

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 13 October 2024 13:52
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2024/0753 FS-Case-654241038

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2024/0753

Address of Development: Pewter House Farm Carr Lane Balderstone BB27LN

Comments: This application has been refused 4 times under various different names. This was refused on the grounds of the road (Carr Lane) being too narrow to support 5 additional houses with at least 2 cars each using the lane. There has recently been developed another passing place opposite 1 Carr Lane Cottage this is [REDACTED], it is shown on the application to be far larger than it is. It has not been approved by planning and has also been made on land [REDACTED]. It is also next to a public footpath which could cause problems and danger to footpath users. The so called passing place is not guaranteed to be maintained and could easily be removed as it [REDACTED].

There is no agricultural traffic from the farm as the applicant now owns the farm agricultural buildings. Carr Lane still remains a single track lane with poor sight, pinchpoints and inadequate passing places. It would also not withstand the traffic 5 houses would generate on the wear and tear of the road. For these reasons I strongly object to this application.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 13 October 2024 10:07
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2024/0753 FS-Case-654205460

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2024/0753

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

Comments: I write to express my concerns regarding the above planning application and have the following comments to make :-

This is the 5th prior approval planning application at Pewter House Farm, seeking to change 3 redundant agricultural steel portal framed buildings into 5 large residential dwellings.

3/2022/0909 Firth
3/2022/1072 Firth
3/2023/0725 Mr Abid Hussain
3/2024/0266 Pewter House Farm Developments
3/2024/0753 Miss Laura Howe

Within this application PSA Design have submitted a Transport Statement which contains a letter to Ms Kelly Holt at Highway Development Control, Highways and Transport, LCC. Within this letter it would appear that after a site visit with Miss Holt on the 21st August 2024, all the concerns and reasons for recommended refusals by Mr Ryan Darbyshire in the previous 4 applications have suddenly gone away. I find this very hard to comprehend, as nothing has changed at the junction of Carr Lane with Commons Lane, Carr Lane is still a single track lane with poor visibility, pinch points and inadequate passing places.

With regard to passing places, the proposed passing place adjacent to Bowford Cottage, is not on Carr Lane but is on the side of Pewter House Farm track and serves no use to the existing dwellings and users of Carr Lane.

An attempt to create an additional passing place adjacent to 1 Carr Lane Cottage has taken place. This is not a Historical Passing Place and does not show up on any historic maps. It was a thick hedge on a steep embankment. The existing thick hedge has been smashed back and the raised banking and soil have been removed. Road scalping has been used in an attempt to make a hard standing. PSA Design fig 1 shows this passing place outlined in red. The red outline is incorrect as it shows the passing place to be twice its actual size, running through a gate posted gateway into a field and up to

the east wall of 2 Carr Lane Cottage's garage.

I note that no application for planning permission has been applied for or approved. The works associated with this passing place are [REDACTED] and cannot be associated with the prior notification application at Pewter House Farm as they have already taken place. The third passing place, near to the junction with Commons Lane would also be created on [REDACTED] involve hedgerow removal and excavation works.

All these passing places are on [REDACTED], [REDACTED] by the applicant, so their upkeep, maintenance and existence are not guaranteed.

It would be WRONG to grant approval for the 5 dwellings at Pewter House Farm using the creation of an [REDACTED] passing place to resolve concerns raised by the Highways Officer in the previous applications. I am not sure if Ms Holt was aware that the passing place discussed during the site visit was [REDACTED] and in [REDACTED], but she may wish to reconsider her view with regard to removing the LHA objections

The application implies that the conversion of the agricultural buildings into 5 dwellings would reduce the amount of agricultural traffic associated with the farm. There is NO farm traffic, as implied by the third party data used by PSA Design in their transport statement. The applicant has purchased the farm buildings and farm house, so they no longer form part of the farmstead or land associated with the farm. The development would increase traffic to a dangerous level of intensification.

I would say that very little has changed with this application with regard to the previously 4 refused applications. Carr Lane still remains a 540m single track lane with poor sight, pinch points and inadequate passing places. This development if approved would lead to the intensification of traffic using the lane, resulting in reduced highway safety. For these reasons, I OBJECT to this application.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 12 October 2024 15:04
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2024/0753 FS-Case-654107576

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Reference No.: 3/2024/0753

Address of Development: Pewter House Farm Developments
Carr Lane
Balderstone

Comments: Yet another planning application (5 in all) in yet another name ([REDACTED])

As previously stated, nothing has changed significantly to change the previous decisions. The passing place recently constructed at the bend close to 1 and 2 Carr Lane Cottages has been created by ripping out the hedges on land that [REDACTED]

[REDACTED], laying down some gravel and erecting a rickety fence. It is neither long enough nor wide enough to be deemed a passing place.

As previously stated in the other 4 applications, there is only one designated passing place on the whole of the lane. To reiterate, there is nowhere else on the whole lane where 2 vehicles can pass apart from this passing place. There is still the problem with the section of track with a one foot ditch on one side and an eight foot drop into a stream on the other.

I fail to understand why, in the letter supporting the application, they seem to be under the misapprehension that if the application was refused again, the site would become a commercial farm. The applicant has already stated previously that they have no interest in the farming aspect of the site and the previous occupier ([REDACTED]) has not run it as a working farm for over 30 years. As for the number of agricultural vehicles using the lane. The numbers stated are a complete [REDACTED]. The only agricultural vehicle journeys are approximately once a year when the [REDACTED] hires somebody to bale [REDACTED] to feed [REDACTED] cattle during the winter. Any HGV's using the lane have only appeared since the applicant took possession of the farm house, presumably delivering building materials etc for the renovations on his property. Prior to this the only vehicle which could be perceived as a HGV is the weekly refuse collection wagon.

As I cannot see any significant changes to the previous 4 applications, I hope that you will concur that the application should be refused again.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 15 October 2024 13:16
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2024/0753 FS-Case-654823805

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2024/0753

Address of Development: Pewter House Farm Carr Lane

Comments: This is the 5th re-submission of the Application for a residential development at this site (although the address is incorrectly stated as Commons Lane). It has been submitted in the [REDACTED] [REDACTED]. This is the 4th name that has been used for what is, on each occasion, exactly the same application from the same party. For the purposes of our comments we use the term Applicant to refer to all 4 persons/entities that have been used as this is in fact the [REDACTED].

The Council will be aware that all 4 previous Applications have been refused.

We would also refer the Council to other planning applications that have been refused in part due to concerns about access on Carr Lane. (3/2022/0842) was an application for 2 holiday lets that would not be permanently occupied and (3/2024/0659) was an application for a single dwelling. Both of these would have generated far less traffic than a development of 5 houses. If these have been refused how can this Application be granted?

We would ask that our comments in relation to all 4 previous Applications are annexed to and considered as part of this new Application as all of our concerns remain relevant. We have been put in a position where we are repeatedly having to refer the Council to the [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] information that has been provided as the basis for the planning documentation submitted on behalf of the Applicant. Rather than continuously spending our time setting out the facts again and again we would ask that the Council takes particular note of the [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] information regarding traffic volume on Carr Lane as set out in each of our previous comments on each of the previous Applications.

We would further draw the Council's attention in particular to the following:

- The Planning Statement and the Transport Statement for 3/2024/0753 are again based on the [REDACTED] assertion that the farm "will cease to operate" once the development is built therefore decreasing traffic. The Council is aware that there was little if any agricultural traffic when the farm was operational and that as noted in the refusals of the previous applications, any farm traffic ceased upon the sale of the farm to the applicant in 2022. The persons who have put these Statements

together appear to have been provided with inaccurate and false information which has the effect of making their submissions unreliable at best.

- The only person in control of traffic generated at the site at the time the Transport Statement relies upon in relation to trip generation in 2023 was the Applicant who had good reason to ensure that traffic numbers were inflated at that time. In any event, agricultural operations ceased some time before the date of the traffic data when the farm was sold. This being the case, any traffic data after that date simply CANNOT be related to agricultural operations at the site.
- As there is no agricultural traffic on Carr Lane, building 5 new homes with at least 10 vehicles and the associated visitors and deliveries will lead to a serious intensification of traffic. Carr Lane is a single track, unlit lane with ditches along the side and is also public footpath. We refer the Council back to all of the comments relating to the unsuitability of Carr Lane as access to such a large development in each of the 4 previous applications.
- The Applicant has suggested that there are plenty of passing places on Carr Lane. Again we refer back to previous comments on previous applications. There remains 1 formal passing place. The Applicant suggests that he has reached an agreement [REDACTED] to re-instate a passing place and to create a new one. The “re-instated” passing place has never been a passing place while [REDACTED]. It was an area of well established bushes along the edge of the carriageway. There is a stile to a public footpath adjacent to the area which has now been roughly cleared and is on a slope. Further it is our understanding that the [REDACTED]. There is nothing to stop [REDACTED] fencing it off. It is also worth mentioning that this “passing place” has already been used as parking for a vehicle (from a visiting utilities company) - photo can be provided. In fact vehicles are often parked on the “informal passing places” and, on occasion, even in the one formal passing place.

We would also be interested to know on what basis agreement has been reached to provide land further down Carr Lane towards Commons Lane as a passing place – the same concerns as to [REDACTED] and future maintenance of such a passing place apply to this area as outlined above. That piece of land could change hands in the future – what obligation would a future land owner have to maintain that passing place?

The other two areas that the Applicant has suggested are informal passing places are again [REDACTED]. One area opposite [REDACTED] is now gated off and cannot be used. The other is frequently used as parking for visitors to properties down Carr Lane. The Council/Highways Agency previously found that these informal passing places could not be taken into account when assessing the safety of the road and suitability for increased traffic generated by the development due to those areas of land not belonging to or being under the control of the Applicant. We would suggest that the exact same argument applies to any additional informal passing places created at the behest of the Applicant in his attempts to secure planning.

- Carr Lane continues to be a single track lane which has no lighting, ditches on both sides and various buildings and stables directly abutting the carriageway. It is used by walkers, horse riders and children on bikes etc. There are chickens frequently on the road.
- The supporting statements suggest that there have been no accidents on Carr Lane. There are numerous regular difficulties. There has been damage to buildings. The Applicant has driven off the road into the ditch and had to have his vehicle recovered by the farmer using his tractor.
- There seems to be some suggestion that the Council should allow this Application to avoid future

large scale farming operations at the site. Clearly this is wholly irrelevant to the present Application. In any event, there is no evidence for this proposition. The site itself does not constitute agricultural land that could support such an operation as it is limited to the empty cow barns and the farmhouse. The only relevant issues are the facts as they stand at the time of the Application. In any event, the Council will be aware reading back through all of the documentation submitted by the Applicant in his various guises that the Applicant has previously submitted clear statements in support of his Application and his contention that 5 houses will decrease traffic, that there is NO intention for farming to take place at any point in the future at the site. The Applicant is presently renovating the farmhouse for his own occupation.

We are fed up of having to respond to repeated submissions by the same Applicant for the same development. We hope that the Council will consider all of the points raised in relation to each failed submission and will refuse this 5th Application for the reasons set out in this and each previous comment that we have submitted.