

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 17 October 2024 12:24
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2024/0753 FS-Case-655424207

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2024/0753

Address of Development: Pewter House Farm Commons Lane Balderstone BB2 7LN

Comments: I wish to object to the planning listed above. The road (Carr Lane) that the proposed development is situated on carries no street lighting nor has any pavement access. The nearest shop is c2 miles away. The road (Commons Lane) leading up to the road that the proposed development is situated on (Carr Lane) also have no street lighting nor footpaths. There is no public transport that serves the road that the proposed development is situated on (Carr Lane) or the road leading up to it (Commons Lane) This would result in all journeys having to be completed by a motor vehicle.

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 17 October 2024 13:18
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2024/0753 FS-Case-655442639

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2024/0753

Address of Development: pewter house farm Carr Lane BB2 7LN

Comments: We have had sight of the Parish response and note the comments regarding farming operations at land adjacent to the Development Site. We understand that planning has been approved for an agricultural storage building on this land. We have looked at that planning application (3/2024/0659) and note in the cover letter it states that [REDACTED] “will also be increasing his stock numbers creating the agricultural need for the proposed building as a result of greater storage requirements”

This suggests that the farming operations that were associated with Pewter House Farm have ceased at the Developments Site as previously stated but have now moved to the land adjacent to it- also accessed by Carr Lane. We understand that the Applicant bought the cow sheds and the farm house from [REDACTED] with a small amount of non-agricultural land associated with those buildings. The land for cattle operations remains in the ownership of [REDACTED] who appears to have continued his operations “next door”. In this sense although farming operations ceased at the Development Site upon sale of the farm to the Applicant, there is continued farming.

We agree with the Parish Council that this is significant.

Either

1. The farming operations have never generated significant agricultural traffic at any time – this is evidenced by the apparent continuation of those operations to date with the only significant large vehicles being those attending the Applicant’s development at Pewter House Farm. No agricultural traffic uses Carr Lane on anything like a regular basis;

or

2. The farming operations have always generated a large amount of agricultural traffic (as falsely stated by the Applicant) in which case the fact that the farming operations continue on land adjacent to the Development Site would mean there would still be large amounts of agricultural traffic on Carr Lane.

This means that even if the Applicant's [REDACTED] assertion regarding large amounts of agricultural traffic generated by the farm operations is accepted - in both scenarios the building of 5 additional residential properties would necessarily lead to an unacceptable intensification of traffic on Carr Lane. In fact if the Applicant's assertion regarding traffic volume generated by farming was true the situation would be even worse as new housing would be adding to what he claims is significantly high volumes of existing traffic.

In any event as pointed out by the Parish Council, the Applicant is not in control of farming operations at the land accessed by Carr Lane. The Applicant simply has control of farm buildings which are no longer in use. Farming operations appear to have continued on land adjacent to the development site. The Applicant does not own this land and is unable to state that all such operations will cease should his planning application be approved.

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 17 October 2024 14:59
To: Planning
Subject: FAO Ben Taylor 3/2024/0753

 **External Email**

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.

Good afternoon Ben

We have been looking at the points raised by the Parish Council regarding the proposed development at Pewter House Farm.

It is our understanding that conversion of agricultural buildings that are not in use is intended as a way of giving new life to existing buildings where there is no longer a need for agricultural buildings. It seems that there is still an agricultural need at this location hence [REDACTED] application to build new storage facilities right next to the buildings that are the subject of this application.

We note that under the planning legislation, development is NOT permitted under Class Q if:

(g)development under Class A(a) or Class B(a) of Part 6 of this Schedule (agricultural buildings and operations) has been carried out on the established agricultural unit during the period which is 10 years before the date development under Class Q begins,

Planning 3/2024/0659 is planning that has been passed by reference to Class A Part 6 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (Permitted Development) Order 2015 (as amended 2018) - the agricultural unit on land which up to the sale of parts of the farm at Pewter House Farm was part of that overall agricultural unit. It seems to us that the hiving up of agricultural units should not be a way to avoid the application of the planning legislation and that under Q1(g) the proposed development at Pewter House Farm cannot proceed. This would be true especially if that hiving up was carried out with the specific purpose of seeking planning to develop residential properties on the land. We are obviously not experts in Planning Law but this is how we understand

the letter and intention of the legislation. We are sure the Council will be able to determine the correct position. We just noted the issue raised by the Parish Council and wish it to be considered further.

Regards

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]