

## Nicola Gunn

---

**From:** Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 28 June 2022 12:48  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Application Comments - 3/2022/0406 FS-Case-432880870

**Name:** [REDACTED]

**Address:** [REDACTED]

Lancashire

**Planning Application Reference No.:** 3/2022/0406

**Address of Development:** Land off Preston Road Ribchester PR33XL

**Comments:** The applicant has proposed changes to external material for the large portal framed building in which he indicates that he proposed to breed snails. I do not believe that the proposed changes should be allowed as they are incongruous to the setting and not in keeping with the environment. The proposed changes to cladding would result in the building being covered in grey plastic resulting in approximately 2/3 to 3/4 of the visible building being industrial grey. The proposed external doors, windows and very large roller shutters are also proposed to be grey adding to the industrial appearance of the building not in keeping with the area. Similar changes to the external appearance have been refused by the council and the resubmission makes little difference to the overall appearance previously refused. I would question also the need for a 3 meter high roller shutter as nothing similar appeared in original application. I would also comment the drawings presented are not to scale and therefore give a very different view of the proposed building than in face of the case. The height of the building actually built is not accurately reflected in the drawings submitted.

The internal and external elevations presented are confusing and do not appear to correspond to one another for example the elevation showing the roller shutter indicates windows no such windows are shown on the internal layout plans. When taking account of the roller shutter measurements it would appear that vehicles will enter directly into the breeding and hibernation units - is this accurate. Staff showers and caging areas appear to have been replaced by offices. Overall plans are very confusing and I question why the developer can not be more accurate in his representations of the buildings.

I note that the revised plans reposition the "holiday cabins" back to their original location, a move refused by the planning committee in the last variation of planning application made by [REDACTED]. It should be noted however on the site 2 run down tatty porta cabins have been placed in the location of bases built in locations previously refused by the planning committee. These portacabins being previously sited for a considerable number of years at the applicant's land in Grimsargh and more recently led to the site. They are an eyesore, not in keeping.