

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 22 May 2026 11:35
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0688 FS-Case-840219315

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Lancashire

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0688

Address of Development: Units 1-21 Mitton Road Business Park

Comments: We would like to raise several points / issues regarding changes in planning on the Mitton Road business park.

1. The plans that have been submitted showing the site now and plans for changes are incorrect, the plan that shows the site lay out now is incorrect, please see the photos and highlighted areas that are incorrect and show the site as it is.

A. Unit 16-21. [REDACTED] there is a large extension missing from the plans?

B. Single access road that is on both plans to unit. From phase 1 road to the back of unit. And parking at the [REDACTED] not exist it's on all plans but never installed.

C. Both plans also show some sort of fence divide between the single access to the rear of unit 16-21 and the parking area.

If something as simple as this is incorrect how can we trust that the proposed changes are what will be carried out

2. We have only lived here 5 years and we were worried about [REDACTED] to a business park. But on checking the planning consent with our solicitor's, we were happy to go ahead on the fact that the site was to have a fence, gates and finished tarmac road [REDACTED] from the business park. You can clearly see the boundary line for phase 1 [REDACTED] where the road has not been finished (see photo). Why has this been left in finished?

With the proposed changes it will feel like we live on a business park.

3. All the attractive landscaping, hedges, fencing and cladding for all the units (Phase 1, 2 & 3) are all aesthetic so it looks lovely for any one passing not the reality of living here.

If fact the proposed changes make phase 2 and 3 look even better for the all the businesses on there and the new houses on Mitton Road but nothing for existing home owners on the site.

4. We have also noticed that the application is by Mr David Hollindrake who is just 1 of the 2 owners of the site.

It is interesting to note that if the business park is separated he will be the owner of phases 2 and 3, not phase 1 where I believe [REDACTED] will be the owner yet this is where all the changes are proposed. What guarantee do we have the everything that is on the application will be as stated and completed in a timely manner as nothing to date has been completed on time, as detailed on the plan or even completed at all.

All of these changes are not to improve the site for anyone on the business park or surrounding homes but because the 2 business park owners no longer wish to continue the partnership.