Nicola Gunn

From:

Planning

Sent:

23 December 2021 16:07

To:

Planning

Subject:

REDACT AND UPLOAD Planning Application Comments - 3/2021/1263

Categories:

xRedact & Upload

Already printed for file and forwarded to officer

From: Contact Centre (CRM) < contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk> Sent: 23 December 2021 06:55

To: Web Development <pre

Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2021/1263



is your address in Ribbie Valley?: Yes



Locality:

County: Lancashire

uprn: 100010586286

usm: 31800392

ward: E05005306

Planning Application Reference Number: 3/2021/1263

Address of Development: Land adjacent to 115 Kemple View, Clitheroe, BB7 2QJ

Your Comments: I am concerned about the amount of traffic going through the small tarmac road leading to the development. This road is already in disrepair and a further 8 cars (allowance for) will mean the road will quickly fall further into disrepair.

I also noted that the large tree on this road has been removed or is not in place on the drawing, will this be felled?

Fnally if this is approved then the site needs to be fenced off as kids use this area as a throughfare to the river and large holes have been dug and left open which may casue an accident.			
2			

Nicola Gunn

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>

Sent: 06 January 2022 18:52

To: Web Development; Planning

Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2021/1263



Is your address in Ribble Valley?: Yes



Locality:

County: Lancashire

uprn: 010093889622

usm: 31802192

ward: E05005306

Planning Application Reference Number: 3/2021/1263

Address of Development: Land Adjacent to 115 Kemple View Clitheroe BB7 2QJ

Your Comments: Dear Sir / Madam

I am writing to you to reject the proposal of the development of this land. This land holds Bats within the old white Horse stables building and as the proposed developer has boarded up the windows on the Building this has meant the bats cannot enter of escape the building either probably to reduce the risk of the development being stopped. There is also a huge Victorian water pipe underneath the land too which if disturbed / damaged will lead to a huge issue of possible subsidence of the neighbouring houses and to the land and eco system too.

There has also been a large number of trees removed from this area and further building will only mean that there will be more loss of natural habitat so I must reject this proposal at all costs to protect and preserve our local area.

Kind regards

Sharon Craig

From:

07 January 2022 10:12 Sent:

To: **Planning** Subject: 3/2021/1263

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.



Application No: 3/2021/1263

Land adjoining 115 Kemple View

January 7th 2022

Dear Mr Kilmartin and Mr Machole,

Re: the proposed development of two, large detached houses on land previously used as stables/paddock at 115 Kemple View.

This is the third application since 2014. Very few alterations have been made to the original plans. They are proposed as family houses, yet there is very little garden space. They present more as offices, or meeting places, than dwellings. Will you make some assurances that these are for the purpose of private dwellings and not meeting, or teaching, places with many visitors.

The plans indicate that the house walls are very close to the plot boundaries. The proposed houses are not in keeping with the surrounding bungalows or houses which all have garden space.

The plans indicate parking for 8 cars but only 6 parking places are mentioned on the actual application.

The access entry to the plot is narrow. I understand that actually own the land currently forming part of the right hand side of the drive, thus making it even narrower.

The access road is very limited. The road has a tight, right angled blind bend and is also a bus route. There is very limited space for any parking of vehicles outside the plot. Will you guarantee that the premises will not be used as a meeting place leading to additional vehicles visiting regularly and needing to park outside the plot.

In addition, there is no room for vehicles to turn on the plot so all vehicles, cars and construction vehicles will have to reverse towards the blind bend.

Yours sincerely,



Application No: 3/2021/1263

Land adjoining 115 Kemple View

January 6th 2022

Dear Mr Klimartin and Mr Machole,

I wish to raise two concerns with you about the proposed development of two, large detached houses on land previously used as stables/paddock at 115 Kemple View.

This is the third application since 2014 but I am still concerned by the size and scale of these houses in the centre of a residential area.

1. The proposal is to build two 5 bedroomed properties. Mr Hitchen (Architect) stated in his design brief that he was approached to "create 2 separate family homes, maximising the internal spaces to create a bright, spacious environment for familiestwo houses which incorporate traditional building materials respecting the local vernacular". In order to fit them in to a restrained site, due to drainage alignments, I feel that the houses are oversized and not in keeping with the other developments around them. One of them has three floors and is consequently tailer than the adjacent properties, some of which are bungalows.

They look more like Village Halls rather than family homes. The larger of the two is in fact, 4x wider than my second they cover is that of 4 houses.

I am also concerned that Plot 1 not only has a study but also an office. This immediately makes me question whether these are family homes or if there is an intention to use them for other means rather than just residential. I should appreciate your reassurance on this matter. There is very little garden space around the properties apart from some small lawns. However the space has been used to provide parking for 8 cars on the plan. It only mentioned 6 on the actual application. (See concern 2) This extra traffic leads me to my next point.

2. In the second of the second

The access road is very limit	ed. The road is only 2.9m wide wit	h a pavement
beside of 1.85m.	m. There is no mention	
of the road layout at the end	of my drive and whether or not the	path is to
continue round the corner	as a safety measure for ped	estrians. This
was to be addressed in the la	ast plan. However I ha <u>ve still not f</u>	ound a reference
shown on this plan at all. I ha	ave a pavement at the	but am aware
that the entrance to these ho	ouses is very narrow and I fear tha	t they will have to
	Certainly the	e large delivery
lorries and cement mixers wi	III have difficulties. There is no tur	ning circle so
they will have to reverse onto	o the main road, which is also the	local bus route.
The location for rubbish bins	is behind the gates (electric?) of t	he houses.
Where are they to put their b	ins when they are to be collected?	The access land
In front of will be greatly	reduced when these properties as	e built and they
will have great difficulty park	king and turning when the new roa	d and pavement
are constructed. They will ha	ive to reverse onto the main road a	and this another
safety hazard which the High	ways Agency needs to address.	

I hope you will take into account these genuine concerns and ensure this application is in keeping with an area which has been sujected to a great deal of building, but not properties on such a large scale.

I know that you do not acknowledge letters but would appreciate if you could let me know that you have received this so that my time has not been wasted.

Yours sincerely,