

## **Grindleton Parish Council response to planning application for the Duke of York Grindleton**

In the application there is a request for change of use on the public house known as the Duke of York.

The first thing we would like to correct is that in the planning application it says that the Buck Inn across the road and the pavilion operate as public house/ bar facilities for the village. This is factually incorrect.

The Buck is closed and has been since November 2018. We have made enquires to whether it will re-open or be sold, but we have had no reply. The Pavilion (village hall) is a well-used, highly rated facility with a private bar for pre-booked/ticketed events, is run by volunteers and, for example, is only booked for 4 events in March. The Pavilion follows a policy not to compete with the village pubs in recognition of their valuable and differing service to the village.

As you know the public house is a vital part of rural life and acts as a drop-in centre for a catch up and chat with friends etc. RVBC are aware that when facilities like this disappear we then have more social problems in terms of loneliness and depression. Village pubs are recognised as reducing social isolation. The village has been vibrant, with plenty of social activity. The closure of the Duke of York Public House will have a direct impact on the above.

The marketing information within the application appears to show that no-one wished to purchase The Duke of York as a going concern. We as a Parish council question the validity and accuracy of the marketing information contained within the application, as it was previously advertised as a well-known thriving business with lots of potential, subsequent advertising showed that wet sales fell by over 75%. Which is it?

The Parish Council carried out its 5-year plan consultation in Q3/4 of 2018 and we had overwhelming consensus from the villagers that a public house was vital to keeping the village alive.

We felt so strongly about the village pub situation in the village, (none open), that we have placed the Buck Inn on the community asset register to try to salvage something for the village in this dire situation we find ourselves, but this does not guarantee we will be successful.

The Duke of York pub as you will be aware is a grade 2 listed building in a conservation area. Whilst we appreciate that the applicant wants to remove the 1970s glass extension from the side of the building, and whilst this will aesthetically improve the look of the building, we realise that this area is the pub's dining room, and once demolished, the building would never return to being a gastro pub.

Previous owners of the building tried to establish decking outside the front and this was refused by the planners. We would hope the RVBC look at the building in the same light today and protect the look of the front facade.

In the application heritage statement, it is not clear as to whether it is the external part of the building that is covered by the grade 2 listing or whether this applies to the internal aspects.

We would also like to ensure the building is treated with the respect it deserves due to its status and keep the look it has going forward. This is because this building is iconic not just within Grindleton but within the Ribble Valley.

### **Holiday lets**

As this is the entrance to the village, this construction has the potential to alter the 'character' of the village. It is felt that the materials used to construct the holiday cottages would need to be sympathetic / in keeping with its surroundings, so as not to adversely impact the area.

The construction of the holiday lets is within a conservation area and has the possibility of impacting visually on the grade 2 listed building by being built with new materials and built in a modern way. The balance of new developments on the same site of existing historic buildings is a tricky balance. It is very

easy for new builds to take away the look of existing buildings. We question whether this meets your key statement EN2?

We do not agree it will bring financial benefits to the village as described in the application. We have nowhere for people to eat out or have a drink in the village. The application refers to the availability of a bus service, but as this does not run in the evenings and any time on Sundays it cannot be offered as transport to/return from establishments in other areas for evening meals. This will impact on increased vehicle usage in both Grindleton and other local villages. They might employ a cleaner at best, but this will be on an ad hoc basis as they do not see the lets being full all year round as per the application. Does this meet key statement DS1 or EC1? Also, is it in contravention of DME2?

### **Builder's store**

This part of the application is the most controversial of the whole application for most of the villagers.

Firstly, in the application it states the building will be a workshop and a store and a depot. If it is a workshop more noise than the application indicates will be generated. If it is a depot this implies it will be used for storage of building materials, sand, stone etc. this would be totally unacceptable due to noise and increase in HGV traffic within the conservation area.

Whilst we agree that a public house created noise that was mainly at given times of the day, with a builder's store this could be from early morning through to late at night. Not with holding this, in the winter will flood lighting be used at unsociable times to light the loading area? Considering the site has houses on two of its boundaries this would be undesirable. The application does say that ladders and scaffolding will be kept in the store. These are noisy when being moved around.

In the application the information says the 1<sup>st</sup> floor will be used for storage of equipment that they don't want to leave on site. At this stage I would like to add a statement from one of our councillors who has worked in the industry.

"In my 45 years of construction experience and current health and safety legislation of manual handling regulations. I find it surprising a store has been designed where tools, materials and heavy equipment must be carried negotiating a flight of external stairs of at least 16 treads on a regular basis. This equipment can vary significantly from light to very heavy and perhaps a two-person lift. If materials are to be stored as suggested (copper tube etc) then negotiating the limited landing space would be hazardous"

As the store will be used to store high value items we have concerns as to how they intend to apply their security. We would want a restriction on unsociable noise at unsociable times and 24/7 flood lighting.

We feel the lowering of the beer garden is not presented as part of thoughtful landscaping of the site, but as an appeasing move of the benefit of 1 or 2 adjacent residential properties.

It goes without saying that, unless the appropriate stringent restriction is put on the use of the lowered garden area, its proximity to the garages and builders store may see it used for parking or storage of bulky materials. Again, not in keeping with the location.

The builder's store is planned to be built alongside millennium woods, which has been developed over the years to attract wildlife and grow native plants. This is an area that is well used by the villagers. It is felt that the woods would be adversely affected by excessive use of floodlighting and noise nuisance from within the depot.

## Parking and traffic

Grindleton is a village that suffers from lack of parking and in this part of the village it is no different. Previously people living on Pendle view have used the pub car park on which to park their private cars at night and at weekends, but since the change of ownership of The Duke of York, residents now park on the road and pavement just below the development. This causes problems to both pedestrians and road users.

The application states the pub attic will be converted into an office for 8 people. The holiday lets have 3 parking places and can accommodate up to 4 people, with the potential therefore of more than 3 cars in attendance. The depot / store has multiple employees and then there will be family vehicles. Without consideration of visiting reps, deliveries and visitors to the site. We can see that potentially you are up to 14 plus vehicles. On the plans there is clearly not this amount of parking available, this leads us to believe that the site is being over developed. The result of this would be more vehicles parking on the road.

We have had strong representation from people who walk past this site with young children and who walk to the local primary school. Clearly their concern is the amount of traffic this development will have. The entrance/exit of the site would have a restricted view of pedestrians and traffic due to the kerbside position of the holiday lets. The village is busy twice a day with buses negotiating country roads transporting pupils to the High school, the Duke of York being a pick up drop off point for pupils of Bowland High.

As per CS Policy DMG2 Strategic Considerations. Tier 2 Villages – Developments **must** meet at least 1 of 6 criteria:

1. Essential to the local economy or social well being
2. The development is needed for agriculture or forestry
3. It is needed for identified local housing needs
4. It is for small scale tourism
5. It is for small scale use appropriate to the rural area
6. It needs to be compatible with the character of the landscape

As a Parish council we cannot see how this application meets the above. We feel the applicant's business needs could be met more appropriately, very close by, by using Greendale storage and Gary Hoerty office space.

In 2010 RVBC refused planning permission to Bradford diocese for 3 affordable dwellings on Main St: as being visually harmful to the character, appearance, significance and rural context of the location within the AONB & Grindleton Conservation Area. 3/2010/0738 refers. It went to appeal and was refused by the Inspectorate.