

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 04 December 2022 19:28  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Application Comments - 3/2022/1072 FS-Case-469610486

[REDACTED]

**Planning Application Reference No.:** 3/2022/1072

**Address of Development:** Pewter House Farm, Carr Lane, Balderstone, Blackburn BB27 LN

**Comments:** This planning application has been submitted following the refusal of planning application 3/2022/0909 on 11/11/2022. Planning application 3/2022/1072 looks to address the reasons for refusal of Planning Application 3/2022/0909, but I can assure you that it does not. The 2 planning applications are identical apart from the inclusion of :-

1) Bat Survey, which is inconclusive, carried out during the day when bats are roosting and not flying about, and suggests incorporation of bat boxes if bats are found during any construction works.

2) A Traffic Count, undertaken by Abacus Traffic Surveys, on the 9th November 2022, in application 3/2022/1072.

Paragon Highways use the information contained in the Abacus Traffic Survey to conclude that there will be a 60% reduction in traffic along Carr Lane and the local network, should the development be approved. Paragon Highways are expecting (or hoping) that the LHA will look at the Traffic Count Survey relating to vehicle movements along Carr Lane associated to Pewter House Farm Business, and agree that traffic movements will reduce by 60% and therefore recommend that approval is granted.

The Traffic Count Survey was carried out on the 9th of November, for 1 day only, not for a week, as one might expect. The survey was carried out by 1 man sat in a car, not 2 people recording the data. The survey states it started at 7.00am and finished at 7.00pm. I had already gone to work before he arrived, and came home at 5.45pm and found he was not on site conducting the survey at that time, so no not for 12 hours.

The Abacus Traffic Count Survey table in appendix B of the Paragon Highways Technical Note shows a total of 60 traffic movements on the 9th November relating to Pewter House Farm Business. After viewing CCTV footage recorded on the 9th November, on the hard drive of a camera which observes movements in front of [REDACTED] situated adjacent to Pewter House Farm, I TOTALLY DISPUTE these traffic numbers. 1 tractor and trailer leaves and then returns using Carr Lane. A quad bike drives around the farm yard and a car and trailer drives up to the area next to Bowford Cottage, turns around and drives back down Carr Lane. The postman drops off mail, an Asda groceries van delivers goods to the farmhouse and the Council Refuse Lorry collects household rubbish. The 6 traffic movements relating to Post, Groceries and Rubbish are domestic and Not Farm related and would continue even if planning was approved. The Abacus Traffic Survey traffic movement numbers do not correlate to the factual CCTV recordings of the same day. I suggest that the Abacus Traffic Count Survey be withdrawn from the application as it could be deemed as misleading. I hope that the LHA and RVBC planning officer ask for a photographic record or vehicle registration numbers of the said traffic on the 9th November. The use of an electronic recording device for 1 week would help clarify actual farm related movements. [REDACTED] has agreed to allow copies of this recording.

[REDACTED]

I hope the LHA and RVBC planning officer see the bigger picture here and realize that misleading information is being put forward to help gain planning approval.

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 04 December 2022 13:38  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Application Comments - 3/2022/1072 FS-Case-469591656

[REDACTED]

Lancashire

**Planning Application Reference No.:** 3/2022/1072

**Address of Development:** Pewter House Farm, Carr Lane, Balderstone Blackburn BB2 7LN

**Comments:** I refer to the above application with regard to development at the above address. On the day in question i.e. 9th November 2022 [REDACTED] on Carr Lane which is adjacent to the lane. [REDACTED] stopped and asked me if I knew why someone was sitting in their vehicle and appeared to be observing [REDACTED] property. [REDACTED] vehicle and was told by the occupant that he was working for Ribble Valley Council surveying the amount of traffic using the lane. This has proved to be a complete fabrication as he was in fact working for Abacus Traffic Surveys. The figures he has provided with regard to traffic on the lane is again a fabrication. [REDACTED] all day and only saw the farmer's wife driving her Quad bike looking for a calf that had escaped followed by the farmer in his tractor retrieving the calf... The only other vehicle that could possibly be classed as HGV was the bin wagon which comes every Wednesday. The fact remains that the road is still only single track and the the decision made by the Highways Dept. should still stand. If you need further proof of the vehicles using the lane the farmer and another neighbour have CCTV cameras which are aimed directly onto the lane. This is a quiet rural area and the addition of 5 more properties would increase the amount of traffic using the lane not decreasing it.

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 05 December 2022 13:26  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Application Comments - 3/2022/1072 FS-Case-469795927

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

**Planning Application Reference No.:** 3/2022/1072

**Address of Development:** Pewter House Farm  
Commons Lane  
Balderstone

**Comments:**

RE: APPLICATION 3/2022/1072 : PEWTER HOUSE FARM CARR LANE BALDERSTONE

[REDACTED] would wish to comment as follows:

This application is simply a re-submission of Application 3/2022/0909 which was refused by the Council on 11th November 2022. The Council will note that the supporting statement provided by the Applicant is the exact same document as submitted in relation to that first application and is dated September 2022.

The reasons given for refusal by the Council are set out below together with our comments regarding application 3/2022/1072:

Ribble Valley Borough Council hereby give notice the prior approval of the authority is REFUSED for the carrying out of the above proposal for the following reason(s):

1. The building operations proposed as part of the development would go beyond what is "reasonably necessary" to change the use of the buildings and would include the construction of new structural elements for the buildings contrary to Class Q, Q.1 (i) of Schedule 2 Part 3 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015.

The Applicant has provided no evidence of any change to the proposed building operations apart from some notes on the proposed elevations which state that there will only be a need for some "repairs where required". We would submit that the Council has already reached a decision that the work required goes beyond what is "reasonably necessary" on the basis of previous proposals and supporting documentation provided by the Applicant. The Applicant has not changed anything about that aspect of the proposals.

2. The proposal, if permitted, would lead to the intensification of use of an access and access track which lack the adequate visibility, width and provision of passing places deemed safe and suitable for such a proposal. The proposal therefore is not in the interests of highway safety and contrary to paragraphs 110 and 111 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).

Firstly, [REDACTED] would submit that there has been no material change in the use of Carr Lane since the date of the Council's decision on 11th November 2022. The reason given by the Council at paragraph 2 of its refusal remains entirely valid.

The Applicant is seeking to suggest that the Highways Authority is wrong to state that the proposal would lead to an intensification of traffic on Carr Lane. As the Applicant has now submitted differing data in support of this further application, it should be noted that the original Application 3/2022/0909 contained a technical note with the farmer's estimate of weekly journeys generated by the farm - stated to be a total of a maximum of 102.5 journeys. The Council will be aware that at least 4 residents have previously queried these numbers as they are not an

accurate reflection of farm traffic on Carr Lane. We also understand that a Council representative has visited the site.

Application 3/2022/1072 now contains a technical note referring to a traffic survey (Applicant's Survey) carried out on behalf of the Applicant on 9th November 2022. According to the Applicant's Survey there were a total of 60 journeys "generated by the farm" in one 12 hour period. On this basis, the farm would potentially be generating up to 420 journeys in a week. Even on the basis of the Applicant's previous submission, this appears a wholly unbelievable number and casts doubt on the accuracy of the Applicant's Survey.

In addition, the Applicant's Survey was carried out on a Wednesday and the reference to the use of the lane by HGVs is accepted in the note as referring to the bin lorry. This is not a journey "generated by the farm". The bin lorry, as with the post van, uses the lane to access the properties up to and adjacent to the farm, irrespective of the farm's existence. Similarly, [REDACTED] would question whether the individual carrying out the survey was able to differentiate between vehicles accessing the farm and those accessing the other property on the lane past where he was situated.

[REDACTED] would also point out that the Applicant's Survey was carried out on a day when there was a specific and unusual issue with a calf becoming separated from its mother which required the farmer to use the lane to access the field where the cattle were on that day. The journeys taken by the farmer and his wife for this purpose were unusually numerous and did not involve the farmer going the full length of the lane where there may be numerous issues with vehicles needing to pass. [REDACTED] understand that he simply accessed his field using the portion of the lane from his farm to the field entrance which is towards the top of the lane. We would point out that the Highways Agency stated in its note recommending refusal of the proposal dated 21/10/22 that "the LHA are more concerned about the first and middle section of the access track, with the first passing place being located approximately 250m away from the site access".

[REDACTED] raise these points to show that the single day of traffic survey carried out on behalf of the Applicant is, in [REDACTED] view, open to question as a true reflection of normal traffic movements on Carr Lane "generated by the farm" and in any event makes no difference to the issues considered previously by the Highways Agency and the Council in Application 3/2022/0909.

Insofar as the Council may be minded to take any further data regarding traffic on Carr Lane into account in this second application [REDACTED] would ask that a fully independent survey be carried out at a time without prior notice of such being given to the Applicant or the farmer or residents. [REDACTED] would also advise the Council that the individual who carried out the survey on behalf of the Applicant presented himself to at least 2 residents on separate occasions as being from the Council. This was clearly untrue.

3. The proposal would result in the creation of an overtly domestic development that would be largely incongruous with the rural vernacular of buildings within the immediate and surrounding area, contrary to Class Q, Q.2 (f) of Schedule 2, Part 3 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015.

The Applicant has failed to provide any further information to the Council that differs in any way from Application 3/2022/0909 which was refused on this and the other grounds set out in that decision.

4. The proposal fails to provide adequate information to allow the Local Planning Authority to assess the impact of the proposed development upon protected species of conservation concern, contrary to Class Q, paragraph Q.2 (e) of Schedule 2, Part 3 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015.

The Applicant has provided a bat survey but has not given any details of further considerations regarding the other wildlife such as owls and nesting swallows that are in the area.

[REDACTED] understand that there is no obligation to consult with residents regarding this particular type of planning application but in the circumstances, we feel that it is important that the Council is made aware of the points that we have raised.