

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 04 October 2024 13:14
To: Planning
Subject: Outlying planning proposal - planning application 3/2024/0268 Grid ref: 362555 436532
Attachments: Article.pdf; IMG_20241004_0001.pdf

⚠ 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.

To Ben Taylor,

This email concerns the Outlying planning proposal at Hothersall - planning application 3/2024/0268 Grid ref: 362555 436532

We are registering our objection to this proposal.

[REDACTED], we are so concerned about the proposal for 6 holiday chalets on Ribchester Road in Hothersall, [REDACTED].

These concerns are:

-Road Safety: as far as we know there have been 3 crashes, including one where a car went right [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] An injured person had to go to hospital. The police were involved.

-It's difficult enough exiting [REDACTED] to this dangerous road, but with cars emerging from the potential holiday chalets, this would just add to the danger, especially as all this would be in close proximity to the dangerous bend.

-In terms of ecological concern, the proposal for hot-tubs is obviously very anti-ecological.

-Nuisance and stress: holiday chalets will mean extra noise, music, the disruption to the road and noise from building. [REDACTED]!

-In 2022, Ribble Valley Borough Council [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Their reasoning included some points which would absolutely apply to the proposed development, so how would this make sense, promote parity and even be considered? Here are a few sentences from the document:

11. The evidence before me and my own observations indicate that there are no facilities for example, a shop, public house, church or school in proximity to the appeal site, such that the future occupants of the proposed dwelling could walk to meet their everyday needs. Even if there were, Ribchester Road is a welltrafficked rural road, with vehicles travelling at some speed, despite the 40mph restriction just to the north-west of the appeal site. The pavement on the opposite side of the road is narrow, without a verge and unlit such that it would not feel safe or be pleasant to use, even for a short distance. It would discourage travelling by walking, particularly for those with young children or

mobility issues, especially after dark.

The submitted plans indicate that the appeal property [REDACTED] which could enable an increase in occupancy, that may simultaneously intensify car ownership. Family visits may also be increased if [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]. The proposal would therefore be likely to result in an intensification of travel particularly by car given the location of the appeal site outside of any settlement.

15. The proposal would not be located to provide suitable access to services and facilities. It would therefore, conflict with Policies DMI2 and DMG3 of the Core Strategy which seek amongst other things, to provide access by pedestrian, cyclists and those with reduced mobility and minimise the need to travel. It would also conflict with the sustainable transport objectives set out in paragraph LLZ of the Framework.

Surely, people on holiday will be wanting to access with cars and through walking, this dangerous road with its issues that have been highlighted in the document from Ribble Valley Borough Council.

Many thanks,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]











