

**From:** Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 22 May 2023 11:40  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Application Comments - 3/2023/0325 FS-Case-518012559

Lancashire

**Planning Application Reference No.:** 3/2023/0325

**Address of Development:** land adjacent to no.9 Old Road

**Comments:** Planning ref no. 3/2023/0325

I have a number of comments to the above planning application:-

**1. Road safety.**

Old Road is a narrow road (only sufficiently wide for two vehicles to pass where no cars are parked). There is a 30m/hr speed limit and no footpath. Any deliveries and the two weekly rubbish collections cause hold-ups. Old Road has a poor surface, poor drainage and cars parked right up to the nearest turning point. The nearest turning point (opposite the site of plot 11) is used day in day out and needs to be clear of any obstruction. The turning area is the entrance to the woodland owned by the council.

In the last year I have provided video evidence to support accidents on Old Rd. One parked car was written off and others damaged. Last winter we had to help cars and a site vehicle (carrying scaffolding) which were unable to drive up and down the steep slope of Old Road in the snow.

This is to indicate how hazardous the road has become and residents fear more accidents will happen when heavy site vehicles and regular deliveries access the site.

It is also imperative that all vehicles exiting and entering the site do so in a forward direction. During construction it is essential that no deliveries or site vehicles are parked on the road by the site as this will cause considerable problems for the residents at Hare Hill Croft and anyone trying to use the nearest turning point for Old Road.

**2. CEMP**

**Public Footpath Hazard:-** The plan apparently only indicates a footpath for site workers, whereas that is the route of the current public footpath but it stops at the fence of plot 11 . However, the footpath needs to continue down to Crow Trees Brow. Also the plan shows no protection to the footpath from the site traffic route but the statement claims only low barriers protect the footpath from the site traffic. Dog walkers regularly use that route and the site traffic will be a problem so close to the footpath. The plan and statement claim a padlocked closed site so how can the public access the footpath when the site is closed? There needs to be a plan showing exact clarification of public footpath route, access and protection.

**Access to plot 11:-** We are not aware of any planning permission for the access road that is currently in place as shown on the plan. Also the proposals state that an entrance to Old Road will be constructed as a first stage. If all further access is then from Old Road this will present a significant problem to all Hare Hill Croft residents and all users of Old Road who need to turn at the first turning point opposite the site.

**Noise and dust control:-** Although many provisions have been listed in the method statements for noise and dust control, our experience with [REDACTED] and there is no enforcement officer available to ensure the correct methods are followed. I believe that the works will be particularly disruptive for the houses of plots 1-6 and no.9 Old Road.

**Site waste management:-** Regardless of what is stated in the CEMP, in the past, waste has been repeatedly burned on site (we have photo evidence of this) regardless of most of the properties on Hare Hill Croft already being occupied.

### 3. Existing timber stile.

None of the conditions or CEMP allow for a stile to be erected to provide access to the land from Old Road. There is a timber stile there at the moment. No public footpath from the stile and no indication to the public relating to the stile. Although a hazard notice is on the fencing free access is available to the site. If this is an example of how things are going to be conducted, we are concerned as to what methods will actually be used regardless of what is stated in the CEMP.

### 4. Tree protection

In the pre-commencement statement it states that all tree protection will be in place. The tree officers have already been called out and visited site and ordered engineering works to stop which was taking place too close to the protected trees. What assurance can be given that the proper tree protection is adhered to in future?

### 5. Wildlife protection

There is no mention in the application of protection for wildlife apart from the bird and bat boxes. We have photographic evidence of daily badger activity across where the site access will be. Hedgehogs also use the badger route. We also have photo evidence of deer and fox in the woodland opposite the site on Old Rd.

### 6. Use of neighbouring field. The field is owned by the applicant.

The statement mentions that the neighbouring field will be used for site storage. Will this mean it will become even

That field is already full of waste material from the building of Hare Hill Croft and is an eyesore for all local residents as well as visitors viewing the site from Pendle Hill. I understand it is currently listed as agricultural land. The supporting information mentions an agreement to submit an application to regularise outstanding issues on Hare Hill Croft which remains outstanding. As you have noted this outstanding since 2021 isn't it about time an enforcement order was issued?

### Public footpath DMMO

There is an existing outstanding DMMO for a footpath crossing that field which has been approved and is waiting to be advertised. More than 15 local residents submitted statements to say that they had used that path for more than 20 years but the applicant has blocked it.

### 7. Mitigation Area within the neighbouring field.

One of the conditions relates to the existing unimproved calcareous grassland and the site boundary has been moved to accommodate that. However, there is a signed legal agreement with the owner of the land to establish an area of mitigation for the loss of protected habitat which was originally on that land. Work for the mitigation area has still not begun and the deadline was November 2022. This surely is in breach of contract and no authority seems to be attempting to enforce that signed legal agreement.

### 8. Landscaping

*Malus sylvestris* (Crab apple) has been specified as one of the trees at the front of the house. I believe this is not an appropriate choice near steps as the crab apples fall and create a sticky mess on the surface. The leaves of *Betula Pendula* support 300 species of insects so might also be problematic so close to the house front. It is also north facing with dense woodland directly opposite. I would suggest an alternative of liquidambar syraciflue 'Lane Roberts', *Sambucus Nigra* or replacing both trees with 2 no. *Pyrus Chanticleer*.

To date an example of control of landscaping is evident at Hare Hill Croft alongside the existing footpath (indicated on the plan). Some of the trees have already died and have not been replaced. The *Lonicera Nitida* specified for shrub planting for the bank was incorrectly planted with climbing *Lonicera*, which has choked some of the trees. Clearly no significant supervision took place during the planting and no maintenance plan, if it ever existed, has been adhered to. The whole area is overgrown and a hindrance to those using the footpath. If this footpath is to be used as per the plan it needs to be drawn to the attention of the footpath officers and at the very least have a maintenance plan.

I consider nothing should take place on Plot 11 until all the outstanding issues are resolved on:-

- a. Hare Hill Croft,
- b. the public footpath and
- c. the neighbouring field.

N.B. I have also submitted these comments by hand delivery including supporting photographs relating to some of the comments.