

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 09 March 2024 17:50
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2024/0149 FS-Case-594049649

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Lancashire

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2024/0149

Address of Development: 4 Shaw Terrace, Main Street

Comments: I would strongly advise that planning permission is denied for this request. The area is an AONB, meaning it is visually beautiful and this would bring the area down with tarmac being used and vehicles being parked on the edge of the preservation area, disrupting the wildlife in the area. It is not in keeping with the area.

I would like to point out the health and safety risks of removing the pavement. Pedestrians will have to cross the drive way to get to and from the bus stop. Vehicles, including farm vehicles, constantly speed up the street. There is also ample parking available on the road near Shaw Terrace, as a single occupant of the house why is such a large driveway required?

The application stating vehicles regularly pass slowly is totally false, as you can see from the parish council minutes, vehicle speeds are a major concern for the villagers. It is outside of the parameters set by the LCC and I'd suggest their acceptance is reviewed. Manoeuvring on and off the drive will impact on the vehicles using Main Street, it is reasonably foreseeable that incidents will occur.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 11 March 2024 13:16
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2024/0149 FS-Case-594418621

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Lancashire

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2024/0149

Address of Development: 4 Shaw Terrace

Comments: I would highly recommend the application be refused on the below grounds:

An application made in 2013 (3/2013/0378) was refused due to harming the character of the village and setting of listed buildings. This will irreparably change the character of the conservation area of Grindleton, that the property lies within. Therefore the same logic should apply again and application must be refused.

The owners of the property must have been well aware that parking is on-street when they purchased the property. Removal of existing stone wall will change the aesthetics of the pretty village, not have low visual impact as stated in the application, this is one of many false statements within the application.

Relocation of street lighting may cause dark areas on the footpath and is a major health and safety concern as the village houses many elderly residents and is right next to a bus stop. This will regularly disrupt the bus services on an already busy main road.

Vehicles reversing to and from the drive will cause a hazard to other road users, which includes farm vehicles and HGV's, and an incident is reasonable foreseeable. The splay is shorter than required and the speed limit is 30mph, which from parish council complaints is regularly exceeded. The statement "traffic is likely to be travelling slowly" is based on what ground? This statement should not be considered as it is not factual.

Finally the flora and fauna in the gardens off Shaw Terrace is a hive of activity for birds and insects and to replace some of this with tarmac and then vehicle emissions of vehicles using the drive would ruin this.

Please consider my views and refuse the application.

Thank you

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 16 March 2024 10:08
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2024/0149 FS-Case-596433967

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Lancashire

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2024/0149

Address of Development: 4, Shaw Terrace, Grindleton. BB7 4RA

Comments: This development will have a huge negative impact on the village, the lovely and supposed to be preserved traditional village of Grindleton. We have seen so much change in the [REDACTED] [REDACTED] There are already so many properties taking up the road side space and we understood this was to end. The "Greendale" request was refused just a few years ago and you have that planning permission and all the reasons that applied to that being refused, apply to this development. I am sure the [REDACTED] will say that this is on the opposite side of the road, but that makes it more important to be refused. This is actually directly opposite the bus shelter and is also an added health and safety risk too. Traffic in Grindleton is a huge problem already with speeding cars and this development is a serious safety issue.

It is also important to note that the more tarmac areas we create in such villages the greater the negative impact on the environment. There is a quite fragile animal and eco system around the area and we have already negatively impacted on that. We all need to commit to caring for the animals, and birds, hedgehogs, badgers, deer, frogs and toads, to name just a few, all use this route through from the Millenium wood. Taking more green space, which is also meant to be preserved, and we rely on our village council and Borough Council to protect our green spaces, will have a negative impact. We have a duty and a responsibility to preserve this for the next generations. If you look at any of the old photographs for this area, and The Grindleton Historic Society has captured so many of these, you can see how much change there has been already and this has to stop. We do not own this village, and we have a responsibility to uphold it, as traditionally as possible.

We also have bee hives in the village and these bees use all of the surrounding green spaces, and flowers, to exist. As a human race we rely on the bees.

Once we tarmac any area we are changing that area forever.

Please consider this request in the light of this information here. I have tried to keep this as simple as possible to demonstrate that simplicity is the key here. Grindleton is a simple working village, and we all strive to keep it as tidy as possible for Best Village competitions etc. This weekend is the litter pick up. Developments like this just flout all of that hard work.