

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 01 July 2022 23:03  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Application Comments - 3/2022/0530 FS-Case-433893046

**Categories:** xRedact & Upload

**Name:** [REDACTED]

**Address:** [REDACTED]

Lancashire

**Planning Application Reference No.:** 3/2022/0530

**Address of Development:** Preston Road, Ribchester, Lancs PR3 3XL

**Comments:** Dear Councillors

I am writing to express my disappointment that, yet again, this development has required the writing of a letter.

This is the sixth application I have been notified of, [REDACTED] in the last 24 months (1 – withdrawn; 2 – rejected; 3 – approved with conditions after hearing; 4 – change of conditions rejected; 5 – not ‘relevant to residents’; 6 – this one). In our first letter of objection, we expressed our concerns that the application was not what it seemed [REDACTED]. Understandably, the Council felt this was conjecture... Sadly, our fears seem to have been borne out, both by this application and by the developer’s recent presentation at the Ribchester Parish Council meeting.

This application, in the main, is a reiteration of the application 3/2021/0595, which was approved. Why then, make another application with most of the same information in it? Is this a good use of the Council’s time (which we pay for)?

The addition of a large roller shutter was predictable enough; why, then, was it not included in the original application? If large wagons need to be loaded, this should surely have been anticipated. [REDACTED] for a smaller scale industrial enterprise in a Tier 2 village which shouldn’t (according to the RVBC Core Development Strategy) have new industrial development – especially when there are existing industrial units lying unused (Bee Mill)? The entrance from the site isn’t very safe, being at the point where traffic is going quickly down the hill in a National Speed Limit area. In addition, it’s on the National Cycleway, where cyclists will be making the most of the long downhill stretch. The roller shutter implies much larger wagons, which would present a commensurately greater risk to the passing traffic.

About six weeks ago (14th May), there was a serious road accident outside the entrance to the site, where a parked car was hit and flipped by a passing delivery driver. Both vehicles written off (although, thankfully, nobody hurt - one of the vehicles was parked and empty). This is not a good place to increase traffic.

The developer recently attended an open meeting at the Ribchester Parish Council Meeting. During that meeting, he mentioned his new visions for the site – new planting, new playground, new grazing area, café... none of which were mentioned in the original application. It would be nice if we (and you) could get a clear idea of what is envisaged, rather than going through this time-consuming process every few months.

Council". We are not in a position to ascertain whether this is true or not; all our observations have been made from [REDACTED] from the public footpath which runs adjacent to the site on the opposite side of the brook. However, the hardstandings which have been placed in anticipation of the (refused) application (3/2022/0271) have not been removed.

We note the site layout on this application (3/2022/0530); along the entrance are three trees, in accordance with the third (approved) application (3/2022/0595). These were existing trees which we assumed would be preserved; indeed, they were mature trees when I first met the former land owner, some 30 years ago. Now, as a result of the development, one has gone and the other two have been hacked back so severely, that it is doubtful whether they will survive. No doubt, new trees can be planted; but these were lovely old apple trees, of a variety one doesn't see often these days.

Many thanks to you for listening to our concerns.

**From:** Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 30 June 2022 19:47  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Application Comments - 3/2022/0530 FS-Case-433603056

**Categories:** xRedact & Upload

**Name:** [REDACTED]

**Address:** [REDACTED]

Lancashire

**Planning Application Reference No.:** 3/2022/0530

**Address of Development:** Preston Road, Ribchester.

**Comments:** We have the following concerns regarding the planning application 3/2022/0530 which details changes to the original application 3/2021/0595 for a Heliculture business and holiday lets on land off Preston Road in Ribchester. [REDACTED]

We believe they should stick to the original plan for a green building which would blend into the natural environment much better than the newly proposed grey finish, which would look more like an ugly industrial building, completely out of character with the location. The residents on Preston Road will have to look down on this building for many years to come, so the more it blends in, the better. The light grey colour of the roof is already imposing enough. We do see the addition of more wooden cladding to be an improvement.

The original application 3/2020/0940, which was refused, showed a stock proof fence which would limit the movement of holiday makers, stopping them from causing noise disturbance directly behind residents properties.

This should be added back into the plan. Limiting their movement would also help to minimize the disruption to wildlife. Owls are known to be roosting and nesting in this area. Young Tawny owls have been spotted [REDACTED] in the last few days. Despite kingfisher perches being removed, the kingfisher is still around although no longer fishing as before. Deer are still seen regularly at weekends when there is no disturbance.

Reports from the recent Parish council meeting have given us a number of other concerns:-

1) It was stated that £60,000 of play equipment, could be provided on the site as well as the possibility of a cafe and hosting children's parties. This is not a positive. This would inevitably give rise to increased noise disturbance to the residents and greater impact on wildlife. The village already has a playground, several eating establishments and children's party venues, so this is not required or wanted by the community. All of these will undoubtedly increase the level of traffic coming and going to the site.

2) The representative for the development [REDACTED] said the venture would not be making any money. So what is the point of this development? This just leads me to think [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Sounds like there is an [REDACTED]. This just means more unsightly storage containers littering the area. He also stated that [REDACTED] wants to do the best for the village and the charity. Firstly, the charity is nothing to do with this development and I suspect this connection has only been brought up to try and persuade residents that the development has some positives. Secondly, It's clear that the village residents do not want this development. How can giving the residents something they don't want or need be good for the village?

3) [REDACTED] claimed that landscaping work on the site along the stream was 'because we wanted to clean that area up'. All this work was unnecessary and detrimental to the wildlife and ecology of the area. Trees have not just been cut back, but removed. It was not in an untidy state, it was natural. Cutting the embankment back and removing trees is only likely to cause more flooding problems and erosion. Removal of a boggy area is the removal of another natural habitat. It appears that very little thought has gone into this landscaping work.

4)It was stated that the shabby containers currently on site would be refurbished as holiday lodges. This doesn't make sense. The shape of these containers in no way resembles the cabins on the plans. The plan that was passed contained an amended site plan showing all six cabins as rectangular buildings. Also, the footings these containers are sat on have been installed according to the last planning application 3/2022/0271 which was refused. These footings still need to be removed.

5)Regarding the cladding, [REDACTED]

This should not alter the fact that permission was granted for green cladding. When finished the building should be green as agreed.

6)Residents had complained that work was sometimes starting earlier and finishing later than allowed. I don't know what times they should be limited to, but can confirm that only last night noisy work was continuing beyond 8pm.

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 29 June 2022 17:59  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Application Comments - 3/2022/0530 FS-Case-433284315

**Categories:** xRedact & Upload

**Name:** [REDACTED]

**Address:** [REDACTED]

Lancashire

**Planning Application Reference No.:** 3/2022/0530

**Address of Development:** Land at Ribchester PR3 3XL

**Comments:** The application letter states that the developer no longer seeks to revise layout of approved lodges. However the concrete base for lodge 6 is already positioned as per drawing 21/145/7 (refused last application) and not as in drawing 21/55/5B. Is this not a breach of condition 2?

The numerous container units placed in the positions of the lodges are in a very dirty state and look to be derelict. Are these intended to be the actual holiday lodges?

The proposed amendments to the external materials has already been refused, reason given was to ensure materials are appropriate to the locality. This latest application to amend materials to goosewing grey will have a very industrial appearance and is surely not in keeping with the rural location. The main building already looks like a factory and is an eyesore. From the proposed elevations 21/55/4C it shows the intention to fit roller shutter doors to the main building. The immense casing for which is already in place but we understood that changes to the elevational details of the building were refused in previous application for variation of condition 2.

The site entrance drawing states stone road and the site layout drawing states tarmac and broken stone road not the approved resin bound gravel. Further changes that understand are not approved.

[REDACTED] pending further planning applications. However the developers have NOT ceased work on the main building as stated in the application cover letter and work continues daily and from early in the morning.

We strongly urge the council to consider the impact that this development is having on local residents and environment and refuse planning applications for this site as the [REDACTED] the decisions made by the council.