30th November 2022

For The Attention of The Planning Department Council Offices Church Walk Clitheroe Lancashire BB7 2RA

RE: PLANNING APPLICATION REF: 3/2022/1022- Land At Morans Farm, Pendleton Road, Wiswell, BB7 9BZ

Dear Sir/Madam

I have been instructed by		
prepare a letter outlining concerns in regards to the holiday lodges constructed at land		
associated with Morans Farm, Pendleton Road, Wiswell and associated variation of conditions		
application submitted to the council (Variation of condition 2 (Plans) from planning permission		
3/2020/0981 to allow alterations to the design of the units, increase in the size of decking, introductio		
of hot tubs and green energy measures).		
The holiday lodges have been constructed significantly different than on the approved planning		
drawings (Application No.3/2020/0981) in addition to the material selection, size increase of the		
footprint and height of the holiday lodges changes have been made to the location and size of		
habitable rooms window and door positions. This is of particular concern on the holiday lodge		
elevations (North Elevation) to lodge nos		
significant changes have been made to the extent and height of the external decking areas and the		
incorporation of external hot tubs		
Significant amendments have been incorporated into the north elevation of lodge with the		
incorporation of large French doors and addition large windows directing views from habitable room		
windows and In		
addition to the above alterations appear to have been undertaken on the configuration of the internal		
areas with the main living quarters and habitable room windows to the bedroom areas		
Similar amendments have been undertaken to the north elevation of		
lodge further adding to the overbearing impact and		

The alterations incorporated into the constructed holiday lodges have caused unacceptable		
	the constructed holiday lodges have	
unrestricted views		
The increase in the height and scale of the deckir	ng area will allow occupiers of the holiday	
lodges		
It should be noted the boundary between lodge and	the	
he ex	xisting boundary treatment does not provide	
any means of effective screening to reduce the overlooking	ng issues caused by the development. The	
boundary wall between lodge	topography of the site, the	
boundary wall	however the	
amendment sought for the location of the constructed external	ernal French doors and adjacent window	
have unrestricted views		
The decking area associated with lodge extends further	her than is indicated on the drawings	
submitted on the variation of conditions application past the	ne boundary wall which will allow the	
occupiers of the lodge when utilising the external decking	and hot tub areas to	
Policy DMG1 General Considerations identifies developm	·	
of the surrounding area and provide adequate day lighting		
amendments to the approved drawings and increase in th	e overall scale of the constructed holiday	
lodges in close proximity to the boundary is in direct confli	•	
increased the dominance, overbearing and oppressive im	pact of the development, and cause severe	
detriment		
	l	
The constructed holiday lodges have been equipped with	· · ·	
elevation of lodges and adjacent to the boundary and	• •	
	erated by air source heat pumps (40 – 60	
decibels) manufacturers' guidance advises to locate air so	• • •	
	as possible. Due to the lodges close	
proximity to the the location of the air source he	at pumps are considered to be inappropriate	

The unauthorised alterations undertaken on the constructed development have had a significant impact on the little and little and

Yours sincerely,



From: Sent: To: Subject:	30 November 2022 17:12 Planning Written objection to variation ord	er Application 3/2022/1022
This email originated from outside Ribble Valley Borough Council. Do <b>NOT</b> click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and are sure the content within this email is safe.		
		Date: 30th November 2022
Re: planning application	n variation order 3/2022/1022	
laws as to why the varianth of the common than the common terms of	rn, I this email to the email sent in by ation order shouldn't be approved. from a personal point of view and how the developers trail e actions of the developers.	has kindly covered all the legalities and planning
measure the heights ar	studied the drawings and decided they were designed the developers had started to build the chalets. They wend the floor levels are circa 500mm higher than the appropriate that the whole internal design has been changed to according	ere higher than anticipated ved plans).
There's been additiona	I decking that has been added and it's so massive if ariation order states). This allows	(which
right to privacy has illeg	gally	human
this very strongly.	e said they've completed market research and that's why	they've added hot tubs and additional decking. I dispute builders and visitors and
·	e local pubs in front of local councillors - e holiday chalet and again they've decided to add in extra	There's no need for all the
documentation not to si		(it even stipulates in the manufacturers ibly over 70dbs 24/7). In an isolated location
that hoise will be a con-	stant drone as the background hoise is less than 200bs.	
	we're not trying to prevent the chalets being built.	like them to be built as per the approved plans so
Here's a thought - the chalets have been built larger in square meterage, with higher floor levels and higher ridge heights with major internal changes and an additional 9 windows		
	planning department to refuse the application as legislation as legislation as legislation as due to the amount and size of the	on quite clearly demonstrates it'll need to be a full

sandwiched between an AONB and two village conservation areas. Given the fact that the chamges have been completed and in most of the variation application are actually additions not variations expect nothing less than a full refusal of this variation order.

Please restore human rights.

And also like to bring to the attention that there's additional portacabins have been put on site. Again this breaks the planning permissions as there's a restriction on how many buildings can be on site at any time. The ugly blue shipping container is being kept as a permanent storage facility and again there's no planning permission for this.

Kind regards