

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 17 November 2022 12:46
To: Planning
Subject: Planning application 3/2022/1039 Land adjacent to 115 Kemple View



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.

Dera Sir/Madam

I have received your letter dated 14/11/2022 regarding this re-submission.

I have looked at the revised plans and documents carefully and I wish to point out [REDACTED]

The Design and Access Statement is incorrect. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Paragraph 6) RESIDENTIAL AMENITY states the following:-

'we have again ensure (sic) compromises are made to the design to respect the neighbouring buildings by removing windows on the first floor or obscuring the windows on the elevations which face onto neighbouring properties.'

'Plot 2 is roughly opposite the turning head adjacent to plot 42 of the development approved under application 3/2015/0445 therefore unlikely to result indirect (sic) overlooking of the dwellings on this site. Plot 1 is set further back behind 115 Kemple view (sic) so is also unlikely to have an adverse impact on these dwellings additionally There (sic) are no facing windows on the first floor of building 1 and 2 that can overlook onto the adjacent plots.'

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] and the first-floor windows on the Proposed North West Elevation of Building 2 will [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Not only that but there is also a balcony proposed at first-floor height to encourage this!!!! The 'turning head' is [REDACTED] I really don't know how [REDACTED] acceptable.

YOU ARE VERY WELCOME TO COME AND VISIT [REDACTED] TO SEE WHAT I MEAN.

Looking at the plan of the Building 2 I see that the two windows on the left of the NW facade belong to a dressing area and bathroom so there is no reason that they cannot be made high level and obscured with Velux in the roof if extra light is needed (as it would appear the bathroom area already has).

The adjoining master bedroom shows double patio doors leading onto a balcony. This is the area where people [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] so why not amend the plan and turn the patio doors and balcony 90 degrees anti-clockwise to look towards Building 1 instead? This would involve changing the roofline slightly to incorporate a dormer but who ever uses patio doors onto a balcony in a bedroom, especially one that don't get any sunlight as it is NW facing. So why not just incorporate a dormer window on the SW elevation with Velux in the roof for extra light if needed?

Notwithstanding the above there is also the question of access to this site in the first place? Forgive me if this is incorrect but I am led to believe that this would involve crossing the land of the neighbour to even get onto the site. How can this be allowed?

The other issue is that this particular area of Kemple View and Kenilworth Drive is a lovely quiet area where there are no particularly noisy people and I am afraid that the building of 2 large properties will encourage more cars and noise, especially in the summer with people using their gardens more.

Also we all know that the main sewers run directly below this site and that it would be very easy to damage them during construction which will cause major problems for the whole area.

I hope that you will consider my comments and ideally refuse this application completely or at the very least prevent direct overlooking of the Raglan Close rear elevations and gardens.

All the problems of overlooking the neighbouring properties could, of course, be overcome by only allowing 2 small bungalows on the site which would also be more conducive to this lovely quiet area.

Yours faithfully