

From: [REDACTED] >
Sent: 17 February 2021 15:09
To: Planning <planning@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Subject: Application No 3/2021/0076

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

17 Feb 2021

Planning Application No N/2021/0076

Queen Mary Terrace and Bridge Terrcae Mitton Road Development Whalley BB7 9JS

Dear Planning

I really hope you reconsider giving planning permission to Prospect to knock down 34 affordable homes, and replace with only 3 on Mitton road

1. The proposal says 'responsible attitude to the environment, to ensure a sustainable development' There is nothing 'sustainable' about this development. Sustainable is supposed to be a balance of good for environment, social and economic future. There is nothing particularly good for the environment or social aspects. Clearly there is much less green space once they have built these houses, it is simple maths. 50 houses larger houses take up more room than 34. I think the word they mean is 'substantial'.

2. Prospect refer to the existing land - as 'Brownfield' site. This is very disingenuous. From Homebuilding site *"Much of the land that was once used for industry in this country now lies redundant. Planners call it Brownfield land "* Planners want Brownfield sites to be redeveloped, so we can see why Prospect call this land 'Brownfield'. But this is NOT an old industrial area; it is a pleasant residential area.

3. Prospect make a lot about saying the present dwellings are not classed as affordable – implying it is thus OK to knock them down. These dwellings are not so classified because the term wasn't around when they were built. But that is exactly what they were built for – to house local health workers – and make sure they could afford to live in them.

4. Prospect promise 3 'affordable' houses. Only three? That implies 47 houses are unaffordable. Presumably some bit of law says they have to have this minimum number. If we designate the existing 32 buildings as affordable, and build another little terrace in Parcel A, where there is an ideal space that would make 38 affordable houses versus Prospect's three.

5. Instead of demolishing the existing houses, why not renovate them? The roofs all look in good shape, so we could presume the houses are in relatively good state, having being built to last longer in those days. It would not cost a lot, and could make some money, to make them look really nice with existing gardens The existing green space in Parcel 1 could be made into a 'Growing area' to

encourage local food production. This could help satisfy the developer's Section 106 obligations, and be considered more 'sustainable'.

6. There are many young people round here, struggling to get on the housing ladder, and what better spot than here? Instead of building more 'unaffordable' houses for local people, why not build a small estate to say 'thank you' to 3 dozen families of the front line local workers who have struggled over last year – and will be struggling a lot more in the future. It is hard to see how Ribble Valley Council needs the money, as there are millions in the treasure chest and it would make a wonderful gesture..

6. Now to the diagram. I'm not clear why an entrance on to Mitton Road is sensible. There seems to be an increased volume of traffic, especially of vast fast tractors coming in and out of the village along that road.

7. Icons Parcel A



Tree to be retained -
Canopy and root
protection area

'Tree to be retained'.

Parcel A. But there are No trees there 'to be retained'..

It marks out at least 10 of these icons in



Tree to be removed

8. Parcel B This icon is self explanatory. So I looked in Parcel B for these icons. There is a line of green blobs (retained?) but no indication of those to 'be removed'. Yet on the plan there is only one row, whereas at present there are two rows of trees – birches on right, beeches on left. Which ones are going to be 'removed'?



Conclusion

These two parcels of land could make a fabulous living space for some families working in the Ribble Valley, giving some room for their children to breathe and grow, while doing their bit for the community. Those people are more likely to spend a higher proportion of their earnings locally. They could bring up their families in wonderful environment for learning, connecting the existing woodlands to create corridors for nature. [REDACTED] (but not speaking on their behalf) that backs on to this development and am always looking for ways for local people to make more use of these woodlands. It could give Whalley something to be really proud of, and show off as people came in and out of the village from Mitton.

Yours respectfully

[Redacted Signature]