

**From:** Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 04 November 2023 12:53  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Application Comments - 3/2023/0725 FS-Case-559537892

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Lancashire

[REDACTED]

**Planning Application Reference No.:** 3/2023/0725

**Address of Development:** Pewter House Farm  
Commons Lane  
Balderstone  
BB27LN

**Comments:** This is the third application of Prior Notification, to convert 3 agricultural portal framed buildings into 5 large dwellings under Class Q (a) and (b) of the GPDO. The previous applications being 3/2022/0909 and 3/2022/1072.

This application states that it addresses the three main reasons for refusal of the previous 2 applications, but I dispute this statement for the following reasons :-

The main reason for refusal with the previous applications relates to the transport and highways impacts of the development. Pewter House Farm is accessed via Carr Lane off Commons Lane. Commons Lane is an unmarked country lane with tall hedges on both sides, pinch points where 2 vehicles cannot pass side by side, and has curves and dips near the junction with Bowfield Lane, which are a traffic hazard. Carr Lane is a single track lane with insufficient passing places, blind spots and corners, and is very narrow in places with ditches on some sides. Even [REDACTED] has driven his 4 x 4 vehicle off the lane and into the ditch and needed towing out with a tractor, on at least one occasion. Photographic evidence can be provided upon request.

Carr Lane remains unchanged and is exactly as it was at the time of the previous 2 applications. There are no new passing places, the lane has not been widened, pinch points remain and restricted visibility is still an issue. I fail to see how this application addresses the points raised by Lancashire County Council Officer and his recommendation for refusal on the grounds of road and traffic safety. This application continues to use the Abacus traffic Data within the paragon highways report, which is totally incorrect and misleading. The traffic movements along Carr Lane relating to the farm business actively stated within this report are extremely exaggerated and should be dismissed. C49 Architecture, design and access statement uses estimated traffic movement data for the previous farm business and suggests that 36.5 daily trips were made along Carr Lane relating to the farm which is suggested to have 140 head of cattle, and arable enterprise. The [REDACTED] is [REDACTED] and has not had a milk tanker down Carr Lane to collect farm milk for over 20 years. The farm has been run more as a hobby farm for the past 18 years generating very low traffic movements.

The creation of an additional 5 large 4 bedroomed houses with a minimum of 15 extra vehicles each creating an estimate of 6 traffic movements per day, generates 90 movements, without including delivery vans and visitors to the 5 new dwellings. How it can be stated, that 5 additional dwellings would create less vehicle movements than a small hobby farm? In fact since the applicant has purchased the farm house and all farm buildings, there is not a working farm anymore, just a block of land. The farm produces no vehicle movements anymore.

Currently there are 7 residential properties, 2 holiday cottages and 1 residential static caravan (probably without [REDACTED] serviced by Carr Lane, and at times the number of vehicles using the lane is dangerous. Other

issues relating to the footpath along Carr Lane, children playing on the lane, and horse riders have to be considered.

In my opinion this application does not address the concerns raised by the LCCH Officer and his recommendation for refusal and therefore should not be approved.