[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: 09 November 2022 13:07
To: Planning
Subject: Application 3/2022/1013 Amendment to S106 of 3/2019/1104 (land off Hawthorne Place, Clitheroe, BB7 2HU).

⚠
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.

Good Afternoon,

I write in relation to the above application submitted by Persimmon Homes and in commenting on this application would like to **strongly object.**

On 24th September 2020 application 3/2019/1104 for 58 dwellings was rejected at committee on the grounds of inappropriate density and housing mix. Persimmon agreed to reduce and amend their application and at a further committee on 4th February 2021 submitted an application for 57 houses and a number of bungalows. Despite only a reduction of one house, incredibly this was deemed enough to satisfy requirements. However this further application also included bungalows where previously all properties had been two storey. This was clearly to make the application more appealing to the planning committee given that RVBC had highlighted that the area, due to its demographic, had a shortage of bungalows. This application was approved and the S106 included details of bungalows for over 55's.

Residents suspected that Persimmon would later [redacted] given that their motives are obviously [redacted] as opposed to providing what communities actually require. However it is incumbent upon RVBC to uphold these agreements and not allow these modifications to the detriment of local people. By providing such housing, not only does it provide older people with suitable accommodation to enhance quality of life and independence as they age, it also in many cases makes available large family houses from the downsizing available, negating the need to build any more.

Three bedroom two storey houses are suitable and are more likely to be purchased by families, despite being marketed for over 55's many older children still live with parents of this age. This would inevitably lead to occupation by family units who would also own and require to park more cars. A bungalow would be more likely to be purchased by a single person or couple who would be likely to own only one to two cars, for which parking would be provided. This development will already double the amount of traffic along Hawthorne Place, a very narrow residential side street, so to add even more for reasons [redacted] would be to further disregard to the amenity of existing residents here.

I can see that the plans for plots 29, 30, 31, 47 and 48 show two storey three bedroom housing but these plans were submitted further down the line after it was approved and detailed within the S106 that these plots would be bungalows. Was this a mistake made by default or design?! Either way I would on behalf of resident[redacted] and the wider Ribble Valley community ask that RVBC planners make a stand and force them to do what they said they would and in doing so provide housing that is actually required.

How long before an application to amend the over 55's four one bedroom bungalows is submitted?

Thank you for your time taken in reading and considering these comments,

[redacted]

[redacted]