

From: clerk@ribchesterparishcouncil.org.uk
Sent: 03 May 2022 16:15
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application 3/2022/0271 Variation of Condition 2 and Removal of Condition 9 of planning application 3/2022/0595

 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.

FAO – Stephen Kilmartin

Ribchester Parish Council has considered, in detail, the above application and has tried its best to understand the reasons for the variations in conditions as they relate to the original application and the reason for it finally being granted approval on appeal. As you may be aware, this whole project to place a Heliciculture business with log cabin accommodation on the edge of Ribchester has caused the utmost consternation - in terms of possible impact on flooding, appropriateness of the development, and other negative connotations - to the residents of Ribchester (and most especially those living in close proximity to the land which is to be so developed).

All the grounds for objection were over-ruled/dismissed when the Application finally went to Appeal last September. Although it did nothing to assuage the deeply felt concerns when the members of the Planning Committee that day declared in public that they gave their decision to allow the appeal with a 'very heavy heart'. This has left the residents of Ribchester with an increased feeling of consternation that this development will go ahead no matter what reasonable challenges may be raised in respect of its appropriateness and 'fit' with the history, geography and topography of this part of the Ribble Valley.

The Council is faced with the difficulty, that the Appeal having once been allowed, the developers are now able to submit changes and alterations to the agreed plan but do not appear to have to justify these amendments – or at least they are not readily discernible from the information provided on the Planning Website. If there are such justifications which have been submitted to RVBC then Ribchester Parish Council requests that it be given sight of them.

Some instances of items which appeared in the early stages of the process which have been amended:

- 1 In the original application 3/2021/0595 there was a report appended from Site Infrastructure Services Ltd, which states, in s7 Conclusion that *'Soakaways are not a viable option due to ground conditions'*. The Parish Council now has photographic evidence that Soakaways have been constructed on the site. Can RVBC please comment as to why this is now considered a viable method to utilise?
- 2 The original plans submitted show a 'Proposed Building' which allegedly was to be used for offices, snail farming and rooms for *'demonstrations and tutorials together with ancillary accommodations, thus creating a countryside attraction'* This now appears on the current plan as 'Boadicea House' how much of which is likely to be used as a 'countryside attraction' is unclear. Although the Parish Council would suggest that the proposed external materials are unlikely to create anything which could be described as attractive. The proposed materials appear to be totally out of place in the context of the main approach road into Ribchester from Longridge, being much more vibrant colours of Slate Blue and Goosewing Grey than the green mentioned in the original application. Furthermore, the building itself, without the elements which were likely to contribute to the 'tourist attraction' justification now appears to be nothing more than a small industrial unit. Ribchester does have such units at the rear of Bee Mill. There

they are appropriate in the context, unlike this development on the edge of fields immediately behind residential properties.

- 3 There are changes to the shape and positioning of the six Log Cabins and the three-bed lodge has disappeared. This might have been the one originally designated to be the '*log cabin...reconfigured to allow for total use of disabled persons with carers*' as stated in a letter from David Liversedge Design. Is that considered to be a reasonable reversal of the plans in the light of this development being about the encouragement of Tourism?
- 4 It is reported that much was made during the Appeal meeting of the 'improvements' to Boyce's Brook. At present, there is a great deal of disquiet in respect of the removal of boulders from the Brook and also that there has been sight of a digger **within** the Brook. Again, there is photographic evidence available of the 'despoiling' of the area around the Brook, these photographs having been sent to the Council by very concerned residents. Shouldn't further information be available as to why this work is necessary and how it will, ultimately, assist in the security of the area against flooding in future?
- 5 Finally, one other thing which did not form part of the original application. Several buildings resembling prefabricated 'pods' and some shipping-type containers have now appeared on the site. These may have been moved from a previously owned site near Grimsargh (speculation perhaps). Would such additions to the site normally require further application as if to be permanent, they would significantly alter the original application?

Ribchester Parish Council would be very interested to receive further information if any is available, as to the points raised above, but in its absence to date, it has no other course of action than to **OBJECT** to the planning application.

Should you wish to have sight of the photographs referred to above, they will gladly be forwarded.

RIBCHESTER PARISH COUNCIL