From: Sent: To: Subject:	Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk> 15 April 2024 22:27 Planning Planning Application Comments - 3/2024/0196 FS-Case-606097288</contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Lancashire	
Planning Application Refer	ence No.: 3/2024/0196
Address of Development:	and off Hawthorne Farm Hawthorne Place Clitheroe BB7 2HU
Comments: *** Please note	e this has been sent via email***
For the attention of the plan	ning department
With reference to the above this application (which is su	planning application Ref (3/2024/0196) I write to offer my objection to pported by
the size of the original file I v the impact on my property , home from within my proper	emonstrate the impact of the build on my property, unfortunately due to vas unable to send this in true resolution therefore it does not truly reflect once again I invite RVBC planning to view the true impact on my family rty and also pricate garden area, alternatively I can come to the council ginal video in person (although still not reality)
March 2024, I was excluded why this was the case I was checked the plans), regardle Persimmon not only does the increased height and position impact on the privacy I am experience.	entitled to within my home. Upon attending the meeting, I was left with nan answers, something which I am sure has been reiterated by
and (Planning additional questions to their part if this application:  There is no possibility of the	(Technical Director) and Director), during the visit I was advised the below, I have added responses which I urge the council to review, investigate and answer as theight of the houses being amended on advised the heights were due to drainage - That the system would not

1

work with out these heights

Is this the case? Why was not this considered during approval of the initial application

When asked why can the properties can not be changed (i.e. the direction in which they face) to allow more privacy to my property but maintaining the drainage height requirement Persimmon advised the council had approved the property positions and heights on the initial application Is this the case?

The boundary treatments were approved previously but now amended due to the new drainage proposal

Is this the case?

The lack of privacy to my property is legal and that the council approved the layout and, height and positioning of the new plots

With regards to the rejection of 3/2022/1116 I asked as to why the rejection not only referenced to condition 9 (drainage) but also raised concerns over privacy (condition 17) Persimmon advised that they did not know why and RVBC planning was not responding as to why

Is this legally correct?

Is the height approved or not?

something raised at the initial meeting in which we were told they were not yet today this was disputed?

Why supposedly are RVBC not replying?

4. They accepted that the privacy to my p	property was very much deterr	mined by the height of fence		
height of my	due to the angle of the prop	perty		
Shockingly they asked me to speak	as to whether they would	be comfortable with their		
fence being higher. Not only is this unac	ceptable as why should	have to commit to		
something they are potentially uncomfortable with for my properties privacy but also should they				
come to sell then I am left with no guara	ntees that the new owner wan	ts to change to the fence		
height, remove any trees etc.				
1. 11.				

Is this acceptable?

5. Finally with regards to why soil was redistributed around the site rather than taken off (which does appear to be a contributing factor to the overall height of the site)

Sustainabilty was cited as the reason as to why - i.e. cost to remove

Has this contributed to the site being higher than actually it should be to original plans?

I appreciate that a view is not a legal requirement and that is not my objection or something I am requesting but a right to privacy most certainly is.

As you can appreciate the impact that this is having on our family life due to stress and concern is not acceptable by any means and all we really seek is the true rights that should be afforded to us as existing properties.

Due to the size of this email I have no alternative but to send a further email which contains other information but I would be grateful if you could please confirm receipt of this email.



From:

**Sent:** 15 April 2024 22:23

To: Planning

**Cc:** Nicola Hopkins; Steve Maggs

**Subject:** Re: OBJECTION :Planning Application 3/2024/0196 Approval of details reserved by

Conditions 9 (surface water sustainable drainage scheme) and 17 (boundary

treatment) of planning permission 3/2019/1104.

**Attachments:** 5735e823-4bf9-4458-b29d-92406256014c.MP4



## **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.

## For the attention of the planning department

With reference to the above planning application Ref (3/2024/0196) I write to offer my **objection** to this application (which is supported by

I attach a video to try and demonstrate the impact of the build on my property, unfortunately due to the size of the original file I was unable to send this in true resolution therefore it does not truly reflect the impact on my property, once again I invite RVBC planning to view the true impact on my family home from within my property and also pricate garden area, alternatively I can come to the council offices and show you the original video in person (although still not reality)

As you are aware some residents on Park Avenue were invited to a meeting with Persimmon 26<sup>th</sup> March 2024, I was excluded from the invitation and when I called and questioned Persimmon as to why this was the case I was advised that the new proposal did not affect my property (and even checked the plans), regardless I attended the meeting. Whilst this may be a possible oversight by Persimmon not only does the culvert drainage solution but the increased height and positioning of will continue to have a significant negative impact on the privacy I am entitled to within my home. Upon attending the meeting, I was left with more questions/concerns than answers, something which I am sure has been reiterated by neighbours on Park Avenue and Hawthorne Place.

Today (15<sup>th</sup> April 2024) I was visited by Persimmon employees (Technical Director) and (Planning Director), during the visit I was advised the below, I have added additional questions to their responses which I urge the council to review, investigate and answer as part if this application:

- 1. There is no possibility of the height of the houses being amended
  - When asked why, Persimmon advised the heights were due to drainage That the system would not work with out these heights
    - Is this the case? Why was not this considered during approval of the initial application
  - When asked why can the properties can not be changed (i.e. the direction in which they face) to allow more privacy to my property but maintaining the drainage height requirement Persimmon advised the council had approved the property positions and heights on the initial application
    - Is this the case?

- 2. The boundary treatments were approved previously but now amended due to the new drainage proposal
  - Is this the case?
- 3. The lack of privacy to my property <u>is legal</u> and that the council approved the layout and, height and positioning of the new plots
  - With regards to the rejection of 3/2022/1116 I asked as to why the rejection not only referenced to condition 9 (drainage) but also raised concerns over privacy (condition 17)
     Persimmon advised that they did not know why and RVBC planning was not responding as to why
    - Is this <u>legally</u> correct?
    - Is the height approved or not?
      - something raised at the initial meeting in which we were told they were not yet today this was disputed?
    - Why supposedly are RVBC not replying?
- 4. They accepted that the privacy to my property was very much determined by the height of fence height of my due to the angle of the property
  - o Shockingly they asked me to speak to whether they would be comfortable with their fence being higher. Not only is this unacceptable as why should my neighbour have to commit to something they are potentially uncomfortable with for my properties privacy but also should they come to sell then I am left with no guarantees that the new owner wants to change to the fence height, remove any trees etc.
    - Is this acceptable?
- 5. Finally with regards to why soil was redistributed around the site rather than taken off (which does appear to be a contributing factor to the overall height of the site)
  - Sustainabilty was cited as the reason as to why i.e. cost to remove
    - Has this contributed to the site being higher than actually it should be to original plans?

I appreciate that a view is not a legal requirement and that is not my objection or something I am requesting **but a right to privacy most certainly is.** 

As you can appreciate the impact that this is having on our family life due to stress and concern is not acceptable by any means and all we really seek is the true rights that should be afforded to us as existing properties.

Due to the size of this email I have no alternative but to send a further email which contains other information but I would be grateful if you could please confirm receipt of this email.

