NIGEL EVANS MP
DEPUTY SPEAKER

HOUSE OF COMMONS
LONDON SW1A 0AA

Nicola Hopkins
Director of Economic Development and Planning
Ribble Valley Borough Council
Council Offices
Church Walk
Clitheroe
BB7 2RA

Our Ref: NE40770

11 April 2020

Dear Nicola,

I'm writing further to my previous correspondence regarding the planning applications for a driving range to be erected at Clitheroe Golf Club, and particularly about the new application 3/2020/0142.

I would like to express my opposition to the proposed application, as I share the local residents concerns that the structure could differ so much from the original application. Not only is the structure that has already been built in breach of planning conditions completely different from the original approved material, but the proposed opening hours have also been extended.

The local residents who neighbour the application are extremely concerned that while the first application had opening hours of 08:00-20:00, that the new application could mean the driving range opening from 6:30-22:00. Currently there is little light pollution in the area, and to have a large floodlit driving range so close to their properties, and open so late, is particularly concerning.

Nigel Evans – MP for the Ribble Valley
Deputy Speaker of the House of Commons

MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT FOR THE RIBBLE VALLEY
TEL: 020 7219 6939 EMAIL: EVANSN@PARLIAMENT.UK
WWW.NIGEL-EVANS.ORG.UK

## Rebecca Bowers

**From:** Planning
**Sent:** 10 August 2020 15:54
**To:** Rebecca Bowers
**Subject:** FW: Amended planning application No 3/2020/0142

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Lynne Calver
PA – Chief Executive

-----Original Message
From: [redacted]
Sent: 10 August 2020 14:55
To: Planning <planning@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Subject: Amended planning application No 3/2020/0142

Elhanan
Whalley Road
Pendleton
Clitheroe
Lancs
BB7 1PP

10/8/2020

Dear Sir / Madam
I wish to comment on the amended planning application No 3/2020/0142 , I feel that this is merely a desperate attempt by Clitheroe golf club to get a structure which has blatantly breached planning legislation in every way approved .
The gesture of decreasing the height by a minimal amount is hardly going to convince people that this is a genuine attempt to solve the problem that the golf club has brought upon itself. I believe like many others ( Mr. Nigel Evans MP , Barrow Parish Council and local residents ) the structure should be dismantled and moved to the correct location , and assembled using the correct materials and measurements as the original plan that received planning approval.
I cannot believe that you can receive planning approval for a structure then build some- thing totally different in the wrong place and with different materials and hope to get away with it . Maybe it's that I am a little naive or this the way in certain circumstances in the valley. This then raises the question why have 'planning dept.and planning enforcement if it's not fit for purpose .
Moving on to other aspects of this project , below is list of other anomalies that still need clarification.
When is low level lightning considered low . Surely not when it is 4 metres above the ground or is that me being naive again.
A question I have asked several times before "where will the golfers go when they need the loo " answers please .
OPEN ALL HOURS no not the one on the tv , but the suggested one for the driving range 6.30 am to 10.00pm .? .??
Wild life as anyone seriously considered the effects or is a matter of " well they will find another home somewhere golf's main priority "

Yours in anticipation of the correct outcome stay safe[redacted]

Tresaith
Whalley Road
Pendleton
Clitheroe
BB7 1PP

31/03/2020

Ribble Valley Borough Council

Planning & Development Committee

Objections to planning application 3/2020/0142.

Dear Sir/Madam.

On the Application for Planning Permission. Town and Country Planning Act 1999.

Section 5. In this section this proposal is described as "resubmission of previously agreed scheme" as the proposed building is totally different from the plan of the previous building this statement appears to be incorrect.

Section 11. Unless a sustainable drainage system is provided, there is increased risk of flooding of the area where the septic tanks associated with the bungalows are installed. In the recent heavy rains, a lot of this area was under water. It seems no coincidence that this occurred after the raising of the ground level of much of the practice area. Further run off from the proposed structure would exacerbate this problem. This same area contains the 2 inch mains water pipe feed to my property & some others, in the event of any fault occurring to this feed, whether damage or corrosion, this could lead to sewage contamination of the water supply, it may be a possibility that such contamination could feed back into the general water supply. I have checked with United Utilities to confirm that this 2 inch pipe is of cast iron and of pre-war vintage.

Section 12. that the proposed floodlighting will adversely affect the bats known to use this area, creating a "vacuum effect". Pleased see attached excerpt from: Threats to bats-Bat Conservation Trust. I have no expertise regarding bats, but often see them in summer/autumn evenings. I therefore ask if a bat survey has been carried out.

This proposed flood lighting is for a much longer time than that on the original planning proposal. Original proposal: 0800-2000 hrs, this proposal; 0630=2200hrs.This also cannot be considered to be "resubmission of the previously agreed scheme".

Further this light pollution will materially impact on our ability to view the night sky.

Additionally, I am concerned that nothing of the development of this practice area has ever been what it seemed

In the initial application for change of use of land & the new greenkeepers hut, the golf club acted in a gentlemanly way, inviting the affected residents to discuss the changes, at that time we were assured that no new buildings would be erected on land which change of use had been applied for,

indeed "site sketch 3, landscaping details 3030585P " is annotated "No new buildings will be erected on land for which change of use has been applied for."

At the same time the residents were told that a screen of trees would be planted along the side of the building. When this failed to materialise I contacted the golf club , and it was agreed that the existing hedge would be allowed to grow instead. I have a letter from the club stating this.
The hedge has now been removed. It was also stated that the area between the bungalows and the landscaping would be mowed twice a year, this has occurred once in 17 years. All of this leaves me disinclined to take anything to do with this development at face value.

A copy of this letter to be sent to Nigel Evans MP.

Yours faithfully

[redacted]

Bats are nocturnal animals that have adapted to a life in darkness, partly to avoid predation during daylight hours from bird of prey species such as sparrowhawks. Therefore the artificial lighting of bat roosts, access points and foraging pathways can be extremely disturbing to bats and should be avoided. Artificial light falling on or close to a bat roost can cause many problems for bats, by;

- **delaying or preventing emergence from roosts**, resulting in reduced foraging time and missing the peak time of insect abundance (just after dusk). As all bats in the UK feed on insects, this missed opportunity can have a serious impact on their survival and the growth rates of their young.
- in some cases lead to **bats abandoning or becoming entombed in the roost** when the entrance is lit up as bats will be less inclined to leave their roosts in these conditions. This is likely to be considered a breach of legislation as both bats and their roosts are protected by law.
- **affecting the feeding behaviour of bats away from the roost**. Slower flying species (lesser horseshoes, greater horseshoes and the 6 *Myotis* species) avoid illuminated areas and therefore lose foraging grounds if they are lit. This results in slower flying species having to use poorer quality foraging sites and losing out on prey, which are attracted to the surrounding lit areas, a so called **'vacuum effect'**.
- **affecting commuting and foraging routes,** which have been shown to be avoided if there is artificial light spill onto these areas.

Unfortunately these light-avoiding species include all of the UK's rarest bat species. However, even our faster flying species recorded more widely (noctule, Leisler's bat, serotine and pipistrelle species) can be impacted by artificial lighting. Some may opportunistically feed under certain streetlamps, as insects are frequently attracted to the short wave length light (UV) some emit, but this leaves them in danger of predation, peregrine falcons have been recorded hunting bats in our lit cities.

It is very important that bats are taken into account when considering the need to light an area if bats are known or suspected to use the area. There are a number of factors that will need to be considered under expert guidance, such as:

- Which species are present?
- How are they using the habitat – roosting, commuting, foraging?
- What are the existing light levels?

Please use the link below for research detailing the main principles of lighting guidance.

**Rebecca Bowers**

**From:** John Macholc
**Sent:** 09 April 2020 16:38
**To:** Rebecca Bowers
**Subject:** FW: Planning Application No : 3/2020/0142

**From:** Marshal Scott
**Sent:** 09 April 2020 16:36
**To:** John Macholc <John.Macholc@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
**Subject:** FW: Planning Application No : 3/2020/0142

John, please see below
Thanks
Marshal

**From:** [redacted]
**Sent:** 09 April 2020 16:29
**To:** Marshal Scott <Marshal.Scott@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
**Subject:** Fwd: Planning Application No : 3/2020/0142

EXTERNAL - This email originated from outside of Ribble Valley Borough Council . Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** [redacted]
**Date:** 7 April 2020 at 13:53:14 BST
**To:** cllr.david.birtwhistle@ribblevalley.gov.uk
**Subject: Fwd: Planning Application No : 3/2020/0142**

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** [redacted]>
**Date:** 6 April 2020 at 16:43:13 BST
**To:** planning@ribblevalley.gov.uk
**Subject: Planning Application No : 3/2020/0142**

Sent from my iPad

Whalley Road
Pendleton

Clitheroe
Lancs.
BB7 1PP

6 / 4 / 2020

Dear Sir / Madam

I wish to make objection to this planning application on the following grounds :-

1) The increased height of the structure from 2.5 mtrs to 3.3 mtrs at rear and 3.4 mtrs to 4.8mtrs at the front without consulting the appropriate authorities beforehand.

2)The increased height of the structure to the front of 1.4 mtrs means The so called "

low level lighting " will cause more light pollution to the surrounding area .

This leaves me to question the term "low level lighting " which will be installed approximately 5 mtrs above the ground . On a recent sortie around a couple of other local driving ranges ( before the lockdown I hasten to add ) I noticed that their " low level lighting " was installed low , ground level to be precise. Moving on I noticed that in the

application form submitted by the agent representing Clitheroe Golf Club, a Mr John Willcock of Willcock Consulting opening hours for the driving range would be 6.30 am

until 10 pm for assembly and leisure , seven days a week. A no no I do think.

3) As a very passionate lover of the countryside and its inhabitants ( to the point of being branded a " bit of a geek " by some ) I can't help but notice the decline in the wildlife population visiting this area . The deer which were regular visitors haven't been seen for sometime , the hares are less frequent, the barn owls seeking food to feed their chicks were enthralling but unfortunately they have moved on . This brings me on to the bats which frequently in the early to late summer at dusk would come from the roosts in Elbow Wood and fly around near to us seeking food . Was a bat survey carried out by the Golf Club and submitted before construction started, if not why was it when I was carrying out renovations to my home it was compulsory before I could commence work.

Will the "low level lighting " have any effect on the bats ? I wonder.

4)Three weeks ago I asked a local estate agent to visit and value my property also if the part built construction ( driving range shelter ) would have any detrimental effect on the value and its appeal to would be purchasers. Her opinion was the lower profile which should have been constructed would have been a more favourable proposition from both a selling and value point. She compared the present built structure to a part built agricultural unit,and then to use her own words " a bit of an eyesore . When I then told her it would be floodlit and operating seven days a week she shook her head and left.

5) Another concern is the question of what do the male participants do when they need the loo ----a) walk back to the clubhouse 300 mtrs away.

b) go in the bushes.

c) come over and use my fence.

This question I asked at a meeting I had with Case officer Rebecca Bowers and Mr John Mackolc back in October last year when the original planning application had been approved on the 10 vote rule ( which I still find quite mystifying , send 7 out but you got to get 10 back to be a winner ) . Anyway the answer was you will have get in touch with environmental health about that . !!

6) The creation of a new 3 mtr wide gravel access track --will this be solely for maintenance staff and not transporting people to the driving range therefore becoming a shuttle service ,eventually turning into a car parking area .

7) I feel that this retrospective planning application has been submitted at a very bad time given what is happening all around with the coronavirus outbreak, I hope this has not been done intentionally to throw a smokescreen under which the

planning application may pass unheeded. As for the explanations as to why the structure is in the wrong place/ wrong shape / wrong material /wrong height --I'm lost for words ,laughable, pitiful spring to mind . Then to the add in phrases "were meaning to tell you about this / regrettably forgot/ modestly increased / the club regrets /changes should have been addressed " I find pathetic. These are all afterthoughts after being caught out blatantly breaching planning legislation and that is why I fervently believe this planning application should be refused .

Yours faithfully in anticipation of the correct outcome

[redacted]

[redacted]y
Maizieres
Whalley Road
Pendleton
Clitheroe
Lancashire
BB7 1PP

12 April 2020

Dear Sir,

**Re: Objection to Planning application 3/2020/0142 (original approved plan 3/2019/0653)**

Prior to stating our objections, and respective justification and reasoning behind them, we wish to make it known that we are disgusted, appalled and have lost any respect in both Clitheroe Golf Club, the Planning Department and application process that has been allowed to continue during a state of national crisis and fatalities.
The application was **filed two days after the UK Government placed the whole country on a lockdown from the Coronavirus** to help protect the NHS and save lives. What Clitheroe Golf Club and Ribble Valley Borough Council (RVBC) have done in allowing the process to accept the application and allow any potential objection to be filed within the statutory 21 days is despicable to say the least. Right now the whole country, not just the residents in the bungalows adjacent to the proposed site, are incredibly worried for their health due to this virus, and the last thing on their mind is taking the time to write an objection to something such as this driving range when people are dying nationally and possibly locally !
We believe that this new planning application has been registered in the current climate on the premise that it would "go through and be resolved unhindered" without proper formal scrutiny, including any resident meetings or council meetings during the lockdown period.

**Objections / Justifications / Queries**

1. The original planning application 3/2019/0653 was formally approved by RVBC in September 2019. This was for the construction of a "timber" building with heights of 3.4m to the front and 2.5m to the rear. The "Steel" structure that commenced construction in October 2019 was approximately 3.5m to the rear and 5.0m to the front !
   In comparing this structure to another local Golf Academy, Prairie Fields in Burnley is a two-level Driving Range *(see attachment 1.1 & 1.2)*, the height of the bays are 2.7m lower level, and 2.5m upper level. Why do Clitheroe Golf Club then require 5.0m at the front for a single tier range ?

2. If work commenced in October 2019 and the planning application 3/2019/0653 with the lower heights had originally been approved in September, at what point were the Golf Club aware of the plans required in order construct the steel frame with the new dimensions, since a draughtsman would take several weeks to draw engineering plans, the steel framework would have had to be designed, ordered, manufactured and delivered in a very short space of time, which I find hard to believe. Can we see the date the order was placed for the steel structure ?

3. In section 2.1 of the 20_0142 Statement it states that the new planning application 3/2020/0142 sets out to accommodate a growing and taller golfing population and to "future proof" the construction by making it higher.

- Why then is the height of the driving bays at Prairie Fields *(see 1.1 – Prairie Fields Dimensions)*, for example, adequate at 2.5m at the front and not 5.0m ?
- Are all the tall people expected to play at Clitheroe ?
- Are the people of Burnley and the areas Prairie Field serves expect to only see average or below average height people in the future ?

4. In section 2.3 of the 20_0142 Statement it states that the new planning application 3/2020/0142 states the stance and ball position may make the golfer "creep" towards the rear of the bay, necessitating a greater height.

    - The height of the driving bays at Prairie Fields *(see 1.1 – Prairie Fields Dimensions)* is adequate at 2.5m. The new height at the rear of the bay on application 3/2020/0142 is 3.8m, 1.3m more than Prairie Fields, at the rear, which could accommodate even the tallest of golfers even if they stood up against the rear wall, let alone creep back further !

5. Sections 2.5 & 2.6 of the 20_0142 Statement state that the footprint and position of the structure has changed in comparison to the original approved planning application. Given the footprint is of the same shape as that of Prairie Fields, this is probably an acceptable footprint. However, in comparison the bays at Prairie Fields accommodate 2 bays in a 5.35m space, giving a 26.75m x 4.018m (inc the walkway behind each bay).

    - Why does application 3/2020/0142 require 35.2m and a 6.0m base width ? Are we to assume that not only are the golfers taller at Clitheroe, but they swing differently to necessitate a further 2.0m stretch !
    - Why do the bays need to be almost a metre wider than other Driving Ranges ?

6. Section 2.8 of the 20_0142 Statement states that the Swing Room has been increased in size to 9.0m by 5.5m. If you look at the approved plans for the Swing Room at High Leigh Golf Club, Mere, the size of the approved swing room is 3.7m x 3.7m by 3.0m high *(see 1.3 – High Leigh Golf Club Swing Room)*.
    - Why do Clitheroe require one 9.0m x 5.5m by 5.0m high ? Are we to assume the taller generation, again ? Are we to also assume that these golfers may not only be extremely tall, but also be obese, given the width of the room ?

7. Section 2.13 of the 20_0142 Statement addresses the issue of the original approved planning application 3/2019/0653 having to have wider timber posts and thus reducing the bay width. Subsequently the steel structure allegedly alleviates this.
    - Prairie Fields driving bays are 2.675m wide per bay *(see 1.2 – Prairie Fields Floorplan)*. Under the new application 3/2020/0142 the bays are 3.52m on average (3.62 on the approved 3/2019/0653 plan). Should the original approved plan this meant that increasing the timber posts would have narrowed each bay to 3.5m, which is even 0.875m wider than the bays at Prairie Fields assuming the 100mm increase was at each side of each bay !

8. As stated in our earlier letter of objection in respect of the flood lighting it is still being planned to be mounted on the roof of the Driving Range structure. Why cannot the use of Low-Level lighting, i.e. Ground level, be used as other clubs use ? How can you say that floodlights mounted 5.0m above ground is low level ?

9. Either the first, and approved planning application 3/2019/0653 or indeed the new application 3/2020/0142 do not include an Ecology and Bat Survey report, which incidentally is a specific Planning Application validation criteria on the Ribble Valley Borough Council's own Planning Department Website at

https://www.ribblevalley.gov.uk/info/200361/planning_applications/1420/protected_species

- One element of the criteria is "Floodlighting", which if mounted to the roof line would surely attract bats, and since they will be launching golf balls into the air, would this not endanger bats and other wildlife ?
- Why could the use of BERM Lighting not be used, as this would provide a more acceptable level and use of lighting, see attached report *1.4 – High Leigh Floodlighting*

10. The opening times on the original application 3/2019/0653 stated that the range would be open from 8.00am until 8.00pm 7 days a week. The new application clearly states 6.30am until 10.00pm 7 days a week.
    - We find this change of opening time a complete disregard for the privacy of residents in the immediate vicinity of the Driving Range. This will create noise and light pollution at both ends of the day when they are either sleeping or relaxing. The times of operation at High Leigh Golf Driving Range are, as quoted from the approved planning application, " *The hours of operation of the driving range hereby approved shall be limited to 9am to 9pm hours on Monday to Friday, 10am to 7pm on Saturday and 10am to 7pm on Sundays or Public Holidays. Reason: In the interests of neighbouring occupiers amenity having regard to the location of the site in accordance with policy DC3 of the Macclesfield Borough Local Plan 2004.* "

11. Finally, the "10 person/objection rule" which RVBC continually seem to purport as being a legal part of the planning application process whereby any application decision will be left to the discretion of the respective planning officer's judgement WITHOUT any need for a council meeting or formal review.
    - To be perfectly honest, we do not know of any other council, let alone any formal legal requirement for a minimum of 10 objections to force any form of scrutiny on a planning application. It makes a total farce of the planning system and the people who administer it, especially when there are only 7 properties in the immediate vicinity of the proposed structure. This is either a flaw that has been overlooked and needs to be addressed, or it is a policy created to "fit" requirements.

In retrospect, we find it very difficult to believe how plans can be approved in September, Construction commenced in October and the Structure erected being made of completely different materials, and 1.5x the original approved dimensions.
In the closing Summary section of 20_0142 Statement, the new planning application is said to be fundamentally the same as the approved application 3/2019/0653; something which I believe is simply an insult to people's intelligence.

Given all the points above, we would expect, at the very least, for the current structure to be taken down and re-constructed to the approved plans (the change of materials to steel would be acceptable but made to the dimensions that have been approved), which are not too dissimilar from other Golf Clubs and Academy's, such as Prairie Fields and High Leigh Golf Club, which incidentally is a significant distance from any nearby properties and their range is far more acceptable !
We would expect the operational hours and light usage times to follow something similar or the same as that of High Leigh Golf Club, utilising the use of BERM lighting, not floodlights.

Finally, this Letter of Objection and indeed all attachments and correspondence, will be forwarded to the **Local Government Ombudsman (LGO)** (should the construction go ahead as planned), and the local Member of Parliament for the Ribble Valley, **Mr Nigel Evans**. Further, whilst we appreciate this

is something the LGO may not immediately be available to investigate under the current situation with Coronavirus affecting everyone in the UK we would expect an investigation into the Planning Process and the enforcement process and actions taken after the blatant breach of planning consent. The whole process from start to finish we would suggest, is nothing short of shambolic at best, and disgusting at least.

Yours faithfully,

[redacted] [redacted]

***Attachments***

*1.1 – Prairie Fields Dimensions*
*1.2 – Prairie Fields Floorplan*
*1.3 – High Leigh Golf Club Swing Room*
*1.4 – High Leigh Floodlighting*
*1.5 – Email from Andy Glover (RVBC)*

[redacted]

Planning Application No : 3/2020/0142
6 Apr 2020, 16:43:13
planning@ribblevalley.gov.uk

RECEIVED BY
CHIEF EXECUTIVE

15 APR 2020

| FAO | |
|---|---|

Sent from my iPad

ELHANON

Whalley Road
Pendleton
Clitheroe
Lancs.
BB7 1PP

| PLANNING |
|---|
| 15 APR 2020 |
| FOR THE ATTENTION OF |

6 / 4 / 2020

Dear Sir / Madam

I wish to make objection to this planning application on the following grounds :-

1) The increased height of the structure from 2.5 mtrs to 3.3 mtrs at rear and 3.4 mtrs to 4.8mtrs at the front without consulting the appropriate authorities beforehand.

2)The increased height of the structure to the front of 1.4 mtrs means The so called "
low level lighting " will cause more light pollution to the surrounding area . This leaves me to question the term "low level lighting " which will be installed approximately 5 mtrs above the ground . On a recent sortie around a couple of other local driving ranges ( before the lockdown I hasten to add ) I noticed that their " low level lighting " was installed low , ground level to be precise. Moving on I noticed that in the application form submitted by the agent representing Clitheroe Golf Club, a Mr John Willcock of Willcock Consulting opening hours for the driving range would be 6.30 am
until 10 pm for assembly and leisure , seven days a week. A no no I do think.

3) As a very passionate lover of the countryside and its inhabitants ( to the point of being branded a " bit of a geek " by some ) I can't help but notice

[redacted]

the decline in the wildlife population visiting this area . The deer which were regular visitors haven't been seen for sometime , the hares are less frequent, the barn owls seeking food to feed their chicks were enthralling but unfortunately they have moved on . This brings me on to the bats which frequently in the early to late summer at dusk would come from the roosts in Elbow Wood and fly around near to us seeking food . Was a bat survey carried out by the Golf Club and submitted before construction started, if not why was it when I was carrying out renovations to my home it was compulsory before I could commence work.

Will the "low level lighting " have any effect on the bats ? I wonder.

4)Three weeks ago I asked a local estate agent to visit and value my property also if the part built construction ( driving range shelter ) would have any detrimental effect on the value and its appeal to would be purchasers. Her opinion was the lower profile which should have been constructed would have been a more favourable proposition from both a selling and value point. She compared the present built structure to a part built agricultural unit,and then to use her own words " a bit of an eyesore . When I then told her it would be floodlit and operating seven days a week she shook her head and left.

5) Another concern is the question of what do the male participants do when they need the loo ----a) walk back to the clubhouse 300 mtrs away.

b) go in the bushes.

c) come over and use my fence.

This question I asked at a meeting I had with Case officer Rebecca Bowers and Mr John Mackolc back in October last year when the original planning application had been approved on the 10 vote rule ( which I still find quite mystifying , send 7 out but you got to get 10 back to be a winner ) . Anyway the answer was you will have get in touch with environmental health about that . !!

6) The creation of a new 3 mtr wide gravel access track --will this be solely for maintenance staff and not transporting people to the driving

range therefore becoming a shuttle service ,eventually turning into a car parking area .

7) I feel that this retrospective planning application has been submitted at a very bad time given what is happening all around with the coronavirus outbreak, I hope this has not been done intentionally to throw a smokescreen under which the planning application may pass unheeded. As for the explanations as to why the structure is in the wrong place/ wrong shape / wrong material /wrong height --I'm lost for words ,laughable, pitiful spring to mind . Then to the add in phrases "were meaning to tell you about this / regrettably forgot/ modestly increased / the club regrets /changes should have been addressed " I find pathetic. These are all afterthoughts after being caught out blatantly breaching planning legislation and that is why I fervently believe this planning application should be refused .

Yours faithfully in anticipation of the correct outcome

[redacted]

RB

Ribble Valley Council
Council Offices
Church Walk
Clitheroe
BB7 2RA

9 April 2020

Dear Sir / Madam

**Planning Application** **3/2020/0142**
**Clitheroe Golf Club**

We are objecting to the planning application above:-

1) The increased height of the structure from 2.5 mtrs to 3.3 mtrs at rear and 3.4 mtrs to 4.8mtrs at the front without consulting the appropriate authorities beforehand. They have built bigger that the original plans which were approved, it should be taken back down to that size.

2 ) The increased height of the structure to the front of 1.4 mtrs means The so called " low level lighting " will cause more light pollution to the surrounding area .
This leaves me to question the term "low level lighting " which will be installed approximately 5 mtrs above the ground .

2) Driving range would be 6.30 am until 10 pm for assembly and leisure , seven days a week. You have extended these hours since the last application. These should be reduced.

3) Concerned about the wildlife has a bat survey been done?

4) The creation of a new 3 mtr wide gravel access track --will this be solely for maintenance staff and not transporting people to the driving range therefore becoming a shuttle service, eventually turning into a car parking area .

Yours sincerely

[redacted]

[redacted]
Inglewood
Whalley Road
Pendleton
Clitheroe
Lancashire
BB7 1PP

12 April 2020

Dear Sir,

**Re: Objection to Planning application 3/2020/0142**

Firstly, I am a [redacted] who does not have access to electronic means of communication and owing to the current situation with the virus I have asked one of my neighbours to email a letter I have written for them to send.
I would like to make a formal objection to the new planning application that has been registered on the 25th March 2020, two days after the country was placed on a lockdown.

I believe that this new planning application has been registered in the current climate on the premise that it would be passed without proper formal scrutiny, including any resident meetings or council meetings during the lockdown period.

The original planning application was formally approved by RVBC in September 2019. This was for the construction of a "timber" building that appears to be a lot lower than the "Steel" structure that commenced construction in October 2019. Why has the higher structure been allowed to be built ?
At what point were the Golf Club aware of the plans required in order construct the steel frame with the new dimensions ?

As stated in my earlier letter of objection in respect of the flood lighting it is still being planned to be mounted on the roof of the Driving Range structure. Why cannot the use of Low-Level lighting, i.e. Ground level, be used as other clubs use ? How can you say that floodlights mounted 5.0m above ground is low level ?

It is my understanding that neither of the applications include a Bat Survey report, surely one would be required as part of the application ?

The opening times on the original application stated that the range would be open from 8.00am until 8.00pm 7 days a week. The new application clearly states 6.30am until 10.00pm 7 days a week.

I find this change of opening time a complete disregard for the privacy of residents in the immediate vicinity of the Driving Range. This will create noise and light pollution at both ends of the day when they are either sleeping or relaxing. The times of operation should be in accordance with what has already been approved and not changed.

Given all the points above, I would expect, at the very least, for the current structure to be taken down and re-constructed to the approved plans but possibly in steel instead of wood, to the dimensions that have been approved
I would also expect the operational hours and light usage times to remain as previously approved or possibly reduce them at weekend ?

Yours faithfully,

[redacted]

**Nicola Gunn**

**From:** [redacted]
**Sent:** 10 April 2020 11:34
**To:** planning
**Subject:** Planning Application 3/2020/0142



To Whom it May Concern,

I wish to object to planning application 3/2020/0142 on the following grounds:

1. The original application was for a wooden building and has now been changed to a metal building. This is not in keeping with the surrounding landscape and is less aesthetically pleasing.

2. The size of the New application is considerably larger both in height and width.

3. The low level lighting is in fact no longer low level and I feel the installation of the floodlights will have a detrimental effect on the local wildlife

4. The proposed opening times of 6am to 10pm will cause additional noise disturbance to the surrounding properties.

Yours in anticipation of a sensible outcome.

[redacted]n
19 Old Row
Barrow
BB7 9AZ

**Nicola Gunn**

**From:** [redacted]>
**Sent:** 10 April 2020 11:37
**To:** planning
**Subject:** Planning Application 3/2020/0142



To Whom it May Concern,

I wish to object to planning application 3/2020/0142 on the following grounds:

1. The original application was for a wooden building and has now been changed to a metal building. This is not in keeping with the surrounding landscape and is less aesthetically pleasing.

2. The size of the New application is considerably larger both in height and width.

3. The low level lighting is in fact no longer low level and I feel the installation of the floodlights will have a detrimental effect on the local wildlife

4. The proposed opening times of 6am to 10pm will cause additional noise disturbance to the surrounding properties.

Yours in anticipation of a sensible outcome.

[redacted]
4 Birch View
Barrow
BB7 9BB

Bradmore,
Whalley road,
Pendleton.
BB7 1PP.
12/04/2020
Application 3/2020/0142

Clitheroe Golf Club Whalley Road Barrow
BB7 1PP
Ward : WISWELL AND PENDLETON
Parish : Pendleton

Dear Sir/Madam,

Clitheroe Golf Club has submitted a retrospective planning application for a Driving Range building.

I must comment on the impact that this application will have:

- Local residents will be significantly impacted by the intrusive lights as we sit outside and the increase of noise that will travel during those long summer evenings.
- Whalley road has already been the location of too many serious accidents and deaths, this additional service to the already busy golf club will necessitate an increase in traffic, (if is not the case why are they building it, how will they get a financial return). We already struggle greatly to turn out of our drive.
- The fields to the rear to our properties are a natural space for many animals, resident and transient, deer commute through the fields to the safety of woodland cover (and a beautiful sight it is); bats are residents also and can be seen darting around in the evening, owls hunt along the field edges. I feel I need to be the voice for all these animal residents. This application will cause a further imbalance on nature and we will lose them through light and noise pollution and additional traffic.

Over the last few years Clitheroe and Barrow have developed greatly, people naturally want to move to this great location to live, however we still need local places to walk and to view animals in their natural surroundings for both our physical and mental wellbeing. Pendleton parish provides the natural spaces which in turn offer wellbeing to its peripheral community.

Regards

[redacted]k.

**Nicola Gunn**

**From:** [redacted]
**Sent:** 13 April 2020 12:38
**To:** planning
**Subject:** Planning application No. 3/2020/0142 - Objections



Dear Sir / Madam,

I am sending this email as my objection to planning application number: 3/2020/0142 on the following grounds:

1. The location of the building they have started to erect is not in line with the planning application, it is in the wrong location.

2. The shape and dimensions of the construction do not match the planning application.

3. In the same fashion, the materials they are using are not in line with the above planning application.

4. The height of the started works has increased the height of the rear from 2.5m to 3.3m and the front has been increased from 3.4m to 4.8m. There has been no consultation for these changes.

5. The original planning application allowed for opening times of 8am to 8pm. This has now been amended to 6.30am to 10pm 7 days a week which has not been consulted on.

Taking all of these items into consideration I strongly believe this planning application should be refused.

My contact details are:

[redacted]
Barrow Gardens Farm (opposite Clitheroe Golf Club)
Whalley Road
Barrow
BB7 9BD
[redacted]

Please acknowledge receipt of this objection.

Regards,

[redacted]n

**Sharon Craig**

**From:** [redacted]
**Sent:** 15 April 2020 14:41
**To:** planning
**Cc:** cllr.davidbirtwhistle@ribblevalley.gov.uk
**Subject:** Planning Application 3/2020/0142



To whom this may concern. I have been made aware of an application to amend the afore mentioned application. The project in hand is an eyesore in a residential area, and the changes to the plan make it even more so. These changes will be an intrusion into the lives of the residents immediately adjacent to the development, not to mention the disruption to the wildlife population, of which there is an abundance in the area. This building is agricultural in nature and not in keeping with a residential outlook.
At the end of the day I am of the opinion that this application should not be allowed to be passed.
Sincerely Kieran Taylor.
--I
Sent from Yahooail App for Android

RB

## Nicola Gunn

**From:** [redacted]
**Sent:** 14 April 2020 14:53
**To:** planning
**Subject:** Driving Range Clitheroe Golf Club. Application no 3/2020/0142.



I would like to put forward my objection to this agreed to application.
The originally planned wooden structure is now a metal framed cladded build. The overall height as been increased with the excuse of people now being "taller"!!
These alterations were implemented without any input or consideration to the residents of this locality.
Metal frame will create a lot more noise for the local residents.
The additional height will make a larger blot on our Ribble Valley than what you previous agreed upon.
I also understand that this hobby centre will apply to be in operation between 6am til 10pm
Do the residents matter?
your James Grogan.

RB

**Nicola Gunn**

**From:** [redacted]
**Sent:** 15 April 2020 14:04
**To:** planning
**Subject:** Planning application No. 3/2020/0142 - Objections

EXTERNAL - This email originated from outside of Ribble Valley Borough Council . Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Sir / Madam,

I am sending this email as my objection to planning application number: 3/2020/0142 on the following grounds:

1. The location of the building they have started to erect is not in line with the planning application, it is in the wrong location.

2. The shape and dimensions of the construction do not match the planning application.

3. In the same fashion, the materials they are using are not in line with the above planning application.

4. The height of the started works has increased the height of the rear from 2.5m to 3.3m and the front has been increased from 3.4m to 4.8m. There has been no consultation for these changes.

5. The original planning application allowed for opening times of 8am to 8pm. This has now been amended to 6.30am to 10pm 7 days a week which has not been consulted on.

Taking all of these items into consideration I strongly believe this planning application should be refused.

My contact details are:

[redacted]n
The Barn Barrow Gardens Farm (opposite Clitheroe Golf Club)
Whalley Road
Clitheroe
BB7 9BD

[redacted]

Please confirm receipt via email

Regards
[redacted]

Get Outlook for Android