

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 08 January 2023 23:28
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2022/1127 FS-Case-476967141

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2022/1127

Address of Development: Overdale, York Lane, Langho BB6 8DT

Comments: Regarding correspondence dated 19 December 2022

Planning App. No.: 3/2022/1127

Grid Ref: 370978 433702

Proposal: Variation of Condition 2 (Plans) of previous application 3/2021/0567

Location: Overdale York Lane Langho BB6 8DT

[REDACTED] location of the proposal and have reviewed the information online. I strongly object to the proposed plans and find the information provided lacks transparency and is potentially misleading in relation to previously approved plans and neighbouring property.

- Whilst the proposed property is a lower height compared to the previously approved plans, the proposed property location on the site is significantly further forward compared to what has been approved. This will have a significant impact [REDACTED] hence my strong objection. The previously approved plans were very considerate to minimise loss of light (and loss of views) whereas these plans are not.
- Comparing the height of the proposed property to neighbouring Windy Ridge is irrelevant and misleading – Windy Ridge is not directly opposite a residential property and is of a significantly smaller footprint.
- Comparing the height of the proposed property to neighbouring Petre View is misleading. The footprint of Windy Ridge at that height is relatively small
- I do have a concern that the rebuild could be disruptive from a noise perspective and would ask that this is considered as part of the rebuild plans. It would be helpful if the neighbouring properties could be appraised of the high-level timeline of activities so that [REDACTED] are prepared for any disruption.
- Parking on York Lane opposite the proposed rebuild tend to be taken by residents of the terraced cottages. I request that any vehicles associated with the rebuild park on the site / any skips are located on the site rather than cause congestion on York Lane or cause inconvenience to the residents.
- Also note that whilst there are some 1.5 and 2-storey properties adjacent to the proposed rebuild, all properties that are directly opposite to the row of terraced cottages are one-storey.

To summarise, I strongly oppose the plans due to the impact of significant [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] Whilst previous planning was approved, the revised plans are much further forward (nearer to York Lane) compared to what was approved.

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 08 January 2023 23:32
To: Planning
Subject: FAO Kathryn Hughes. Overdale Proposed Rebuild 3/2022/1127
Attachments: Overdale Proposed Rebuild_080123.docx

⚠ 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.

Regarding correspondence dated 19 December 2022

Planning App. No.: 3/2022/1127
Grid Ref: 370978 433702
Proposal: Variation of Condition 2 (Plans) of previous application
3/2021/0567
Location: Overdale York Lane Langho BB6 8DT

[REDACTED] location of the proposal and have reviewed the information online. I **strongly object** to the proposed plans and find the information provided lacks transparency and is potentially misleading in relation to previously approved plans and neighbouring property.

- Whilst the proposed property is a lower height compared to the previously approved plans, the proposed property location on the site is significantly further forward compared to what has been approved. This will have a significant impact [REDACTED] hence my strong objection. The previously approved plans were very considerate to minimise loss of light (and loss of views) whereas these plans are not.
- Comparing the height of the proposed property to neighbouring Windy Ridge is irrelevant and misleading – Windy Ridge is not directly opposite a residential property and is of a significantly smaller footprint.
- Comparing the height of the proposed property to neighbouring Petre View is misleading. The footprint of Windy Ridge at that height is relatively small
- I do have a concern that the rebuild could be disruptive from a noise perspective and would ask that this is considered as part of the rebuild plans. It would be helpful if the neighbouring properties could be appraised of the high-level timeline of activities so that [REDACTED] are prepared for any disruption.

- Parking on York Lane opposite the proposed rebuild tend to be taken by residents of the terraced cottages. I request that any vehicles associated with the rebuild park on the site / any skips are located on the site rather than cause congestion on York Lane or cause inconvenience to the residents.
- Also note that whilst there are some 1.5 and 2-storey properties adjacent to the proposed rebuild, all properties that are directly opposite to the row of terraced cottages are one-storey.

To summarise, I strongly oppose the plans due to the [REDACTED] to my [REDACTED] Whilst previous planning was approved, the revised plans are much further forward (nearer to York Lane) compared to what was approved.

Council Offices
Church Walk
Clitheroe
Lancashire BB7 2RA

8th January 2023

Dear Sir / Madam

Regarding correspondence dated 19 December 2022

Planning App. No.: 3/2022/1127
Grid Ref: 370978 433702
Proposal: Variation of Condition 2 (Plans) of previous application 3/2021/0567
Location: Overdale York Lane Langho BB6 8DT

[REDACTED] location of the proposal and have reviewed the information online. I **strongly object** to the proposed plans and find the information provided lacks transparency and is potentially misleading in relation to previously approved plans and neighbouring property.

- Whilst the proposed property is a lower height compared to the previously approved plans, the proposed property location on the site is significantly further forward compared to what has been approved. This will have a significant [REDACTED] hence my strong objection. The previously approved plans were very considerate to minimise loss of light (and loss of views) whereas these plans are not.
- Comparing the height of the proposed property to neighbouring Windy Ridge is irrelevant and misleading – Windy Ridge is not directly opposite a residential property and is of a significantly smaller footprint.
- Comparing the height of the proposed property to neighbouring Petre View is misleading. The footprint of Windy Ridge at that height is relatively small
- I do have a concern that the rebuild could be disruptive from a noise perspective and would ask that this is considered as part of the rebuild plans. It would be helpful if the neighbouring properties could be appraised of the high-level timeline of activities so that [REDACTED] are prepared for any disruption.
- Parking on York Lane opposite the proposed rebuild tend to be taken by residents of the terraced cottages. I request that any vehicles associated with the rebuild park on the site / any skips are located on the site rather than cause congestion on York Lane or cause inconvenience to the residents.
- Also note that whilst there are some 1.5 and 2-storey properties adjacent to the proposed rebuild, all properties that are directly opposite to the row of terraced cottages are one-storey.

To summarise, I strongly oppose the plans due to the impact [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Whilst previous planning was approved, the revised plans are much further forward (nearer to York Lane) compared to what was approved.

Kind regards
[REDACTED]