

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 31 August 2022 10:22
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2022/0623 FS-Case-448167550

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2022/0623

Address of Development: Woodfold Park Stud
Woodfold Park
Mellor
BB2 7QA

Comments: I object to this planning application for the reasons outlined in the "Conservation Officer Response" associated with this proposed development.

First, that the developments being proposed for the Stud do not compliment the existing buildings on Grade 2 listed Woodfold Estate.

"The proposed new wings do not compliment existing form (flat-roofed; horizontally emphasised openings) or the use of materials (large expanses of glazing; timber cladding). The proposal's undue prominence, incongruity and conspicuousness is harmful to the character of Woodfold Park Historic Park and Garden and the setting of the listed buildings within the Park.

Secondly & probably more importantly from a planning perspective the conditions outlined in the original "new build" planning consent for the Stud need to be adhered to.

"Paragraph 2.3 of the Planning Statement may suggest that the existing development is an element of the 'enabling development' (in my understanding?) in 3/2001/0672. If this is the case, NPPF paragraph 208 (see also Enabling Development and Heritage Assets, Historic England, 2020) identifies 'enabling development' as development that would not be in compliance with local and/or national planning policies, and not normally be given planning permission, except for the fact that it would secure the future conservation of a heritage asset. Enabling Development and Heritage Assets paragraph 13 identifies that the harm done by enabling development contrary to other planning policies is likely to be permanent and irreversible and is therefore likely to be a last resort."

This suggests to me that planning consent for building the Stud on a green field site in the first place was a very special case. Severely restricting any significant change to the overall architecture at a future date?

As a [REDACTED] because it became over populated with new builds. We [REDACTED] surrounded by countryside and felt that by [REDACTED] we would be protected from over build in the future. I hope & expect RVBC to take a very firm stance on any future planning applications that appear to disregard the historic significance of Woodfold Park. Recognising the Grade 2 listed, historic significance of not only the park but also some of the architecturally noteworthy buildings within it's boundary's. Surely this must be recognised by the council as one of the jewels in the crown of the Ribble Valley?

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 27 August 2022 13:24
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2022/0623 FS-Case-447401306

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2022/0623

Address of Development: Woodfold Park Stud Woodfold Park Mellor BB2 7QA

Comments: I object to this planning application for the reasons outlined in the "Conservation Officer Response" associated with this proposed development.

First, that the developments being proposed for the Stud do not complement the existing buildings on Grade 2 listed Woodfold Estate.

"The proposed new wings do not compliment existing form (flat-roofed; horizontally emphasised openings) or the use of materials (large expanses of glazing; timber cladding). The proposal's undue prominence, incongruity and conspicuousness is harmful to the character of Woodfold Park Historic Park and Garden and the setting of the listed buildings within the Park. However, these are my opinions as an officer of the Borough Council only which will not prejudice the formal decision of the Borough Council."

Secondly & probably more importantly from a planning perspective that the conditions outlined in the original "new build" planning consent for the Stud need to be adhered to.

"Paragraph 2.3 of the Planning Statement may suggest that the existing development is an element of the 'enabling development' (in my understanding?) in 3/2001/0672. If this is the case, NPPF paragraph 208 (see also Enabling Development and Heritage Assets, Historic England, 2020) identifies 'enabling development' as development that would not be in compliance with local and/or national planning policies, and not normally be given planning permission, except for the fact that it would secure the future conservation of a heritage asset. Enabling Development and Heritage Assets paragraph 13 identifies that the harm done by enabling development contrary to other planning policies is likely to be permanent and irreversible and is therefore likely to be a last resort."

This suggests to me that planning consent for building the Stud on a green field site in the first place was a very special case. Severely restricting any significant change the overall architecture at a future date?

As a [REDACTED] I hope & expect RVBC to take a very firm stance on any future planning applications that appear to disregard the historic significance of Woodfold Park. Recognising the Grade 2 listed, historic significance of not only the park but also some of the architecturally noteworthy buildings within it's boundary's. Surely this must be recognised by the council as one of the jewels in the crown of the Ribble Valley?