

Philip Dagnall

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 26 March 2019 17:22
To: Philip Dagnall
Subject: Re: your response to the current main amendments planning policy consultation

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

This email has been delivered from an external source.
Do not click any links, open any attachments or reply to this email unless you are certain this email content is legitimate.

Dear Mr Dagnall

Thank you for your email. I confirm I wish to resubmit my previous consultation response and not add other material. I understand the flooding risks are being considered elsewhere

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
From: Philip Dagnall
Sent: Tuesday, March 26, 2019 10:47 AM

Subject: your response to the current main amendments planning policy consultation

I am contacting you just to seek clarification of a series of emails we've had recently regarding the consultation. You sent to us two email on 13th March. Can I take it from those that you wish to resubmit your previous consultation response of last year, which was attached to one of the emails, as a response into the current consultation or do you intend to add other material?

Yours sincerely, Phil Dagnall, Forward Planning

Tops for resident satisfaction – 79% of residents are satisfied with Ribble Valley as a place to live (Perception Survey 2018)

This transmission is intended for the named addressee(s) only and may contain sensitive, protectively marked or restricted material, and should be handled accordingly. Unless you are the named addressee (or authorised to receive it for the addressee) you may not copy, use, or disclose it to anyone else. If you have received this transmission in error, notify the sender immediately. All GCSX traffic may be subject to recording and/or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation. This e-mail is issued subject to Ribble Valley Borough Council's e-mail [disclaimer](#) which you are taken to have read and accepted.

Although the Council virus scans incoming and outgoing emails (including file attachments) it cannot guarantee that the content of an email communication or any file attachment is virus free or has not been intercepted or amended as it passes over the internet. The onus is on the recipient to check the communication is virus-free. The Council accepts no responsibility for any damage caused by receiving emails from our email systems and/or hosted domains.

1950

1950

1950



Philip Dagnall

From: Colin Hirst
Sent: 13 March 2019 13:52
To: Philip Dagnall
Subject: FW: RVBC your ref sub22HEDDPD: HED DPD Comments re.docx
Attachments: RVBC HED DPD Comments re.docx

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Categories: Red Category

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 11 March 2019 12:06
To: Sub22 Consultation
Cc: Colin Hirst; Ian Brown
Subject: Fw: RVBC your ref sub22HEDDPD: HED DPD Comments re.docx

Dear Sir or Madam

Your ref: sub22HEDDPD

Thank you for your letter of 1st March. After a discussion with Mr. Hirst I am resubmitting my comments sent in response to the earlier consultation in July/August 2018. In spite of follow up emails on 5th and 17th December 2018 I received no confirmation that my comments had been received and submitted to the inspector. I also asked for information clarifying the rational for replacing 2 small sites in Chatburn and Wilpshire with a large site at Highmoor which will add considerably to the traffic overload on Pendle Road and to the overstretched infrastructure in Clitheroe town. Further development of Highmoor will also have a serious negative impact on endangered wildlife. Please ensure and give me cofirmation that my views will be seen by the inspector.

Yours sincerely,

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, August 31, 2018 3:26 PM
To: pmods22@ribblevalley.gov.uk
Cc: [REDACTED]
Sub: [REDACTED]

Dear Mr Hirst

I attach my comments on the proposed Highmoor Farm development (site 13) as per the invitation in your letter of 27th July with a copy to Councillor Ian Brown, my representative on the RVBC.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

Section of text in the upper right quadrant, appearing as a list or set of instructions.

Section of text in the middle of the page, possibly containing a table or detailed list.

Section of text in the lower right quadrant, possibly a signature block or a specific instruction.

Section of text at the bottom of the page, possibly a footer or concluding remarks.

RVBC HED DPD Comments re: site 13 HIGHMOOR FARM.

Your Ref: pmods22HEDDPD

Dear Mr Hirst

Thank you for your letter of 27th July inviting comment on modifications to the development plan.

When I wrote at the very first consultation I supported any necessary development being close to the A59 as much employment involves commuting from the town. This support was qualified by the need for adequate infrastructure development, of which so far I have seen no evidence, our schools and health centre are under great pressure. I suspect letters of support were the exception. The major building programme around Edisford and Henthorn is already overloading Eshton Terrace, compounded by the railway crossing. There is an urgent need for a western link road from Henthorn to the A59/Whalley Road roundabout to give an alternative route in/out of town. Apart from bridging the railway such a route will be simple, across agricultural land and will improve access to the sewage works which will need major expansion to deal with all this increase in housing.

My concerns about 100 units at Highmoor Farm are principally in 2 specific areas as well as those around infrastructure.

Access:

The A59/Pendle Road roundabout has been necessary for many years on safety grounds and earlier action would have saved a number of lives but it will not significantly relieve the congestion already increasing at both ends of Pendle Road with only a few of the 1050 houses so far built on the Standen estate development (Half Penny Meadows.) Work on services installation for Half Penny Meadows has left Pendle Road regularly flooded outside 61 Pendle Road and twice the Environment Agency has investigated pollution of Shaw Brook by contractors

I consulted the minutes of the Special Planning and Development Committee meeting of 17th July to understand what circumstances had changed at Ribblesdale View, Chatburn and the Wilpshire site HAL2 that requires them to be replaced by Highmoor Farm. The only apparent reason in the minutes seems to be that a bigger site is more deliverable than 2 smaller sites. The Clitheroe Advertiser reports the councillors local to the smaller sites put forward arguments if so these are not minuted. There is no indication in the minutes that the many drawbacks to site 13 (particularly that Highmoor Farm will empty onto Pendle Road which is already going to take the traffic of 1050 additional houses with probably 2 cars per house) were taken into account.

Wildlife and Loss of Rural outlook:

The meadow between the farm and Pendle Road is a breeding ground for curlews, indeed their call I regard as the first sign of spring (no cuckoos here!) The RSPB estimates 30% of Europe's curlews are in the UK and breed in Scotland and Northern England. They are in severe decline with numbers dropping 42% between 1995 and 2008. There are bats, herons, a pair of sparrow hawks and owls. The rookery in the wood between the meadow and the playing field has been shrinking over several years until the last 2 seasons when it has recovered a little with new nest building. There are

breeding mallard on the pond in my garden adjacent to the meadow as well as unusual birds including nuthatch, woodpecker and tree creeper which visit from the copse beside Shaw Brook which is directly next to the proposed site.

To favour a 100 unit build in an important rural green belt area and breeding ground which will share access to an already overused principle road to the A59 about to be loaded with another 1050 unit development solely because a bigger site is more deliverable than 2 smaller sites is not effective or sustainable development planning.

Yours sincerely,

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area.