

## Sharon Craig

---

**From:** Rachel . <blparishclerk@outlook.com>  
**Sent:** 19 July 2022 18:06  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** 3/2022/0580

**Categories:** To Upload

---

### External Email

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.

---

The parish council would like to strongly object to this application on the following grounds.

1. The applicant asserts that while this is partly Greenbelt, they argue 'infill'. As the parish council see this it is urban sprawl as it clearly extends the building line into Greenbelt.
2. York Lane is very narrow at the access point to the proposed development with a bend to the south and a very dangerous and blind junction a few yards to the north. The entrance to the proposed site does not benefit from a footpath on that side of the road and hedges screen vision to the north and south. The splay shown on the applicants drawings is grossly insufficient.
3. The applicant illustrates views of the property in 'Location and Visual Impact' in their Design Statement. Views are artist's impressions of views from York Lane, not modified photographs (road widths are exaggerated and shadows wrong - unless the sun was shining from the north that day!). The road width is insufficient for an additional entrance at this location.
4. The design statement admits that the site is in the Green Belt and there is no possible justification given for such a building on grounds of agricultural, forestry or exceptional justification need. The building would also be highly visible to the East across a substantial amount of open space (a resident of Whinney Lane tells me there are fine views from the back of her house further down the road on the same side all the way to Clitheroe). The alleged "infill" space is several hundred yards long from the double garage opposite 43, Whinney Lane all the way up to the next group of houses in York village and contains nice hedges and trees much of the way.
5. The footpath, which follows the mis-categorised "infill" is adjacent to a brook. I did not see any drainage particulars on the application to protect the stream against surface flooding – possibly onto Whinney Lane further down.
6. The lower access to the proposed site is close to the junction of Whinney Lane and York Lane and we know too much traffic travels too fast on Whinney Lane already. The further higher access will be dangerous onto a narrower part of York Lane, which is still a minor rat-run and the vision splays are way too short for the actual speeds there; if you did make the splays wide enough, you would need to demolish a stretch of decent stone wall that enhances the street-scene at that point.
7. The DAS states that the 2 acre parcel of land the applicant wants to develop this property on half an acre of is indeed on green belt land which in itself should be enough to refuse the development.