

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 07 August 2024 09:53
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2024/0601 FS-Case-636803104

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2024/0601

Address of Development: Brockhall Farm
Brockhall Village
BB6 8BB

Comments: [REDACTED] wish to lodge an objection to the Planning Application REF: 3/2024/0601

Access to this development falls into 2 parts

1. The application only deals with the overall access from the cattle grid to the farm.

[REDACTED]. The noise and vibration of vehicles passing over the grid is intrusive and HGVs passing cause the house to shake. This will be a major problem if construction commences.

No mention is made in the application that an investigation into the vibration and of the annoyance of the noise from the cattle grid has been undertaken.

Please see work done by Bradford University <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/312597198>
Investigation of noise and disturbance from vehicles crossing cattle grids.

In this report BS 4008 2006(1) refers to spacing between bars of 130 to 150mm, the spacing on this cattle grid are 190mm. The bars in this grid are cylindrical which combined with the extra spacing makes the gap between bars greater (normal bars are flat topped) thus increasing the noise and vibration level.

There is no evidence that a such a survey has been undertaken, or included as part of the application.

[REDACTED] would ask that the applicant undertakes a survey of noise and vibration [REDACTED]

Passing places show the method of construction but make no mention of any upgrade to the existing track which needs constant pot hole filling with existing traffic levels or any curbing to stop vehicles running off the road.

The track is unsealed and as such noise levels are high.

Because it is unsealed dust is a major problem during dry weather. This will only get worse with increased traffic.

The increase in traffic flow from 6-8 per day to 32 per day (it is not clear if this is single or return journeys) will increase the dust and degradation of this unsealed track and create further risk to those pedestrians using this track.

It appears from the overall access map that the cattle grid extends over the boundary between the farm land and that owned by Brockhall Village.

2. No reference is made to access from the Cattle Grid to Old Langho road.

I understand that the track from the cattle grid to Larkhill is owned by Brockhall Village and has a right of way for farm traffic, not a housing development.

There is no passing place on the road from the cattle grid to Old Langho Lane which is a distance of about 1km.

This track is used by
existing occupants of the 2 houses at the farm
people who have fishing rights, these rights are granted by [REDACTED]
walkers, dog walkers and hikers

There is no provision for a footpath yet the application shows this as a route for pedestrians to the bus stop.

Each property adjoining the proposed access road has a varying number of protected trees, most of which have branches overhanging, with subterranean roots extending underneath the surface of the proposed access road. A 'Tree Survey' should have been undertaken, with the result included as part of the planning application by both the Applicant and the Planning Consultants. There is no evidence that a 'Tree Survey' has been undertaken, or included as part of the application.

The increase in traffic flow from 6-8 per day to 32 per day (it is not clear if this is single or return journeys) will increase the dust and degradation of this unsealed track and create further risk to those pedestrians using this track.

[REDACTED] estimate that some 70 pedestrians, adults and children many with dogs, use the track each day having to step off the track to allow vehicles to pass. This would be dangerous when traffic levels increase.

The previous application included letters from LCC Highways and the Parish Council, please could you explain why these are not part of the application?

We feel that by reason of RVBC's failure to have addressed this point, therein exists a clear example of maladministration.

We understand that part of the proposed access road is designated by Lancashire County Council Statutory Footpaths and Rights of Way as:
'Right of Way 3-6-FP2'. The proposed access road is an existing unsealed track, widely used by Joggers, Dog Walkers and Ramblers, all of whom will be adversely affected by the additional vehicular traffic using the Statutory Right of Way.

At present, on a daily basis, a small number of vehicles pass up and down the track, each causing varying degrees of vibration. With this in mind, there is no doubt that the increase in traffic that would inevitably result from delivery and construction vehicles required to create the development, will be unbearable. Plus the subsequent domestic and delivery traffic on the track that would result from the occupation of the proposed development, would have an ongoing continuous negative effect on all properties that border the track.

The RVBC Core Strategy would/should have been examined by the Planning Consultants, who in turn would/should have referred to National Planning Guidelines, in relation to the designation of Isolated Developments. This becomes relevant, because there is no sustainable public transport within a reasonable distance of the proposed development and in 2014, The UK Government entered into a legal obligation to achieve Net Zero CO2 emissions by 2050. Part of the obligation is to reduce the need for individual travel, which will be impossible to achieve with an estimated additional 32 vehicles using the proposed access road on a regular basis. The estimated number of additional vehicles is derived from the Planning Application, which includes parking spaces for 37 vehicles (including 5 in Current existence).

Another major cause for objection to the proposed narrow, unsealed and unlit access road, is that during the hours of darkness, the estimated additional vehicles using the proposed access road would have to use full headlights for the whole of the traverse along the track, thus creating another negative impact upon the adjoining residential properties.

In respect of the serious nature of this issue, we would expect that the decision will not be made under delegated powers.

█ also demand that RVBC extend the consultation period to allow time for the 'Tree Survey' to be undertaken.

In conclusion, [REDACTED] expect the above points to be regarded as material considerations. [REDACTED] also feel that it is totally improper for a democratically elected public authority to proceed with the approval of this planning application in the existing form, as it will clearly impose additional risk of liability to an existing number of Borough Residents and council tax payers, all of whom in turn will have no legal redress.

Yours faithfully,

□ □ □ □ □

