From:

Sent: 09 February 2025 15:46

To: Planning

Subject: Objection to planning application

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.

FAO Maya Cullen

Planning Application No: 3/2024/1039

Grid Ref: 361455 433386

Proposal: Variation of condition 2 on planning permission 3/2020/0498 for proposed construction of three

holiday cottages with associated parking and amenity areas.

Dear Ms Cullen

With reference to the letter received informing me of this planning application, I wish to raise the following objections.

The original approved planning application of 2020 stated that:

- * The development would be physically well-related to an existing group of buildings and is compliant with policy DMB3. (6.3).
- * The building is part single storey and part two storeys in height reflecting the scale of agricultural rural buildings.The scale, mass, height and detailing of the development will not undermine the visual qualities of the area and complies with the requirements of Key Statement EN2, policies DMB3 and DME2.

Having gained planning permission for this development Mr Dewhurst proceeded to build a development with significant changes. He made 3 applications to increase the roof height of the buildings above those approved by the original consent, and the first 2 applications were refused: the third he withdrew, deciding to go ahead anyway, confident he would achieve retrospective planning permission. Hence the ridge height has been increased by over a metre from 7.3 to 8.6 metres. This increased height of 1.3 metres of all three cottages is out of character and the scale and massing increases the prominence of the building (see photo 1 below). This development therefore is not compliant with CS policies DMG1or DME2: the conclusion reached by officers when dealing with application 3/2023/0257, which was subsequently refused.

Moreover, the 'detailing of the development' now has included installing many skylights in the roofs of all 3 'cottages' (none included in original application) leading of course to significant light pollution close to the UCLAN Observatory, and the trees and hedges he mentions screening the development have all been removed apart from the one bordering the bridleway which does not belong to him but to the owner of the bridleway.

Finally, it is ironic that Yours sincerely



