From: Sent: To: Cc: Subject:	04 January 2023 09:25 Planning Application 3/2022/1098 FAO Stephen Kilmartin
	d from outside Ribble Valley Borough Council. Do NOT click links or open s you recognize the sender and are sure the content within this email is safe.
Re planning applic	ation : 3/2022/1098 Fir Tree House Chatburn
Good morning Mr K	Cilmartin
Apologies for the delay in getting this email to you but unfortunately as I think y8u are aware the planning application residents notice only arrived a few days ago so assume that this along with the plans not being available during some of that period that the comment will still be put to the planning committee and parish council for consideration.	
River Valley Boroug responding.	Notification letters were a week late with plans visible and then removed from h Council website, dates available should be required, hence the delay in
Borough Council.	w die in addition to the letter provided the 3rd of January to kibble valley
>> - Previous tree removal, although under a separate application, was suspected as a precursor to this application for the construction of a property. This was clearly done with the intention of a planning application submission being supported in what is a well established conservation area of the Ribble Valley. The preservation officer at that time saw no reason to support the removal of trees.	
designed to addres	ne application is within a protected conservation area aside the housing is not ss any local need for housing and given its size and footprint would make it one antly proportioned properties within the historic area of Chatburn.
>> - The design has and view cannot b	made no considerations for neighbouring properties whilst entitlements to light e protected the significance of the footprint of the build and height of antly change this area of the village.
>> - Should the current owner of the land and neighbouring property Require an additional property or space it is unclear why the current access which is established on to Downham Road could not be used, with a much less imposing scheme not visible from the current road. This would also mean that the un-necessary removal of protected trees would not be required,	

>> -The size and design of the proposed scheme is not in line with the neighbouring cottages and would not add value to the conservation area as it stands. The materials are not consistent with the two neighbouring properties.
>>

>> - Within the heritage statement it indicates that the size of the property is in line with its neighbouring properties. This is not the case and is much larger in footprint and layout and any of the existing properties. Also whilst the property is south maybe 16m back from the road as indicated the garage construction will be significantly nearer. The indication is that the Boundry wall will conceal much of the property and the single story garage yet the height of the wall and the height of the proposed garage did not seem to align to this statement.

>>

>> - I cannot see how the removal of established and significant trees removal and resisting wall built at the same time as Fir Tree House and the construction of a new property would in the words of the heritage statement enhance through sympathetic placement and confident design conservation area that is a traditional village setting and the 1974 act used to protect the development of such schemes.

>>

>> -It it's also unclear from the heritage statement how the loss of a tennis courts and the replacement of such with 4+ bedroom property would 'accrue some benefit' for a conservation area?

>>

>> Apologies once again for the delay in getting these comments to you and should have any questions please don't hesitate to contact me

## Many thanks



0 4 JAN 2023 1 st January 2023 ATTENTION OF | PLANNING APPLICATION 3/2022/1098 With reference to the above Pienning Application we would fitally make the Following exservations; We were informed that a letter would be received on 12/12/2022 exegarding the above expelication. Mr Kilmantin was untormed by that inome that been received at the time of the telephone call on Thursday 22nd December 2022, It was delivered by post the same day (7.m).
2/ The intermetion on line was not available until several days after 12th December 2022. Regarding the Phanning Application We would track the following observations which we feel are relevant towards making an objection to the proposed development. HERITAGE STATEMENT 12.74476 are uncluded in the Conservation Rice and consideration should therefore be given as to how the sproposed new build will affect these proporties. 4:3 It states that the house is of a size appropriate for the plot and ineighboring proporties 4.5 states that case has been taken to take unto the Visual aspect of the property white steer elevations of the christing would be lost Conspicuous within the conservation asser What therefore, about the effect that the first floor development will have on the proporties development development will have on the proporties development ut will be HIGHLY Visible and certainly (not descreet as states) 5.3 It is stated that the entrance exected through the Boundary wall would amount to loss than Substantial harm in 3.5 a stone Wall is stated to be of important historic feature get the Boundary Wall, which we consider to be an untegral post of the Conservation asea us being breaked to form the entremen

## STATEMENT

3 10 states that aspects of the application property and vicinity which confer significance on the conservation include Boundary Walls.

Che The north side is the most visible aspect the.

Che wieluded in this. If not they should be considered when the affect of the first ofloor level impacting on the Visual levels us assured.

We believe that the construction will have a "Berlin Wall" effect on the visual appearance above the existing site line of the Boundary Wall.

## VISIBILITY SPLAY - HIGHWAYS RESPONSE

which the L.C.C have approved these developments they are based on the assumption that the 20 mph speed limit will be outhough to.

This will not be the ease and the Parish Council even after the 20 mph speed limit was centroduced have asked for various lypes of epecd crestrictors but to in effect

The contrance is badly seted of the speed limit is not tofonod and an acceptation unevitable

SUMMARY As These properties Acurham Road Chathur are uncluded in the Conservation Alea we would expect that our views would be afavorwable considered as the considered as the montal to the sproperties position and would do enothing to enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation area

four Sincerety The director of Economic Co Development . Planery Cornere Offices Church World BBT 2RH