

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 12 March 2023 20:15  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Application Ref 3/2022/1181 – Cherry Hall, Main Street, Grindleton  
**Categories:** xRedact & Upload

 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.

### **Planning Application Ref 3/2022/1181 – Cherry Hall, Main Street, Grindleton**

I wish to express my objection to the above planning application. The grounds for my application are set out below:

#### **Design Statement.**

1. Section 1.1 - states that a desk based archeological / historical assessment of Cherry Hall Site was carried out in 2011, but does not include any detail of the findings?
2. Section 2.4 - I think the date of approval of application No 3/2001/0015 should be 06.03.2001 not 2021. It must refer to what is now the first floor of the 'existing' extension.
5. Section 3.3 - states that "buildings within the conservation area are modest and conservative" also that the homogenous use of building materials for walling, roof coverings of stone or slate and stone for boundary walling again adds a further layer of attractiveness". The document then promotes the proposed extension to be clad adopting "a contemporary approach, with a mixture of modern forms and materials". This proposal is at odds with the appearance of the surrounding buildings that give the village its attractiveness.
3. As stated in section 2.1 Cherry Hall occupies a prominent roadside position. The extension would be clearly visible from Main Steet.
6. Section 3.5 - Statement of Significance: this paragraph introduces the importance of the view to the character of the area. In my view the adoption of "contemporary approach" to new buildings will adversely affect the view providing a loss to the local 'community'.
7. Section 4.2 - Appearance: As stated above, the statement promotes "contemporary finishes" which are totally out of character with the statements in para 2 of section 3.3.

8. Section 4.4 Highways and Access - Contrary to what is stated here, it will not be possible for 4 cars to use the off road parking. The development is likely to lead to increased parking on Main Street due to difficulty maneuvering cars in and out of the parking places at Cherry Hall. Have Highways assessed this proposal? It could also lead to an increase in vehicles backing out of the track into Main Street with associated risks to health and safety.
9. Section 4.8 Residential Amenity - The statement is misleading and inaccurate. The proposed development will significantly impact on the residential amenity of nearby residents. The development may result in increased parking on Main Street, and will result in increased vehicle movements along the narrow track to the north of the property. This track is a shared access with Beech Cottage and Stonelea Cottage.

The extension will have an adverse effect [REDACTED] The extension whilst slightly lower than the existing structure will result in a significant reduction in light within a significant [REDACTED] In the winter months the shadow from the extension will put the [REDACTED] into shadow.

At present [REDACTED] by one window on the [REDACTED] of Cherry Hall, the proposed development will result in an additional four windows and the glazed link at first floor level [REDACTED] This will result in a [REDACTED]

The construction works will have a significant impact on the local residents. HGVs and other construction equipment will have to access the site via the very narrow track which is used for vehicle access to Stonelea Cottage and Beech Cottage. [REDACTED] the track for [REDACTED]

Emergency services will also need access along the track in case of emergency.

During construction working there will be noise and perhaps dust nuisance impacting on local properties.

The track is also a public footpath used by residents and also by many visitors including school groups doing DofE activities. Construction traffic will result in a hazard to all users of the footpath.

10. Section 5.3 - Policy DMG1 "General Considerations".  
The development does not comply with paras 1 to 3 of the 'Design' section. It is not sympathetic to existing land uses in style and building materials.  
It does not address para 3 of the 'Access' section which calls for protection and enhancement of public rights of way and access. The development will certainly not enhance the public footpath to the north of Cherry Hall.  
It does not comply with para 1 of the 'Amenity' section – it will have detrimental impact on residential amenity as described above.  
The development also does not "enhance" heritage assets - 'Environment' para 3.
11. Section 6.1 - Impact on Grindleton Conservation Area - There are several incorrect and misleading statements in this section of the statement. These include those described below:

- The fully glazed link is intended to provide a “visual degree of separation between the old and the new”. This implies that it will be unobstructed and therefore ‘transparent’ however it separates the bed and the bathroom within an en-suite bedroom! I do not believe that in use it will achieve the objective set out in the 2nd para of 6.1.
- Also the glazed link will not be simple and restrained in appearance. It will result in reflection and also light pollution in the darker hours.
- Contrary to the statement in para 4 the proposed addition will be clearly visible from Main Street and will not be concealed by the existing property or site planting.
- It is patently incorrect that "the extension will not be visible from the track to the north of Cherry Hall. This statement is misleading, as the extension will be a matter of a few meters from the track.
- On the basis of the above it is also incorrect to state that "the addition will only be experienced from within the site of Cherry Hall itself”.

## **Drawings**

Materials - as stated above the drawing proposes the adoption of graphite grey zinc roof, black aluminum and charred timber board cladding and a glazed link. In my opinion the use of these materials is out of character for the neighborhood, ignores local design guidelines and will be aesthetically displeasing in this context.

The drawing shows the existing boundary wall being retained along the south of the track. However, given the extent of excavation required to construct the new 1m high stone retaining wall immediately alongside the existing wall, it is almost certain that the existing wall will need to be demolished and rebuilt, resulting in a loss in character. The Grindleton Conservation Area Appraisal states that boundary walls are a distinctive feature of the conservation area.

## **Grindleton Conservation Area Appraisal – Ribble Valley Borough Council**

Spatial Analysis - The report describes the view being “especially fine from the Top of the Town at the upper end of Main Street”.

The view south towards Pendle Hill from adjacent to Stonelea Cottage is also described as "important" in the Grindleton Conservation Area Townscape Appraisal Map. This view will be impacted by the extension. The extension and its "contemporary" appearance will be visible from Main Street and very clearly visible from the public footpath when looking south towards Pendle Hill.

## **Other comments**

It should also be noted that planning permission has previously been granted for the construction of a new property in the garden of Cherry Hall. If this residence is constructed together with an extension to Cherry Hall then many of the issues referred to above such as vehicle movements on the track, car parking on Main Street, will be worse.

It should also be noted that the Parish Council objected to the planning application for the above “application 3/2010/0002 - Proposed erection of 2 no dwellings in the garden of Cherry Hall”, on the basis that:

- “The vehicular access over the bridleway to the development from the main road is unsuitable due to the width and sight lines into the main road when exiting the bridleway.”
- “The entrance to the bridleway is so restricted that any visitors to the development and existing houses would tend to park on the main highway causing further congestion on this busy road.”

In my view these points are applicable to the current application.

Regards

