introduction comments on the property being in a 'worse condition than expected'.

However, the existing walls appeared to be of sound construction before the work commenced on the removal of the roof and timbers, first floor timbers and beams and internal stone walls. The remaining external walls could be retained with proper building practices. The old stone walls form part of the character of this once delightful looking property and in full keeping of the surrounding rural residential properties.

Raising of the ridge height.

The property and the properties directly across Abbott Brow have what is described as limited headroom but adequate and again in keeping with the type of properties in the immediate vicinity. The property was purchased with these measurements and lived in for approximately 200 years previously, and should remain the same height. The sun setting over Lower Abbott House with a raised ridge height would reduce the light to the four properties directly across Abbott Brow. (Lower Abbott House Farm, Melwyn, Lynton, Lower Abbott Cottage).

The proposal of timber cladding is NOT in keeping with any of the existing properties in the vicinity and would in my eyes degrade the appearance of Abbott Brow. The front porch has had many positive comments over the years and must be retained. No cladding to the property at all.

There is a public right of way to the northeast of the property by the brook/stream which then turns west and passes the rear of the property underground, which during the initial demolition of the old stone outbuildings has now been diverted (hopefully with the permission of the environment agency) presumably so the proposed extension could be built?

The questionnaire section 'Trees and Hedges'

There were trees on the boundary to the rear but now removed. Presumably, to divert the brook closer to the neighbours boundary for the building of the extention.

Questionnaire section 'Assessment of flood Risk'

There is a watercourse within 20 metres (even after relocating) on two sides of the property.

It sinks underground on the property of Lower Abbott House and has to be regularly checked and cleared to prevent flooding of the property which has occurred on several occasions.

The proposal of building a wall between the Brook and the new extension will divert the Brook when it overfows/blocks (which OFTEN occurs) onto neighbouring land. I see the potential for the brook to be neglected.

Surface water must not be discharged into the main sewer when there is a natural water course on the property.

Questionnaire 'Waste storage and Collection' I'm sure this property is on the main sewer.

Please consider our concerns.

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>

Sent: 03 June 2022 13:40

To: Planning

Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2022/0449



Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2022/0449

Address of Development: Lower Abbott House

Abbott Brow Mellor

Comments:

3/6/22

Regarding Planning Application 3/2022/0449
Sireen Patel
Lower Abbott House

The introduction comments on the property being in a 'worse condition than expected'.

However, the existing walls appeared to be of sound construction before the work commenced on the removal of the roof and timbers, first floor timbers and beams and internal stone walls. The remaining external walls could be retained with proper building practices. The old stone walls form part of the character of this once delightful looking property and in full keeping of the surrounding rural residential properties.

Raising of the ridge height.

The property and the properties directly across Abbott Brow have what is described as limited headroom but adequate and again in keeping with the type of properties in the immediate vicinity. The property was purchased with these measurements and lived in for approximately 200 years previously, and should remain the same height. The sun setting over Lower Abbott House with a raised ridge height would reduce the light to the four properties directly across Abbott Brow. (Lower Abbott House Farm, Melwyn, Lynton, Lower Abbott Cottage).

The proposal of timber cladding is NOT in keeping with any of the existing properties in the vicinity and would in my eyes degrade the appearance of Abbott Brow. The front porch has had many positive comments over the years and must be retained. No cladding to the property at all.

There is a public right of way to the northeast of the property by the brook/stream which then turns west and passes the rear of the property underground, which during the initial demolition of the old stone outbuildings has now been diverted (hopefully with the permission of the environment agency) presumably so the proposed extension could be built?

The questionnaire section 'Trees and Hedges'

There were trees on the boundary to the rear but now removed. Presumably, to divert the brook closer to the neighbours boundary for the building of the extention.

Questionnaire section 'Assessment of flood Risk'

There is a watercourse within 20 metres (even after relocating) on two sides of the property.

It sinks underground on the property of Lower Abbott House and has to be regularly checked and cleared to prevent flooding of the property which has occurred on several occasions.

The proposal of building a wall between the Brook and the new extension will divert the Brook when it overfows/blocks (which OFTEN occurs) onto neighbouring land. I see the potential for the brook to be neglected.

Surface water must not be discharged into the main sewer when there is a natural water course on the property.

Questionnaire 'Waste storage and Collection' I'm sure this property is on the main sewer.

Please consider our concerns.

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>

Sent: 05 June 2022 12:43

To: Planning

Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2022/0449



Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2022/0449

Address of Development: Lower Abbott House

Abbott Brow Mellor BB2 7HT

Comments: With regards to the application form we have the following concerns:

1 Assessment of flood risk:

The applicant has ticked "No' to:

'Is there any water course within 20 metres of the development?'

There is a brook directly behind the proposed extension, within 1 meter of the property.

Are the planning authorities not aware of this? This brook has constantly overflowed and flooded the garden of this property on numerous occasions. The brook needs constant maintenance to stop the flooding.

- 2 With regards to materials of the proposed new building. There is mention of Timber boarding/cladding. There are no properties in this area with timber cladding. This is not in keeping with other properties and it should be natural stone only. Timber cladding needs maintenance and is a fire hazard.
- 3 Design Statement: 'Request to raise the ridge height of the previously approved scheme by a nominal amount (1 metre)':

One metre is by no means a nominal amount. To raise the roof of the property by 3 feet 3 inches is going to block the light for the properties opposite, especially and completely transforms the look of the property.

4 The front and side elevations should be maintained in the original stonework for appearance and to fit in with other neighbouring properties.

5 Foul Sewerage:

There is no definitive answer as to how foul sewerage is to be disposed of. We are under the impression that the property is on the main sewer. Is this not the case?

We trust that our concerns will be considered carefully.

From: 06 June 2022 09:40

To: Planning

Subject: FW: Application no 3/2022/0449 Lower Abbott house ,Abbott Brow , Mellor

Attachments: image0.jpeg; image1.jpeg; image0.jpeg

From

Sent: 01 June 2022 06:59

To:

Subject: Application no 3/2022/0449 Lower Abbott house, Abbott Brow, Mellor

 \triangle

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 Mr Dowd.

I have been asked to write to you on behalf of

of Abbott House and the owners have a number of concerns in regard to the current application which was registered on 24 th May 2022.

1. They were surprised not to be officially consulted as part of the application given all the other were consulted . My clients have a

are fully aware of the current application and were also aware of the previous application (3/2021/0517) which they objected to at the time of the application. It should be noted by the local authority that the reasons for demolishing the house were the state of the structure and low ceiling heights . I would suggest the local authority look at this reason carefully as the ceiling heights were consistent with every property of this age in the valley . The ceiling heights are clearly noted on the existing survey drawings (2335mm at ground level and 2650 at first floor level is not considered as low) . Wall structural condition might be a reason for demolition but usually this can be addressed during refurbishment .

- 3. In examining the two applications we cannot see any reference to a bat survey albeit it is now too late as there is no roof on the property and any outbuildings that did exist have been removed. It does raise the question that as the outbuildings were all being removed as part of the original application why a bat survey was neither submitted or requested.
- 4 The agents have answered a question in relation to a water course on the site incorrectly . They have noted there is no water course within 20 m of the development .

There is a culverted stream running not only under the site but also under the foundations of the new extension. This watercourse runs from Abbott Brow ,around the southern end of the site ,

through the site and exits in the NW corner of the site running through the adjacent field and then under the A59 . It can be clearly seen from the location plan and site survey .

The implication of answering 'no ' to this question changes a number of considerations .

The new extension is constructed on top of the culvert . If this culvert collapses or becomes blocked (which it is at present) it can cause the open stream to flood on the road

and has been known to cause flooding to the cottages on the other side of Abbott Brow . Does this create a flood risk zone and it does ask the question as to the position of the proposed extension?

cannot be relocated . We are aware this issue should have been recognised by the local authority during application 2021/0517 and a full report requested. This might negate the approval granted under 2021/0517 .

We would suggest the position of the extension be reviewed given this information as it is our understanding that there is a specific formula for building adjacent to a culvert or watercourse which could ,dependant on the culvert size , restrict the construction of a building to as much as 6-10 m from the culvert . We also understand licences are needed for works adjacent to a stream and / or a culvert . There could also be a need to investigate if there are any affected species .

5. The proposed extension illustrates a large first floor window facing SE . It may as has been noted on the previous application

. We would ask that if this extension is built as currently designed the size of this bedroom window be reduced .

6. Finally there are a couple of questions on the application form related to drainage. The connections are noted as unknown. We would suggest checking this more carefully with the agents . There is a mains drain in Abbott Brow but it would seem odd to connect a SW drain to a main drain with a stream in the garden .

We have attached a couple of photographs taken from outside the site and leave you to consider the state of the building together with a part site plan with the location of the culverted stream marked on .