

Jane Tucker

From: John Macholc
Sent: 05 August 2011 08:22
To: Jane Tucker
Subject: FW: Planning applicaton responses

From: David King [mailto:dtkcarrscroft@tiscali.co.uk]
Sent: 02 August 2011 21:25
To: John Macholc
Cc: Christopher Smith; Chris Smith; kate hooper; richard Sherras; Ian OREILLY; toni parker; brian berry
Subject: Planning applicaton responses

RIMINGTON & MIDDOP
 PARISH COUNCIL

RESPONSES TO PLANNING APPLICATIONS

Dear Mr Macholc
 Please note the above P C's responses to the following applicatons

3/2011/00596 tennis Court at Denis Field

The P C has no alternative but to object to this in order to remain cosnistent with its earlier objections to other non agricultural developments on land which has agricultural curtilege. The site chosen for the court is agricultural land and although the P C is sure that consstent with the other developments on this site th court will be well built and in this case well screened it is stil a domestic use of non domestic land

The two applications for placing photovoltaic cells on barn roofs 0591 and 0592

Since it considers that the visual impact in both cases will be small has no objections

The P C does however have a number of concerns which it feels could be addressed in a general comment through the P C L C in September

Is the reflective glare from these cell a matter of planning consideration?

Could the cells be Matt balck or bettr the coluor of the roof on which they are to be located?

Would the fact that the cells may be placed there purely for financial gain and not as an alternative source of energy for the resident be a consideration?

And finally and probably most controversially application 0366 for wind turbine westb of the A682 near Little Middop

The PC is resolved to treat every applictaion for wind turbines individually since it considers that each has unique features. In this case it wishes to object because it sees the aapplication as a change of use for agricultural land to commercial /industrial use. There is no indication that the land owner will benefit from the turbine other than as an industrial development.

It is also aware that the guidance given by central Governmnt would probably support this otherwise random development. It believes this to be a mistake since to encourage development with approval for this application would set a precedent which could lead to the pepperpotting of turbines over the currently idyllic landscape of the Ribble Valley.

It considers the visual impact caused by the development of this site to be unduly intrusive

The County Council have published data which notes sites that would be favourable in terms of climatic conditions. The PC believes that this is not such a site.

05/08/2011

Again the P C referred to the need for guidance, informed comment, and discussion on the issue and would ask that you forward their request for the issues of PV cells and wind turbines in the planning context to be put on the agenda of the next P C L C meeting

Could you also confirm receipt of the P C's response to the Core strategy Consultation
And to planning applications 0389 and 0526

I am away on holiday from tomorrow and in the event that you did not get copies they have been recieved by Councillor R Sherras who will not doubt be kind enough to forward them to you

Thank you for your consideration
yours sincerely

David King
Clerk to the Council