

23 MAR 2013

FOR THE
ATTENTION OF

**Clerk to Gisburn Parish Council
Higher Scarloom House
Holden
Bolton-by-Bowland
Clitheroe
Lancs BB7 4PF**

Mr Colin Sharpe
Senior Planning Officer
Ribble Valley BC
Council Offices
Church Walk
Clitheroe
BB7 2RA

23 March 2013

Dear Mr Sharpe

**PLANNING APPLICATIONS 3/2013/0161 AND 3/2013/0189
PHASES 2 AND 3, STRAWBERRY FIELDS, GISBURN**

For information, at last night's Parish Council meeting eighteen local residents attended, mostly those who live at the Strawberry Fields end of the village, and they were given the opportunity to express their views on the above applications, after which the Parish Council considered their collective response to the proposals.

Please be advised that Gisburn Parish Council wish to formally object to the above applications.

Firstly, the applicant has already received outline planning permission for 21 houses at the same location. At the start of the process the applicant was advised by yourself, in writing in a letter of 27 April 2012, that a development of 37 houses was not sustainable and was excessive in relation to the size of Gisburn and the services available. Therefore, at that time, "the Local Planning Authority does not therefore offer encouragement for the submission of a planning application relating to the larger site for 37 dwellings". The Parish Council were not opposed to a development of 21 houses and many of the residents living close to Strawberry Fields could also support a small scale development. However, the Parish Council and many local residents agree that a development of 37 houses is excessive relative to the size of the village and there is not the infrastructure to support such a number of new dwellings. There was the consensus at the meeting that the applicant was acting in contradiction to the planning advice unequivocally stated in April 2012.

Secondly, despite what the utility company and application form may claim, there is a flooding problem at that end of the village and this problem could only be exacerbated by the construction of more properties. This particular problem has upset many residents at that end of the village and there was considerable discussion on this issue both at last night's meeting and at the meeting to discuss Phase 1 of the development some months ago. I understand that you are to be sent some photographs by affected individuals.

Thirdly, there are serious access issues with regards to Phase III of the development. Access would be along a single lane with no turning area. This would cause problems for delivery and emergency vehicles and anyone visiting a Phase III property could park in the lane thereby completing blocking it. There do not appear to be any pavements along the access lane which again is a safety issue. Also, there is a drop of approx. 2m from the access lane into the car park/oil tank area of the properties in front of the Phase III development and with an increase in vehicular traffic along the access lane there is greater potential for dangerous accidents.

Fourthly, the height of the intended Phase III properties relative to those to their front means that there will be a loss of privacy for those dwellings which will be overlooked. Development of Phase III would also negatively impact on the properties to its front as well as on Nethergill and Langlands in terms of increased light and noise levels.

Fifthly, the Phase III development is on agricultural land which has never been part of the diner site. There was a consensus at the meeting that development on the brownfield site on which the diner was sited would generally be acceptable but encroaching onto greenfield areas is unacceptable. Certain individuals were very upset at the Phase III site being described as "former Strawberry Fields diner".

Sixthly, an increased level of traffic having to enter and exit the development onto the busy A59 can only lead to the increased likelihood of an accident, particularly as many drivers approach the village in excess of the speed limit.

Seventhly, there are two trees – a Horse Chestnut within Langlands and a hawthorn tree – which would be adversely affected by the development of plot 37. The application form is therefore incorrect when it says there are no trees on adjacent land that could influence the development.

Eighthly, the current electricity supply to the area is supplied via overhead cables which would go through the development site and the double pole mounted transformer box would be in the middle of the access road. Whilst we understand this is not a planning issue it is a practical issue which would require (expensive) resolution.

Finally, as background, there was some disquiet amongst those present regarding various (alleged) inaccuracies contained within the applicant's submissions. I am sure you will be advised of these alleged inaccuracies in letters from individuals.

I can also advise, again as background, that there was disappointment about the way these applications have been conducted. The applicant and his agent attended a Parish Council meeting several months ago and talked at length about Phase I of the development. No mention was made at that earlier meeting about Phases II and III but many residents believe these subsequent Phases were already being devised. It was submitted that it would have been better for the applicant and his agent to have been candid from the outset in order to enable discussions to take place with residents and maybe a compromise solution attained regarding the number and location of proposed dwellings on the site.

Yours sincerely

**For and on behalf of Gisburn Parish Council
CATHY HOLMES (MRS)
CLERK TO GISBURN PARISH COUNCIL.**