

## **Aighton, Bailey & Chaigley Parish Council**

### **Planning Application 3/2023/0132**

#### **- Punch Bowl Inn, Longridge Road, Hurst Green -Erection of a new building to accommodate 6 holiday lets and one unit for managers accommodation.**

The Parish Council strongly object to this application and believe it should be refused on planning grounds.

In 2018 the Parish council objected to planning application, 3/2018/0362 which included the conversion of the existing Punch Bowl Inn to holiday lets. The principal reasons for objection were over-development of the site and concerns around highway safety but the application was approved by Ribble Valley Borough Council. At that time loss of heritage did not appear to be an issue, as there were conditions in place;

*'No development, site clearance, preparation, strip-out or demolition shall commence until the applicant, or their agent or successors in title, has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological recording and analysis. This must be carried out in accordance with a written scheme of investigation, which shall first have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority'*

*'Notwithstanding the submitted Heritage Statement prior to the commencement of the development a further Heritage Statement shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development thereafter shall be carried out in accordance with any agreed mitigation measures set out within the approved Statement.'*

Both conditions were disregarded when the Punch Bowl, a grade 2 listed building, was demolished. We feel it pertinent to also register the sense of dismay and outrage felt by our parishioners and the approval of the court decision in March 2023 that requires the listed building to be restored to its former state.

The current application contains a new heritage statement, which suggests that much of the heritage value of the building stems from its position by the road as a prominent landmark. The other aspects of historic interest are below ground level components, which may be destroyed in the digging out of foundations to renew the building on the same site.

It has been suggested that the re siting of the building away from the original site would enable the excavation of the foundations, and these could be retained for historic interest in front of the building. If those excavations remained, unless cars were to drive over them, it would not be possible to change access to the site from the road and so the highways issues would not be solved.

Also, if excavation of the old foundations were a condition of planning approval, how can we be sure that these conditions would not be disregarded in the same way previous archaeological and heritage conditions were, and the court order to rebuild and restore the old building is now being challenged/ignored?

Even if the building was moved, road hazards remain. There is still a very dangerous bend and bad junction does not have sufficient sightlines to the east. This is the case with or without the building. We refer to a similar application for holiday accommodation outside the village of Hurst Green: 3/2018/0685 on land close to Reed Deep. This was refused, and an appeal against the decision was dismissed on 12/11/2019. The Inspector for that appeal noted that there were

insufficient sightlines, and that adequate sightlines could not be obtained, even had the applicant permission to remove hedges from land he did not own. The situation is the same here.

We note that the applicant's supporting Highway Report refers to accident figures for the most recent five years. As the Punch Bowl site has not been in use for upwards of ten years, these are meaningless. We also note that the applicant's Highways Report makes much of the unlawful demolition of the Punch Bowl giving greater visibility to the right, from the very dangerous 30m to 60m. However, the Inspector's report on 3/2018/0685 reiterates the LCC Highway statement that a visibility of 120m would be required. The traffic volume along the B6243 is very similar either side of Hurst Green, and, therefore, the visibility from the egress from the applicant's site barely reaches half that required by LCC Highways.

Crossing the B6243 to gain access to the public footpath toward Bailey House or to use the pavement, as there is none on the Punchbowl side of the road, would be extremely dangerous. It should also be noted that the pavement is extremely narrow and would struggle to accommodate a buggy or pram. In fact, the school bus dropping children off for Bailey House does not stop at this point but takes the children further along the road where it is safer to cross the road.

### **Conclusion**

Taking this as a new application on its own merits and entirely separate from previous applications the Parish Council believe that it should be refused on

1. highways grounds, as it completely fails to meet adequate safety standards.
2. Heritage conditions. Its heritage value was reported to be that of a prominent local landmark by the road. Moving it to a new site constitutes a loss of that value to the community.
3. We are concerned that this case is in danger of setting a precedent of ignoring planning guidance, and that in the future, other parties may consider that the demolition of listed building is a viable and profitable option compared to sympathetic restoration.

Yours Sincerely

Parish Clerk

Aighton Bailey and Chaigley Parish Council.