

**From:** Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 04 March 2023 13:14  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Application Comments - 3/2021/0660 FS-Case-493381529

**Planning Application Reference No.:** 3/2021/0660

**Address of Development:** Bowland and Marl Hill Tunnels

**Comments:** I understand the need for United Utilities (UU) to undertake the HARP project, however I do not believe the current form is the most appropriate in this day and age. The current tunnel was built between 1935 and 1955 prior to the area being designated an AONB in 1964. Surely progress made since should mean that, in this day and age, another tunnel should not need to be built but rather repair or utilise the current tunnel.

My objection to the current format of the project is the huge effect it will have on the ANOB landscape and the effect it will have on the population and the habitat and wild life of the area. My opinion is if the current proposal goes ahead Ribble Valley will lose part of its ANOB. This will result in loss of tourism for the area and this will affect livelihoods throughout the whole of the Ribble Valley, not just Newton in Bowland.

The proposed Haul road from just outside Newton in Bowland to the work site will be a huge blot on the landscape in itself whilst ensuring 'reasonable' access for HGVs over the Fell Road will involve the destruction of walls and trees, loss of wild life and will result in a completely changed landscape.

A vast majority of houses in Newton in Bowland are grade 2 listed and have to jump through hoop after hoop with the planning authority to maintain their properties, so how the current proposals could even be given a thought re planning consent seems ludicrous. We are also part of the Dark Skies area which once again will be lost if the current format goes ahead.

It is only in the last few days that I and a number of villagers have been made aware of S177 of the Planning Act and how it relates to an AONB. We now understand the position, the default planning decision for such a project in an AONB should be to rejected. The requirements of S177 do not appear to have been met by UU in a number of important ways, including detailed reasons why alternative ways of undertaking the project are unsuitable.

Also under the current proposals, there will be over 100 HGVs going over the fell road every day which will cause a huge increase in pollution, the complete opposite to National policy on transportation. I am sure climate change campaigners would love to know what is being proposed. My thoughts are in the 21st century there must be alternative ways of undertaking such a project without giving rise to such unacceptable consequences.

The residents of Newton in Bowland do not have any shops or facilities and the nearest large town is Clitheroe, so this project will affect us tremendously as the normal way for us to get into Clitheroe is via the same road as the 100 HGVs.

Also, on a side thought our house prices will drop and probably be unsalable.

UU say that this option is the only one available and they have looked at different ways of getting this project

completed but when asked for the different proposals we were informed that this is the proposal and would not tell us the other options.

Every single consequence discussed above is caused by UU's current proposals. It is this that makes the project extremely undesirable as proposed and it is this that I believe should be challenged by RVBC under S177 and rejected for now.