

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 23 August 2022 11:55  
**To:** Planning; Adrian Dowd  
**Subject:** Objections - Planning Application Number: 3/2022/0568  
**Attachments:** Key Objections to the Proposed Development Application\_ Number 3 2022 0568  
[REDACTED]

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

 **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.

Reference: 3/2022/0568

Planning Application Number: 3/2022/0568

Grid Reference: 362007 443548

Location: Land to the rear of Malt Kiln House, Malt Kiln Brow, Chipping, PR3 2GP

Proposal: Four new, two-storey residential dwellings.

Dear Mr Dowd,

I wish to make you aware of a number of strong objections to the proposed development of; 4 large, two-storey, 4 bedroom, detached properties on protected meadowland, situated to the rear of Malt Kiln House. The proposed development is positioned directly within the Kirk Mill Heritage Site (DME4) located on the outskirts of Chipping, a rural village with medieval origins and a designated 'Conservation Area', of significant historical and archeological interest. It is situated in the Ribble Valley and lies within the Forest of Bowland 'Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)', an 'Outstanding Landscape of Natural and Cultural Heritage'. Landscapes are a product of constant change, the purposes of AONB designation is to reflect this process of change, encouraging activities that conserve and enhance the special qualities of the area and minimising activities that present a threat to the unique character of the landscape. The proposed development would be in direct contradiction to this and have significant adverse effects on the local environs.

The scenic countryside around Chipping is part of the 'Bowland Fringe' - a diverse transitional landscape, wrapping around the dramatic upland core of the Bowland Fells. A myriad of streams and valleys cascade off the Bowland Fells, they support various expanses of semi-natural riparian woodland, one of these is the 'Clark House Biological Heritage' site (DME3 Special Protection Area), a mainly wooded valley, traversed by Chipping Brook. Biological Heritage Sites (BHS) are areas of land rich in wildlife; they support many of Lancashire's most important and threatened habitats and species. They are the most important places for wildlife outside of legally protected land such as SSSI and form part of a national network of wildlife sites. The northern edge of the proposed development site is part of the southern boundary of the 'Clark House Biological Heritage' area; it is made up of mature trees and hedgerows, which should be preserved at all costs. Any property developments close to the area would significantly affect the wildlife habitats, which the Biological Heritage Designation should protect.

The mature trees and hedges, which cover a significant portion of the proposed development site, are encompassed within a designated 'Woodland Grant Area - 3', many are also highlighted in the Lancashire County Council Tree Preservation Order (No.1) 1970. Any development on the proposed site would have significant negative effects on local biodiversity in direct contravention to local and national planning recommendations 'to protect or enhance the local environment, including wildlife habitats, trees and woodland parks and gardens'.

The design, heritage and scale of the proposed dwellings are out of keeping with local character, whilst these issues might be solved by conditions or revised proposals, these could not remedy the siting problems discussed above. Furthermore, there is no proven requirement for this type of 'prestige' dwelling in the village. According to the latest local planning policies (Ribble Valley – Core

Strategy) further development in Chipping is not sustainable and there is NO provision for additional building of the type suggested. Chipping has become a 'retirement village' the majority of the population being over 60. The village already has more than enough large 'luxury' dwellings, considerably more than other areas of Lancashire. Younger families and first time buyers can't afford to live here. In order to create a more vibrant and rich community, with a mixed age group, additional housing should be affordable younger working families.

main supposition for the proposed development is that it is acceptable to build properties in protected rural, conservation areas, as long as they are zero carbon, self-sustainable, eco homes. This argument is completely flawed – 'the majority of carbon and other toxic emissions, related to a property or building, are at the development stage'. No amount of solar panels, ground source heating etc. will ever offset the polluting effects of initial construction, it goes without saying that the larger the property the greater these will be. In truth the best strategy in terms of conservation and carbon emissions would be not to build them at all or maybe plant some trees! After all, the plot which they describe as 'vacant' has for many years been part of a Woodland Grant Scheme – which provides financial incentives to plant trees. They are after all one of our most powerful 'weapons' in the war against climate change. They are the ultimate carbon capture and storage machines. Like great carbon sinks, woods and forests absorb atmospheric carbon and lock it up for centuries. National and Local planning policy states quite clearly that there need to be very 'Exceptional Circumstances' met before any new building developments in protected, conservation areas, can be considered.

for their proposal within planning policy. The Ribble Valley Core Strategy clearly states that development in and around rural conservation areas such as Chipping, is not sustainable, it is classified as a Tier 2 village (KEY STATEMENT DS1), i.e. development restricted to Local Needs Housing/ Regeneration Benefits only. The main housing requirement locally and nationally is for 'affordable housing' (Core Strategy 3.12 To increase the supply of affordable and decent homes in the borough to help meet identified needs) . These are luxury properties, if built they may fetch upward of £600,000 in today's market, possibly as much as a million and could never be deemed as 'affordable'. The average UK family size has decreased dramatically over the last few decades, a large percentage of households are now single person and this trend appears to be on the increase. There is a UK wide requirement for new homes but they need to reflect this trend and be small / affordable as well as carbon neutral.

This application should be considered on its own merit NOT as part of the overall Kirk Mill Development Plan, which is unlikely to happen at least not in the short or medium term - the Mill and accompanying land are still on the market, despite a recent auction (July 22). It is over 8 years since the original application and 6 years since the appeal, approved on the basis of the whole area being regenerated for tourism etc. In reality the only development has been residential housing (Fellside), which has irretrievably damaged the local landscape and put considerable strain on the village infrastructure, particularly the roads. In truth there has never been any justification within planning policy for additional residential homes in Chipping. The adjudicator recognised this at the appeal stage and was very specific about the plot in question, which felt was not relevant for residential dwellings, in this AONB. There have been several proposals for large detached houses on this plot since 2014, the last one in 3/2019/0132 was over 3 years ago.

(who put forward the initial Kirk Mill proposal in 2014), are stretching the bounds of planning legislation, which negates against the building of 'unsustainable' new residential homes in the countryside most especially AONB.

**On 21/08/2022 local received a letter from stating that they plan to start working on the site. We are all shocked that this work has been allowed to go ahead when the 'Current Application' has not been either fully assessed or appraised. It goes without saying that all the have severe reservations - we experienced first hand the significant disruption and devastation caused by the neighbouring Fellside development. We have grave concerns regarding safety and the inevitable destruction of the 'protected' local environment, especially since the company proposes to build over the winter and feel that the work is being initiated without proper regard to planning. The initial stage will be to construct an entrance at Malt Kiln Brow, this will be a mammoth task in terms of terrain and it is very likely to affect the surrounding trees / hedgerows, which have designated protection (TPO – 1970). It could also lead to flooding of the local brook and hence the historic conservation village further downstream. The ground surface at the planned entranceway is NOT stable – there has been relatively recent landslip in the vicinity, these works, if initiated, could cause further earth movements, which may lead to damage of neighbouring properties in the Grove and Malt Kiln House, both in very close proximity.**

In summary the proposed development is in direct contravention to local and national planning policy for the area and cannot be justified in terms of: sustainability, 'identified local need', affordability or siting. If approved it would undoubtedly have significant detrimental effects on the local environment, landscape, heritage and population. There is absolutely no requirement for additional 'prestige' homes in this area, the village infrastructure is cracking under the strain of the latest development at Fellside, and it certainly cannot support any additional 'unnecessary and undesirable development'. My '**Key Points of Objection**' are outlined in more detail in the attached document (Key Objections to the Proposed Development Application Number 3 2022 0568 [REDACTED]).

Attn: Adrian Dowd, Planning Department, Ribble Valley Borough Council  
Email: Adrian Dowd [REDACTED] planning@ribblevalley.gov.uk  
Reference: 3/2022/0568  
Planning Application Number: 3/2022/0568  
Grid Reference: 362007 443548  
Location: Land to the rear of Malt Kiln House, Malt Kiln Brow, Chipping, PR3 2GP  
Proposal: Four new, two-storey residential dwellings.  
From: [REDACTED]  
Application Letter received: 08/08/22  
Date: 23/08/22

## SUMMARY - Key Points of Objection:

Please note that, throughout this document, quotes from [REDACTED] – the applicant, are highlighted in *blue*, quotes from planning policy:- *NPPF - green*, *Core Strategy - purple*. Quotes from the original Appeal document (2016) in *black*.

- 1. NON-COMPLIANCE with Council Planning Policies (Ribble Valley - Core Strategy / Government Planning Guidance (NPPF)).** The proposal represents an inappropriate form of development within the Forest of Bowland, a rural area of 'Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)'. In the absence of 'any special circumstances', as defined in the NPPF, the proposed development would, by its inappropriateness, have a harmful impact on the character of the immediate area and local vicinity. One of the main principles of planning policy is for all development to be 'sustainable'. The Ribble Valley - Core Strategy clearly states that Chipping is in a Tier 2 zone in which further development would not be sustainable. The NPPF and local Core Strategy both identify the most critical housing need to be for 'affordable' homes. Large 4+ bedroom, luxury detached properties are classified within the upper echelons of the housing market and as such could not in any conceivable way be categorised under the 'affordable' umbrella, even if they were 'Eco Builds'. Most of the discussion concerning planning policy contained within [REDACTED] '*Design and Access and Environment Statement 31Jul22 - 22\_0568\_D\_and\_A\_Statement\_2022*' relates to the NPPF. This is undoubtedly important as a framework but every district is unique in character with specific planning requirements, local policy is designed to address this. The details for this area are laid out in 'Core Strategy 2008 – 2028 A Local Plan for Ribble Valley', a copy of which is available on the council's website. The title on the front page of the main submission is '*ZERO CARBON HOME*'; most of the text within this document is centred around this chain of reasoning. It is for the most part generic in nature and does not reflect the true importance of the proposed site in terms of local habitat, conservation or heritage. At one stage, the document author even mentions Fylde BC, a fact no doubt since Chipping is actually in the Ribble Valley!
- 2. CONSERVATION AND SITING - Adverse Impact on the AONB Landscape.** The layout and siting of the properties, in themselves and relation to adjoining buildings, spaces and views, is not sympathetic to the appearance and character of the local environment. The proposed development site is part of the Kirk Mill Heritage site (DME4), which lies within the Forest of Bowland AONB. It borders a Local Biological Heritage Site (DME3) and is also completely encompassed within a Woodland Grant Tree protection area. All very credible indicators of the important local biodiversity: the trees, hedgerows and meadow within the proposed area provide a vital habitat for wildlife, especially, insects, birds and bats and should be preserved at all cost. The natural environment provides us with a wide range of important benefits including clean water, air and productive soils. Increasing pressures on this environment threatens vital services as well as wildlife habitats.
- 3. GROUND STABILITY / DRAINAGE AND FLOODING** – The proposed development site is steeply sloping and as such provides critical drainage for surrounding land, there are 2 brooks bordering the meadow which act as outlets to the run-off. The streams lead in to the main Chipping Brook which flows in to the local village and is prone to flooding. The stability of the land for building is questionable – slope failures and landslides have already occurred. Climate change has led to increasing adverse weather events in this area, for example storm Arwen last year. After extended

periods of heavy rainfall, when the ground becomes saturated with water, soil structure on the slope is weakened. In recent years the council has reinforced the wall and road bordering the plot because of subsidence, a strong indicator of the grounds instability. The slope stability assessment carried out for the application concurs with the above discussion - it states the following '*Slope stability analyse indicate the existing site configuration to be potentially unstable. Some evidence of movement has been observed. The proposed site works, including cut and fill, indicates potential instability in the proposed slope configuration*'.

- 4. HIGHWAY SAFETY / SUSTAINABILITY** – The transport network / infrastructure in the direct local area is inadequate to support additional motorised vehicles and not 'sustainable'. Chipping is a small rural settlement, with very poor indirect links to surrounding villages and towns;- Longridge and Clitheroe. Any proposals for additional development in the village are unacceptable in terms of sustainability and highway safety. The village is a 'Conservation Area' popular with: tourists ramblers and cyclists - as such all effort should be made to reduce motorised traffic throughput NOT increase it. Additional traffic flow would undoubtedly create dangerous conflicts between pedestrian: cyclists and motorised vehicles, thereby instituting a 'safety hazard'. There are several narrow bottlenecks in the village (for example Windy St, Church Raike and Talbot St) where cars are often required to back-up – additional traffic would increase the queues in these locations and create an unquestionable 'safety hazard'. The local road network is already overburdened and cannot support the increased flow, which would inevitably be introduced by the building of additional homesteads.
- 5. POLLUTION** – The construction sector contributes to 23% of air pollution, 50% of the climatic change, 40% of drinking water pollution, and 50% of landfill wastes. For decades, the environment has suffered because of the devastating human impact on our planet caused by industries that pollute, destroy and waste. Rising levels of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gasses have contributed to global warming to such an extent that climate change has reached a crisis status and pose one of the largest global threats of our lifetime.

All construction sites generate high levels of pollution, which can carry for large distances over a long period of time. Every single construction action has an impact on the environment. Building is a major source of pollution, responsible significant particulate emissions, more water pollution incidents than any other industry, and thousands of noise complaints every year. Although construction activities also pollute the soil, the main areas of concern are: air, water and noise pollution. The effects are often severe and by their nature difficult to negate, they are detrimental to the health of employees, people living nearby and the local flora / fauna.

The main premise that [REDACTED] have put forward to support their application is that because they plan to build 'zero carbon eco self- sustainable dwelling' – it is OK to ignore the site constraints in terms of conservation and biodiversity. They do not appear to recognise the importance of the proposed site setting with regard to:- heritage, ecology and the landscape. The land in question lies directly within an AONB, it is part of the Kirk Mill Heritage Site (DME4), covers a Woodland grant area and borders a BHS ('Clark House Biological Heritage' site DME3 - Special Protection Area). These environmental issues have not been given any weight in the main **DESIGN, ACCESS & ENVIRONMENT STATEMENT**.

- 6. LOSS OF PRIVACY** - The mass, bulk, scale and notably the elevation of the proposed properties would present an overbearing and intrusive element to those [REDACTED]

The proposed dwellings would have an unacceptably adverse impact on the amenities of the properties immediately adjacent to the site and the surrounding area by reason of overlooking, loss of privacy and visually overbearing impact. The **Human Rights Act** in particular **Protocol 1, Article 1** states that a person has the right to peaceful enjoyment of all their possessions, which includes the home and other land.