

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 07 May 2023 12:11
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2023/0180 FS-Case-513645110

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2023/0180

Address of Development: Ashgreen House 4B Wiswell Lane Whalley

Comments: Firstly, we did not receive the original neighbour notification. The first time we were aware of the development was when the applicant knocked on the door to inform us of it. We were assured that the new building height would not exceed the level of the current fence and that the minimum number of trees and hedges would be removed.

Since then the ground level has been artificially raised so that the house is directly overlooking neighbouring properties [REDACTED]

Prior to the removal of the trees and hedges we had an abundance of wildlife visiting the garden, including two families of great tits, two families of blue tits, chaffinch, wagtails, robins, nuthatch and a great spotted woodpecker, as well as squirrels and hedgehogs. None of these now visit and there is no chance we will ever see the woodpecker again. This has been an environmental disaster.

The design of the new building is not in-keeping with the style of the village or neighbouring properties and will be an eyesore.

On the basis of the points above we object to the application.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 07 May 2023 12:22
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2023/0180 FS-Case-513649041

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2023/0180

Address of Development: Ashgreen House, 4B Wiswell Lane

Comments: Firstly, we did not receive the original neighbour notification. The first time we were aware of the development was when the applicant knocked on the door to inform us of it. We were assured that the new building height would not exceed the level of the current fence and that the minimum number of trees and hedges would be removed.

Since then the ground level has been artificially raised so that the house is directly overlooking neighbouring properties [REDACTED]

Prior to the removal of the trees and hedges we had an abundance of wildlife visiting the garden, including two families of great tits, two families of blue tits, chaffinch, wagtails, robins, nuthatch and a great spotted woodpecker, as well as squirrels and hedgehogs. None of these now visit and there is no chance we will ever see the woodpecker again. This has been an environmental disaster.

The design of the new building is not in-keeping with the style of the village or neighbouring properties and will be an eyesore.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 07 May 2023 12:18
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2023/0180 FS-Case-513645247

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2023/0180

Address of Development: 4B Wiswell Lane,Whalley BB79AF

Comments: Having looked at the position where the new house is situated, on a sloping field that wasn't being used,I think the house is a welcome addition to the overall number of houses that have been built in Whalley over the last few years.

I know the owner has tried to follow the rules from the very beginning with dead trees needing to be cut down. At every stage he has tried to follow the rules, employing the right people like an architect to submit the plans etc,and a recognised builder to do the construction work.

Everything looked to be heading in the right direction until Christmas 2022, but since that time nothing seems to have progressed for the last 4 months.

I do know that he was trying to be forward thinking, by getting a ground source heat pump and having a bore hole drilled for water etc,

All things considered I think the house would be a good thing for Whalley, and I ask that my comments are considered when you are making your decisions


[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 08 May 2023 14:05
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2023/35203 FS-Case-513860738

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2023/35203

Address of Development: 4B Wiswell Lane,Whalley BB79AF

Comments: It is noticeable that most of the new estates built by the volume builders in and around Whalley in the last few years tend to stay with the same basic designs.This architect designed one storey house built on unused land will have excellent green credentials with solar panels and a ground source heat pump which the majority of new homes in Whalley definitely do not have.It does not make ant sense to stop such an environmentally friendly build for the sake of a few centimetres.



From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 08 May 2023 20:05
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2023/0180 FS-Case-513927548
Categories: xRedact & Upload


Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2023/0180

Address of Development: 4b Wiswell Lane, Whalley, BB79AF

Comments: Very much in support of this planning application. The work already been completed and roof ready to go on. It's been designed to fit the site very well and does overlook neighbouring properties. This is a beautiful new self build in the Ribble valley. Especially with all the new housing estates in around Whalley this is a refreshing change and needs to be finished in the way it was intended. I fully support this application.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 08 May 2023 17:30
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2023/0180 FS-Case-513902095
Categories: xRedact & Upload

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2023/0180

Address of Development: Ashgreen House, 4b Wiswell Lane, Whalley, BB7 9AF

Comments: There are a number of concerns about this application and the [REDACTED] procedures and previous permissions that the developers of this address have shown.

The first reason to object to this new application is a significant loss of privacy to nearby private residencies, due to the fact that the current as built building height does not correspond to the original application which was only just acceptable. If this application is approved and the current construction is allowed to remain it will be almost 1.2m (1200mm) above its original approved height, and some 2.5m above the fence line to its southern boundary, this is without the extra height yet to be added by the solar panels. This is clearly not what was intended on the original application nor what was approved, and this application does nothing to address this serious breach of the original application. Indeed if this application is approved then it will set a dangerous precedent for future developments in the Ribble Valley.

The second reason for objection to this application is the movement of the 'redline' southern boundary. It appears that the applicant is seeking this planning permission [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

The third reason for objecting to this application is that the applicant has failed again to declare that this application is within 20m of a watercourse. Again using the link above it is clear that a watercourse runs along the northern boundary of the site and then to the west of the proposed development and is at some points less than 1m (1000mm) from the proposed building. We have been made aware that the LLFA are seriously concerned with the current amendments the applicant has made to the watercourse and again without proper arrangements within this application, indeed what appears to be a failure to recognise the watercourse exists, we are concerned that this development will cause flooding to nearby properties.

It should also be noted that the tree report accompanying this application was carried out for the previous planning application and does not reflect the current conditions at the address. The recommendations of the report to protect the existing trees and hedgerows were not followed and indeed the applicants have already entirely removed G4 and G2 and a significant length of G1 as identified in the tree report.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 07 May 2023 11:30
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2023/0180 FS-Case-513640588
Categories: xRedact & Upload

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2023/0180

Address of Development: 4B Ashgreen House Wiswell Lane Whalley Clitheroe BB7 9AF

Comments: I am writing to express my concerns and objections to the changes in the proposed planning application for the development located at 4B Ashgreen House Wiswell Lane Whalley Clitheroe BB7 9AF. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] I have noticed discrepancies in the revised plan with regard to the building height and ground level measurements that were not present in the original plans.

In the initial application, the sections depicted the ground level at the same elevation as 15 deerpark. The west elevation was set to be only 3.1 meters above the ground level (AT THAT TIME!). However, the revised plans have not only increased the height to 3.5 meters, but have also ignored the fact that the build was never started at this ground level and they have created a the new ground level that has been significantly increased by dumping hard core and soil, causing significant discrepancies and negative impacts [REDACTED]

The new section drawings report the ground level to be at 66 meters above sea level (assuming the unit is meters), whereas the original west facing cross section demonstrated it to be at the same ground level as the house [REDACTED] therefore the ground level should be at about 63m. I accepted these original plans because as the build moved east (up the hill) to be compliant with the drawings the owner should have dug down to maintain that level. Therefore minimising any visual impact or overlooking [REDACTED]

The recent changes in the planning application have increased the ground level to 66 meters at the west elevation, effectively altering the original approved ground level by circa 3 meters. This adjustment, in addition to the 0.4-meter height increase, significantly impacts [REDACTED] by making the building more visually prominent and obstructive than initially proposed. Reducing light, creating an eyesore, and more importantly they have very clear [REDACTED]

With this increase in height, the patio that is planned directly and very close to [REDACTED] anyone [REDACTED]

Any planting that is planned to reduce sight line this will significantly impact [REDACTED]

I am also aware there is yet more height to be added to the building roof with the addition of solar panels. Do to the huge height increase this is also another negative impact [REDACTED], resulting in further [REDACTED] increased eyesore

I kindly request that these discrepancies be thoroughly investigated and resolved to ensure that the development is

in line with the original ground level measurements and height restrictions. [REDACTED] have a right to maintain [REDACTED] privacy, and we believe that these changes unfairly encroach on [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] there has been a complete disregard and respect for the original plans that were approved. All these changes that are in this submission have [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 07 May 2023 11:12
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2023/0180 FS-Case-513636615

Categories: xRedact & Upload

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2023/0180

Address of Development: 4b Wiswell Lane, Whalley, BB79AF

Comments: Refreshing to see a unique self build that's been cleverly designed to stay in keeping with the area. It's clear a lot of time, thought and resources have already gone into this. I find it difficult to understand how the minimal changes could have any detrimental impact to the area. Completely support this application!!

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 06 May 2023 17:25
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2021/0991 FS-Case-513529121
Categories: xRedact & Upload

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2021/0991

Address of Development: Ashgreen House 4B Wiswell Lane Whalley BB7 9AF

Comments: We did not receive the original neighbour notification of this development and the first time we were aware of it was when the applicant knocked on our door to inform us of the tree felling and building work. We were assured that the roofline would only be as high as the current fence and that the minimum number of trees and bushes would be removed.

The height of the house now clearly exceeds the height of the fence due to the applicant having artificially raised the ground level, which is not referred to in the new application. It now clearly [REDACTED] All bushes and trees have been removed.

In previous years [REDACTED] was visited by at least two families of great tits, two families of blue tits, coal tits, chaffinch, robins, wagtails and numerous other birds and wildlife (squirrels and hedgehogs) including an occasional visit by a great spotted woodpecker. The only birds that now visit [REDACTED] are pigeons, magpies and crows. There are no longer squirrels and hedgehogs and there is no chance of the woodpecker ever returning.

This has been an environmental disaster!

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 06 May 2023 17:05
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2023/0180 FS-Case-513526782

Categories: xRedact & Upload

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2023/0180

Address of Development: Ashgreen House 4B Wiswell Lane Whalley BB7 9AF

Comments: We strongly object to the 'single storey dwelling' in its current form. This planning application does not address any of the main concerns previously raised by the Council. Unfortunately, what has been built is not according to previously agreed plans.

The original planning application ref:3/2021/0991 showed the building to be a height of 3.1 metres from the ground level of [REDACTED] (assuming at its highest point), see sight line on document 21 0091 'proposed section'. Therefore, although it is [REDACTED] no objections were originally put forward as [REDACTED] of the building above [REDACTED] fence (approx. four blocks). Also see document 21 0991 – proposed elevations.

The original site at the point of the agreed application sloped downwards considerably from east to west. Rather than excavate the site for the bungalow and remove enough earth from west to east to ensure the finished height was 3.1 metres along the entire length of the building (as indicated on the plan) the west elevation ground floor has instead been raised significantly on a concrete block platform.

This has resulted in the building being far too high at one end (approx. 2.475m above our back fence line). The ground floor level at one end (the west/kitchen end) almost is the height of the top of [REDACTED]. At the west side the overall height of the 'bungalow' is the same as [REDACTED]. This is demonstrated on drawing '230180 site sections' as being near the eaves [REDACTED] not shown on the revised sections). As it stands this is not the one storey height bungalow, we were expecting from the original plans it is roughly 5.1m [REDACTED].

Since the building work has commenced [REDACTED] the original ground levels and platform have been made by adding several tipper loads of earth around the west side of the building and the platform. This is clear and original ground levels (pre measurements supplied on the recent topography report) can be evidenced by the height of the soil level to our fence and the garage. Photographs, videos and measurements taken before, during and after the build started also clearly show this (supplied).

The west elevation contains a kitchen window (previously patio doors) leading onto an outdoor patio area. [REDACTED] Due to the now raised aspect of the building and added earth it is possible to walk around the platform/patio and proposed landscaped areas [REDACTED]. To give some perspective, rather than not being able to see anyone above the fence [REDACTED]. If the height of the patio area was to remain [REDACTED] This is at a distance of approx. 11metres [REDACTED]. 1.3 metres [REDACTED].

The glass in the kitchen window is not [REDACTED] however it will [REDACTED] at an angle from inside the kitchen of the bungalow due to its height [REDACTED].

Whilst building work has been underway, [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] Our
homes should be our sanctuaries and every homeowner has a right to privacy, reasonable amenity and enjoyment
of their home. The gross disregard to these rights and the privacy of [REDACTED] has been astonishing to say the least.
[REDACTED] whilst people have been on the site and the feeling of
[REDACTED]

This proposal also raises serious concerns for us [REDACTED] and others due to
the sheer size and scale, imposing and overbearing nature of the build at its current height and [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

There have been several trees removed which provided protection and privacy to [REDACTED] Whilst plans to
replace these have been made, they do not disguise that the building has been built far too high and contrary to
what has been submitted on original plans agreed by the council, therefore we cannot support the application at
this present time.

Comments on Planning Application 3/2023/0180 4b Ashgreen House, Wiswell Lane, Whalley.

[REDACTED]

We strongly object to the 'single storey dwelling' in its current form. This planning application does not address any of the main concerns previously raised by the Council. Unfortunately, what has been built is not according to previously agreed plans.

The original planning application ref:3/2021/0991 showed the building to be a height of 3.1 metres from the ground level of [REDACTED] (assuming at its highest point), see sight line on document 21 0091 'proposed section'. Therefore, although it is [REDACTED] no objections were originally put forward as [REDACTED] a small proportion of the building [REDACTED] Also see document 21 0991 – proposed elevations.

The original site at the point of the agreed application sloped downwards considerably from east to west. Rather than excavate the site for the bungalow and remove enough earth from west to east to ensure the finished height was 3.1 metres along the entire length of the building (as indicated on the plan) the west elevation ground floor has instead been raised significantly on a concrete block platform.

This has resulted in the building being far too high at one end (approx. 2.475m [REDACTED]) The ground floor level at one end (the west/kitchen end) almost is the height [REDACTED] At the west side the overall height of the 'bungalow' is the [REDACTED] This is demonstrated on drawing '230180 site sections' as being near [REDACTED] (not shown on the revised sections). As it stands this is not the one storey height bungalow, we were expecting from the original plans it is roughly 5.1m [REDACTED]

Since the building work has commenced [REDACTED] the original ground levels and platform have been made by adding several tipper loads of earth around the west side of the building and the platform. This is clear and original ground levels (pre measurements supplied on the recent topography report) can be evidenced by the height of the soil level [REDACTED] Photographs, videos and measurements taken before, during and after the build started also clearly show this (supplied).

The west elevation contains a kitchen window (previously patio doors) leading onto an outdoor patio area [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Due to the now raised aspect of the building and added earth it is possible to walk around the platform/patio *and* proposed landscaped areas and [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] To give some perspective, rather than [REDACTED] If the height of the patio area was to remain, [REDACTED] This is at a distance of approx. 11metres [REDACTED] 1.3 metres from [REDACTED]

The glass in the kitchen window is not facing [REDACTED] it is at 90 degrees, however it will still be possible to [REDACTED] at an angle from inside the kitchen of the bungalow due to its height above [REDACTED] ground level.

Whilst building work has been underway, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Our homes should be our sanctuaries and every homeowner has a right to privacy, reasonable amenity and enjoyment of their home. The gross disregard to these rights and

This proposal also raises serious concerns for [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] due to the sheer size and scale, imposing and overbearing nature of the build at its current height and proximity to [REDACTED]

There have been several trees removed which provided protection and privacy to [REDACTED] properties. Whilst plans to replace these have been made, they do not disguise that the building has been built far too high and contrary to what has been submitted on original plans agreed by the council, therefore we cannot support the application at this present time.

RE: PLANNING APPLICATION REF 3/2023/0180 - Erection of single storey dwelling with solar panels on the roof and air source heat system together with landscaped (patio) areas (amendments to planning permission 3/2021/0991)

OBJECTION

1. This document seeks to set out the grounds for objection and detail behind these points for the above referenced development.

Background

2. It is assumed that the applicant purchased the site with planning consent (Ref 3/2020/0006) from the previous land owner and applied for amendments under application 3/2021/0991. The applicant proceeded to commence construction and has been the subject of visits from planning enforcement due to the height of the current blockwork in relation to the fence line of neighbouring properties to Deer Park Crescent for some time. The current application seeks to formalise the current state of construction of the property which is considered to be in breach of the current permission (3/2021/0991) in relation to it's overall height and impact on neighbouring properties.

Grounds for Objection

3. The grounds for objection are as follows:-
 - a. The '*proposed height*' of the property is materially different from the initial approved consent and would have considerable impact on the neighbouring properties of Deer Park Crescent;
 - b. There appears to be a disconnect between the LLFA and the '*watercourse*' that runs through the site;

Proposed Height

4. The initial application for the property was by [REDACTED] under ref 3/2020/0006.
5. The application included plans for the proposed new dwelling which can be seen under appendix 4. The elevations propose a structure of 3.10m in height and viewing the West Elevation, show a reference to the fence line that is purported to be the boundary fence to the Neighbouring Deer Park Crescent properties. The fence scales off the plan at 1.80m in height which represents a standard timber boundary fence. This would assume a height above the fence of (3.10m less 1.8m) 1.30m. Given the plans don't reference any particular property, and in the absence of any section plan, it could be assumed that this would represent the worst-case position for any neighbouring property.

6. Application 3/2021/0991 'Revisions to initial approved plans was submitted by [REDACTED] which also included a proposed set of elevations. The elevations propose a finished height of structure to be 3.15m notwithstanding the additional height of a solar array.
7. Application 3/2021/0991 also included a section plan (Appendix 9). Cross referencing the section with the floor plan it is assumed that this section runs through the Living and Bedroom 2 which would suggest a comparison with the rear garden of number [REDACTED]. The section suggests a height of 3.15m of the building and again adds a boundary fence for reference – again scaling at 1.80m in height – suggesting an impact of 1.35m above the fence line.
8. Works have commenced on site and the blockwork appears to be somewhat completed (May 2023), although works have halted since Ribble Valley Planning enforcement's involvement. The block work is now 'towering' above the neighbouring fence line and almost the door threshold is visible on the West Elevation – according to the approved plans this should not have been the case and merely the eaves of the structure should have been visible.
9. Application 3/2023/0180 has been submitted by [REDACTED] in an attempt to formalise the breaches in planning permission under the guise of further proposed changes. It must also be noted that a previous attempt was also brought before Ribble Valley Planning Department under application 3/2022/0992 and was subsequently refused.
10. A section plan has been submitted alongside application 3/2023/0180 which is attached (appendix 8).
11. It must be appreciated that the site falls approximately 1.86m from the East Elevation to the West Elevation. This can be picked up from the TOPO plan attached to the application (Appendix 6). It must also be noted that considerable earth works were undertaken by [REDACTED]. It can be seen via the lie of the current land up against the boundary fence from the neighbouring properties of Deer Park Crescent which in fact arrived in c2014-2015 and thus were installed to a height of approx. 1.8m above the. Then, current ground level. Therefore, any earth that is piled up against this boundary fence line is in fact a recent addition.
12. Given that the land falls away from East to West (referring to the site plan) it would have been helpful to see a section on the West Elevation which would confirm the true impact of the proposed dwelling. In absence of this, it is quite easy to calculate given the applicants TOPO has picked up the existing fence line level on or around the Western elevation and this reads as 66.85. Taking the proposed finish height of the dwelling to be 69.48 this gives an impact of some 2.63m. For reference a standard boundary fence is approximately 1.80m in height and a standard residential doorway 2.10m. This is completely unacceptable and wildly different (double in fact!) from the initial approved application which stated the finished height of the building would sit some 1.30m above the fence line.
13. Furthermore, it can be seen from section B-B that the Finished Floor Level of the building is some 1m higher than the external ground level. Comparing that with the neighbouring Deer Park Crescent property, who's FFL is assumed to be 64.50m that is a difference of 1.88m (66.38 less 64.50). [REDACTED]
14. Considering all of the above, I believe Ribble Valley Planning should refuse the application on these grounds and insist that any future building on the site should have it's finished floor level conditioned in order to comply with the initial plans approved in order to mitigate any impact on neighbouring properties.

Watercourse

15. It is deeply concerning that the LLFA has no comments on the application presented. In my opinion the applicant has supplied [REDACTED] information under the 'Assessment of Flood Risk' section of it's application form (Appendix 7). When asked if there is a watercourse within 20m of the development, the applicant has ticked 'No'. What is odd is that when asked in the same section how the surface water is to be disposed of this have applied a cross next to 'Existing Water Course'.
16. I feel that LLFA have merely been mislead here given the applicants false information and find this difficult to comprehend given the application form requests a signature and a declaration of truth.
17. The comments and action taken above have been mirrored in all previous applications on the site, yet, under application 3/2020/0006 [REDACTED] included a site plan that clearly shows the watercourse (Appendix 3). Further applications have removed the marking of the watercourse but a quick look at Lancashire County Council's Mario Mapping software indeed shows the watercourse to be present (Appendix 10).
18. It is also very difficult to understand why the neighbouring development of 8 houses at Oakhill sought detailed consultation from the LLFA which resulted the developments' entire surface water disposal directed into the same watercourse. [REDACTED] don't believe this exists, what then happens to the discharge of surface water from the Oakhill development? Furthermore, there doesn't appear to be any direction or build over requirements applied to this very application and the LLFA appear to deny the mere existence of the watercourse.
19. The design and access statement of this application refers to this very watercourse and points out that Redrow ensured it was 'live' back in 2015 following the flooding of the land. Can we request that full clarification as to the status of this watercourse is investigated and thorough consideration given to how this interacts with the proposed dwelling and interaction with the Oakhill Development? Given the proposed recourse to alleviate the issue of overall height would be to set the finished floor level significantly lower, this would surely result in a clash if not an under-build against the watercourse let alone proximity issues?

Summary

20. In summary the application should be refused on grounds of significant increased impact on neighbouring properties of Deer Park Crescent and severe departure from the previously approved plans.
21. Further investigation should be sought on the watercourse to the rear of Deer Park Crescent through the applicants' land given the contradiction of advice from the LLFA between this application and the Oakhill development, in order to avoid flooding of the properties to Deer Park Crescent.

Also included in email:

Appendix 1 - 20_0006_location_plan
Appendix 2 - 20_0006_site_plans
Appendix 3 - 20_0006_location_plan
Appendix 3a - 20_0006_app_form
Appendix 4 - 20_0006_proposed_new_dwelling
Appendix 5 - 21_0991_App_Form_Redact
Appendix 6 - 23_0180_Topographical_Survey
Appendix 7 - 23_0180_App_Form_Redact
Appendix 8 - 23_0180_Existing_and_Proposed_Site_Sections
Appendix 9 - 21_0991_Prop_Section