

PLANNING

10 MAR 2022

FOR THE
ATTENTION OF

7 March 2022

Dear Sirs

Objection to Planning Application - 3/2022/0144 – Proposed erection of a random stone single residential dwelling within the rear curtilage of Pimlico House

We are the owners

We wish to object to the proposal on the following grounds.

Firstly, I would like to address the introductory paragraph of the Planning Statement which is over dramatic and not entirely correct. The building was not a coach depot as such but a large, corrugated iron shed which was mainly used for storage and for the maintenance of the commercial vehicles owned by [REDACTED]. The large coaches used by [REDACTED] would not fit within this shed and were parked in the yard area. The shed did, [REDACTED] house a small flat back wagon used for the transportation of wool. The building was demolished after a fire because it was unsafe not because of it falling into a derelict state. The shed was actually pulled down quite quickly after the fire. There was no detriment to those working in the area because there was only one person, the owner of the then [REDACTED] whose business closed after the fire. [REDACTED] in the storage shed and that added to the ferocity of the blaze.

The Application is made in the name of [REDACTED] residing at [REDACTED]. This is not true. [REDACTED] is owned and occupied by [REDACTED]. I have spoken with [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] is not the applicant. Therefore this application is misleading.

Previous applications in the last 6 months by [REDACTED] for this site have been refused and I have listed these for ease of reference below:

Planning application 3/2021/0857 was refused on two points:

1. The proposed building is incongruous and conspicuous and harmful to the setting (and views into) of Gisburn Conservation Area and the setting of listed buildings because of its overtly modern and utilitarian form and its materials. This is contrary to Ribble Valley Core Strategy Key Statement EN5 and Policy DME4 and DMG1.

2. The proposed building has a harmful impact on the residential amenities of 1 Stable Close in respect to overshadowing, overbearing and overlooking impacts. This is contrary to Ribble Valley Core Strategy Policy DMG1.

Planning Application 3/2021/1098 was refused on the following point:

1. The proposed building is unduly prominent, incongruous, and conspicuous and harmful to the setting (and views into) of Gisburn Conservation Area and the setting of listed buildings because of its size and overtly modern and utilitarian form. This is contrary to Ribble Valley Core Strategy Key Statement ENS and Policy DME4 and DMG1.

We believe that this new application, which although under a different named applicant, uses the same re-hashed planning statement and site plan as previously presented by [REDACTED] and should be refused on the grounds of point 2 in planning application 3/2021/0857 whilst considering point 1 of planning application 3/2021/1098. The proposal appears to be the previously refused commercial unit with windows! The retail unit on the site is a listed building within the Gisburn conservation area and this proposed development would be to the detriment of that listed building and the conservation area due to its proximity.

Location and site plan make no sense and do not even indicate the housing development of Stable Close which was built in 1984 and comprises of 7 houses, a barn conversion, and a cottage which makes the plans misleading. The yard area mentioned in the planning statement is currently used as parking and a turning area for the [REDACTED] business and the proposed area is not in fact the area to the rear of Pimlico Barn [REDACTED]. The structure which formed part of [REDACTED] burned down in late 2009. The structure which burned down was in fact part of a furniture showroom [REDACTED] and was used for storage. The closeness of this building to [REDACTED] meant that during the fire extensive damage was caused to [REDACTED] for which [REDACTED] from the owner of the site at that time. So you will understand our concerns about the [REDACTED] once again. There has been no structure on the site since 2009 following the fire and no bus depot since the [REDACTED] prior to 2007.

The applicant would now appear to be trying for a residential building but this does not address our concerns of loss of amenity.

When [REDACTED] had a building on the site it was a single storey building. This Proposal is for a two storey building. This building will take [REDACTED] and will remove [REDACTED]. There will also be an [REDACTED]. We have always enjoyed a [REDACTED]. What is being proposed is a [REDACTED] large stone building. This removes the amenity of view and light which [REDACTED]. There has never been a two storey building on this site. The proximity of this overbearing gable end to the [REDACTED] is an obvious concern to us. We will literally be [REDACTED] stone corridor. Hence, coming out of [REDACTED] stone gable end of two storey house which has not existed before [REDACTED]. This causes a loss of this amenity.

The proposed structure will take away parking and turning for the [REDACTED] business. Where will deliveries to [REDACTED] business be unloaded? Where will their customers park? We would envisage large delivery vans either using Mill Lane as turning or parking. There is very limited parking on Mill Lane. This has been a concern and requirement of previous planning permissions. The proposed dwelling takes away the facility for turning within the curtilage of the retail unit and I believe this was a requirement of the original planning consent. The development is next to the junction with the A59 which would be dangerous to either reverse out onto Mill Lane into traffic or to reverse into the site on the junction with the A59.

At what depth will the foundations of the new property need to be dug? We have concerns about the stability and proximity to [REDACTED]. The plans do not address the [REDACTED]. The new structure is to be made of "stone" and will therefore require deeper footings. The previous structure was built around "posts" to which cladding was added there were no foundations as such. This can easily be seen on site. The site has a dirt floor.

There is no facility for the disposal of sewage from the site – Currently the [REDACTED] business only has a porta loo for use as a toilet facility. What about surface water run off? [REDACTED] has a concrete yard which already stands deep in water when it rains heavily. A further building on the site will take away the ability for rainwater to drain into the ground slowly.

In the application there is a point relating to contamination on site and states that there is no contamination, I would disagree. As you can see from the planning statement the site was used to store commercial vehicles, has a now covered over inspection pit and had a large diesel tank located at the front. I would imagine that years of "dropping oil" from commercial vehicles and "dieseling up" would have contaminated the site. Also following the burning down of the building there was no clear up of the site. The building was also used to store oil drums [REDACTED] the ferocity of the fire. I do not believe that a survey of the site to assess contamination risk has taken place.

It would appear to us that [REDACTED] who owns the site is more concerned with [REDACTED] than the well being of the people who already live in this part of Gisburn with no thought into the impact of [REDACTED] proposals. It is not necessary to "in fill" this site which will be to the detriment of [REDACTED]. The house will have little outside space and inadequate parking. It will be "unduly" prominent to [REDACTED] and will take away light and the amenity of rural views there has never been a two storey building on this site.

In line with our comments above we wish to re-object to the proposal as it stands.

Yours faithfully

[REDACTED]