

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 15 February 2023 16:06
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2021/0660 FS-Case-487503741

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2021/0660

Address of Development: Newton in Bowland

Comments: This Application has not provided evidence of why other, more sustainable, options are not possible. Therefore the Applicant has not demonstrated that the scheme is in the public interest.

A fundamental aspect of this application is the stated need to build a new tunnel through the Bowland hills and the absence of other more suitable options, in order to address the water supply obligations of United Utilities.

The Applicant seems to accept this point and the Design and Access statement describes the other options possible and how an Option Appraisal exercise which was carried out in 2017 / 2018. The Applicant also seems to be at pains to mention in their Application, that they consulted widely about the different options in accordance with RVBC's Planning Policy requirements ref. Design and Access Statement paragraph nos. 40 and 424). However no evidence of this consultation is provided.

Evidence of the adequacy of this consultation (at the Options Appraisal stage) and the proper consideration of other options which do not require this scale of development within an AONB seem to me, to be fundamental for the consideration of this Application and a prerequisite for establishing that the specific develop option proposed, is in the public interest.

From:
Sent:
To:
Subject:

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, February 16, 2023 2:17 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: HARP/UU AND THE EFFECT ON MY LIFE

 External Email

This email originated from outside Ribble Valley Borough Council. Do NOT click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and are sure the content within this email is safe.

Good morning

HARP/UNITED UTILITIES.....PLANNING REF: 3/2021/0660/0661

I am writing yet again to explain the awful effect this construction work will have on my property and its value, my way of life and most importantly my physical health and mental well-being.

My husband and I got involved with your webinars held a year or so ago with alleged employees of United Utilities/HARP trying to reassure us that we would hardly notice any work going on. Someone even rang us to tell us the same thing until I gave him our address and [REDACTED] and were [REDACTED] So I invited him and his CEO [REDACTED] and decide for themselves whether or not we will be affected. Needless to say this invitation up to now has been ignored but still stands.

How am I going to be affected ? The list again is long and ever changing as new concerns come up.

Up to over 300 trundling lorries and vehicles a day for 8-10 YEARS rumbling and vibrating past your house. Would you or the CEO of UU find this acceptable? I don't think so!

This will churn up roads. Kill wildlife. Affect emergency services. Is the company going to accept responsibility if god forbid something dire happens and ambulances, fire engines etc cannot get to them? Bear in mind also the fact that

all this potentially dangerous work will create more opportunities for injuries, traffic incidents etc. The B6478 is a fast road and many impatient drivers may want to overtake dangerously.

It will affect deliveries...both postal and shopping. Companies may even refuse to deliver to us completely. I am not [REDACTED] and do the majority of my shopping online.

This will add hours onto our journeys providing we can hopefully get out of our property in the first place. It will create noise and vibration. We will have to take photos of our land and property on a weekly basis to log and ensure no damage is being done. Stop us from enjoying going outside into our lovely garden re noise and dust from the lorries.

There will be more insect infestations as they too are displaced.

The work is going to be practically constant apart from one and a half days a week.

Apparently the work will also be going on through the night with lights on which will destroy the lovely "dark skies" of this area. [REDACTED] this is particularly distressing. This will also affect our sleep patterns and god knows we are already losing sleep worrying about all of this!

There are still many, many more reasons why this affects us. Unfortunately we are not so naive as to think this dreadful set of events will not go ahead. So then we have to address the question of compensation that UU/HARP are going to be offering to concerned residents like me and it will need to be considerable because as far as I am concerned this company will be endangering my and a lot of other people's health with this unrelentless, constant aggressive work.

Regards

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 16 February 2023 15:26
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - HARP Tunnel Planning Application - 3/2021/0660
FS-Case-487842219

Planning Application Reference No.: HARP Tunnel Planning Application - 3/2021/0660

Address of Development: Newton in Bowland

Comments: The National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 177 states:

When considering applications for development within National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, permission should be refused for major development other than in exceptional circumstances, and where it can be demonstrated that the development is in the public interest. Consideration of such applications should include an assessment of:

- a) the need for the development, including in terms of any national considerations, and the impact of permitting it, or refusing it, upon the local economy
- b) the cost of, and scope for, developing outside the designated area, or meeting the need for it in some other way; and
- c) any detrimental effect on the environment, the landscape and recreational opportunities, and the extent to which that could be moderated.

In respect of paragraph 177 c) and the words “the extent to which that could be moderated”, I would offer the following:

1. The detrimental effect on the environment could be moderated by adopting a more innovative project solution. To date, we have not been assured comprehensively, that all tunnel refurbishment options have been exhausted. That is to get the desired project outcome but without the need for a new tunnel and of consequence all the “muck shifting” and environmental damage that that would entail. For example, the existing water supply from the Hawswater Aqueduct could be diverted into the River Lune at Kirkby Lonsdale and be transferred within the river and be abstracted at the existing intake works just upstream of Lancaster, into the Lune/Wyre transfer aqueduct and then into the existing treatment and supply network. Using this option, water could remain flowing at the same time as the existing Hawswater Aqueduct could be refurbished. That way money could be saved by not building a new tunnel, and local impact and disruption to the environment and the community could be reduced enormously.
2. If all tunnel refurbishment options are to be ruled out for substantive reasons, then “muck shifting” operation options must prioritise on least disruption to the highways and the surrounding environment and community. Such a prioritised solution must start with a conveyor belt system from the new tunnel outlet to the tip. This method would have the added advantage of exercising close control over environmental impact; there would be less noise pollution, no road transportation of waste thus eliminating the pollution and dead weight of two hundred vehicles movements per day.
3. I assume that the tunnelling compound will need a sewerage system to manage the wastewater created by the works and from the labour force. I assume the compound will need to treat the wastewater. Could there be a permanent upgrade to Newton Sewage Treatment Works close by, to take the additional load and consequentially

improve the discharge to the river forever? That way, a valuable legacy could be left to the Hodder.

4. Clearly, there are many operational constraints that must be imposed on operational activities so as to minimise day to day impacts on the environment and the community – protection against noise and light pollution, adverse impact on tourist activities, and emergency services must be maintained.

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 16 February 2023 11:01
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2021/0660 FS-Case-487705979

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2021/0660

Address of Development: Forest of Bowland AONB
Newton in Bowland

Comments: I do not believe that the requirements of The National Planning Policy Framework have been complied with for this application in that:

When considering applications for development within National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, permission should be refused for major development other than in exceptional circumstances, and where it can be demonstrated that the development is in the public interest. Consideration of such applications should include an assessment of:

I believe the language adopted throughout this process does not suggest that an assumption of refusal position has been adopted and that exceptional circumstances or overwhelming public interest have been proved.

a) the need for the development, including in terms of any national considerations, and the impact of permitting it, or refusing it, upon the local economy;

The impact on the local economy has not been fully assessed as there has been a lack of public consultation and information gathering. Farming, hospitality, recreation and tourism are key to the economic security of people in the locality and all of these will be severely impacted.

b) the cost of, and scope for, developing outside the designated area, or meeting the need for it in some other way; and

The alternatives to this scheme and the rationale for selecting this option have never been subject to independent scrutiny.

c) any detrimental effect on the environment, the landscape and recreational opportunities, and the extent to which that could be moderated.

This scheme will have a huge detrimental effect on the environment for which there is very little effective mitigation. The landscape will be altered irrevocably by the destruction of ancient trees, hedgerows and stone walls. Promised reinstatement does not moderate this damage. Enjoyment of the countryside surrounding Newton in Bowland is a key recreational resource for both local people and visitors and is acknowledged as vital to well-being and mental health.

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1005759/NPP_F_July_2021.pdf