3 letters from same address

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: 15 August 2023 22:40
To: Planning
Subject: objection to Planning Application No. 3/2023/0540

15/08/2023

Ribble Valley Borough Council
Council Offices
Church Walk
Clitheroe
2YD

[redacted]

F.A.O. Mr Will Hopcroft

Dear Mr. Hopcroft.

I am writing following receipt of a letter to residents of Chapel Brow concerning Planning Application No. 3/2023/0540 from Nicola Hopkins. I wish to state my objections to the plans. I have been in discussion with neighbours and with your offices over many years now it is disappointing that yet again we must highlight our concern over numerous issues which appear to be in conflict with the original design principles and planning approval: 3/2011/1071.

RVBC and United Utilities went to a great deal of work to establish a development scheme that would satisfy the need for housing and provide an area of land on the eastern side of the site that was understood to be a public open space with landscaping, public access routes and a pond with dipping platform, all of which is located in the St Lawrence Conservation area established by RVBC several years ago.
The current application wishes to remove the pond and describes it as 'originally to attenuate water drainage and it is no longer necessary.'
They cite concern by the purchaser of the new property that Health and Safety issues are the driver and removal is required.

Upon closer examination of drawing CN-00-001 Rev J shows the removal of footpaths and access routes to, and through, the area and furthermore they intend to install a new fence, without breaks, which will effectively render the area closed-off from public access. The original scheme shows an access/egress pathway connecting to the bridle path adjacent the houses lower down Chapel Brow.
The fence line is clearly shown on the drawing extending from the new wall, yet to be built, adjacent the road at Chapel Hill down almost to the southern boundary adjacent the reservoir wall. This is already marked as a 'swale' on the approved landscape plan and is not now, and won't be on completion, an easy

access route for foot traffic and mums pushing prams. Afterwards, it is also very easy and quick to install a further obstacle to ensure access is impossible. Why then is the pond an issue?

Reference to Drawing No.CN-00-001 Rev G shows the earlier incarnation of the drawing with paths and access as defined in early planning approvals although the pond is omitted. Both drawings are in the same application package and it is very easy to miss the significance of the differences. It is puzzling that the marketing effort by Agents acting for the owner have emphasised the pond and the adjacent reservoir as an important feature to be valued by the new residents and the wider community. How odd for such a reversal of attitude. This totally contradictory affair causes me to wonder what may be behind this planning application to seek RVBC approval for these changes.

Let me explore the thoughts that are occurring to me. It appears to be a clear case of overstating one element to blind the reader of unspoken and possible unnoticed changes elsewhere on the drawing and by inference, in the Planning Application. The use of the phrase 'Green Space' as if it were an accurate description of 'public open space' which is used more correctly in all the P. Application 1071 documentation which I shall explore in the final part of this letter.

The new fence line and omission of public access route suggest that the Applicant is seeking to separate this easterly part of the Development Site and retain title for other as yet undeclared reasons. One might argue that the new fence does not actually reach the reservoir wall thus allowing pedestrian passage. I ask myself the question that if this is public open space then I sympathise with blind, elderly, infirm and mums and toddlers having to negotiate this previously described 'public open space.'

Let us not lose track that the Planning Approval No.3/2011/1071 was granted for the development and building works and associated groundworks for the site as a whole and the easterly side of the site was described as public open space in numerous document. I shall cite references as a final section in this letter. This open space was also described as public open space for the community as a whole, and not exclusively for the benefit of the owners of the new houses.

Now let me explore the not inconsequential matter of unlawful dumping of spoil and digging debris on the land behind Chapel Brow leading down to the reservoir.

Inspection of the new drawing Rev. J named above says:- *'Green space* to be returned to existing site levels as indicated.' There is an arrow pointing to a named level that happens to be at the original level provided by Survey Operations to United Utilities. The other levels on this drawing version J, shows figures which I take to be extracted from that original survey. At the lower levels near the south boundary wall at the reservoir it shows levels of 100 plus/minus decimal points. This indicates a gradual slope from top to bottom of about 3M.

There is no mention of this removal elsewhere in the application by way of verbal or written confirmation that what they infer in their one line arrowed statement means that removal of all unlawfully dumped spoil will be removed from site. Therefore by pointing to one level that has not been unlawfully altered one could deduce that some mischief is at play. I am aware that RVBC are in contact with other residents of Chapel Brow who have become involved with more detailed affairs than I express here although my reasoning cannot be faulted.

Let us not forget that this is RVBC and Longridge Town's Conservation Area and therefore they jointly should be protective of it and accept these thoughts as a cautionary flag.

I therefore strongly object to this application and seek refusal in it's entirety and that the site as a whole is completed as described and approved in Planning Approval 3/2011/1071.

I am keen to see the outcome of this planning application, with of course relevant explanation of decisions that address the above

yours

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: 15 August 2023 23:03
To: Planning
Subject: Fwd: Against planning application 3/2023/0540

Sent from my iPad

Ribble Valley Borough Council,
Planning Application objection Letter
Clitheroe

Dear Sir,
As per the letter from Nicola Hopkins dated 26 July, planning application No.3/2023/0540

Please accept this objection to the plans referred to in the above letter.

Planning Consent 3/2011/1071 was granted many years ago with conditions for good reason and it seems these conditions are now being ignored.

The main point seems to be the removal of the pond and paths surrounding it, which is suggested as only a small change.....how then can this be seen as a 'public space' for continued enjoyment by the community and encourage the wildlife to return. This is a conservation area and something the original plans made a big deal of to get planning in the first place.

This new application makes no reference to the levels of the field being returned to what they were originally either and I understood this was a previous condition which seems not to be being upheld by those granting permissions. What is the point of seeking the views of neighbours, saying you are seeking to serve the community and going through the process of granting approvals with conditions if these are not to be upheld?!

I suggest rather than grant yet more changes you seek assurances that the original Planning Application No. 3/2011/1071 is upheld in its entirety.

I look forward to hearing what is to happen next.

Yours faithfully,

[redacted]

[redacted]

Nicola Gunn

From: [redacted]
Sent: 15 August 2023 22:24
To: Planning
Subject: objection to planning no 3/2023/0540

15/08/2023

Ribble Valley Borough Council
Church Walk
Clitheroe

[redacted]

For the attention of Mr. Will Hopcroft/planning@ribblevalley.gov.uk

Ref: Planning Application No. 3/2023/0540

I write to lodge my opposition to the planning Application named above.

Planning Approval was granted in 2011 for this development and whilst variations have been allowed over the years this current application seeks to change a very significant part of the scheme.
Planning Approval No. 3/2011/1071 was granted for the scheme as a whole. I believe agreeing to these changes undermines the original intent of the approved planning by the Planning Authority of protecting certain environmental and social aspects for the community that the Planning Authority, surely in part at least, is here to protect.

1.
2.
3. The public open space at the eastern side of the site is at risk of being swept away
4. although it is part of the St Lawrence Conservation Area and constitutes public open space for the community as a whole. I have read the supporting documentation that comprise the 1071 application which was granted and great play was made to influence RVBC
5. by what appeared to be a clever and thought full way of building in spite of much local objection. United Utilities provided numerous Landscape strategy reports, Habitat and Species management plan, Ecology reports and detailed drawings illustrating the
6. overall master plan and how the proposed landscape and planting scheme would enhance and preserve this part of the St Lawrence Conservation Area. All of these factors were approved by RVBC.
7.
8.
9.
10. There is a statement in the application letter which suggests creating a pond is no longer
11. necessary as a good thing. This also implies there will be no need for a footpath and instead raise a fence and as such suggests this is not intended as a public area as at the core of the original planning your authority approved.

12.
13.
14.
15. I see no reference to replacing the site to the original levels - you will be aware of
16. the unlawful dumping of building spoil that has resulted in a current eyesore as opposed to a natural field in a conservation area This has raised the land surface and removed the gentle slope that features in The Conservation Statement. Approx. 2 M difference
17. is easily observed which does not seem to be accounted for in their application.
18.

Given the above and my general feeling that to grant this will just lead to more applications I strongly object to the approval of this application and the developer be informed that he must finish the TOTAL scheme as approved in 3/2011/1071.

best regards

[redacted]

[redacted]