

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 13 June 2023 23:11
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2023/0138 FS-Case-523743511

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2023/0138

Address of Development: Twin Brook Farm
Upbrooks
Clitheroe
BB7 1PL

Comments: Our objections to the original application(3/2019/1103) for the demolition of Twin Brook farm and the building of two detached houses still hold true.

Our original contention that the site plans were inaccurate have proved to be correct. We have measured out the dimensions of building 2 from the original application and the building will not fit on the site and allow a drive way to the new development.

The application is only for a change from one detached house to a pair of semi detached houses, and ignores the fact that there is a material change to the size of the gardens and parking arrangements of Building 2 from the original application.

The car parking for the far semi detached house appears to be on land that was earmarked as a vegetation buffer as part of the approval for Twin Brook Industrial estate (See application 3/2016/1089 proposed site plan and also 3/2016/0401 tree scheme) In fact some of this land has already been changed from green buffer to a wood storage yard .

The submitted plans [REDACTED] and has not been corrected [REDACTED] this has the effect of minimising our loss of privacy.

The scale of the new building is inappropriate to the location . It is over 2 meters higher than our building and due to its extra length will block out even more light.

I think my original objections about scale , loss of privacy and light were not taken into account, for instance no drawing was ever made of the size and proximity of the buildings in relation to [REDACTED] , or the fact that the proposed site plan went [REDACTED]

It is also unclear from the plans what will happen to the public footpath that runs between the site and Mearley Brook, as with the original application , the site plans are unclear in this area.

I would like to meet the planning officer to discuss this further , as my objections to 3/2019/1103 were dismissed as [REDACTED] and have now been proved to be correct .