

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 13 February 2025 16:08  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Application Comments - 3/2024/1016 FS-Case-687405641

[REDACTED]

Lancashire

[REDACTED]

**Planning Application Reference No.:** 3/2024/1016

**Address of Development:** 1-7 The Picture House, George Street, Whalley, BB7 9TH

**Comments:** To: Kathryn Hughes, Planning Officer  
Ribble Valley Borough Council  
planning@ribblevalley.gov.uk

**OBJECTION – Application 3/2024/1016 | Destruction of Nesting Owls**

Dear Ms. Hughes,

I am writing as a long-standing resident of Whalley, deeply troubled by this planning application. I have lived in this beautiful village for many years and have watched it change, not always for the better. This latest proposal, however, is beyond the pale.

There are owls nesting on the roof of this building! God's creatures... and they have been there for some time. I have personally heard them twooting at night, a comforting sound, a reminder that nature still thrives in our community. These owls have come home to roost, as is their God-given right, and it is utterly disgraceful that this development seeks to destroy their habitat without a second thought.

**The Bible Teaches Us to Protect God's Creation**  
The Book of Job 12:7-10 tells us:

"But ask the animals, and they will teach you, or the birds in the sky, and they will tell you... In His hand is the life of every creature and the breath of all mankind."

The Lord Himself commands us to respect and care for His creatures, and yet here we are, seeing them pushed out of their home for the sake of development.

**Legal Protections for Owls**  
This is not just a matter of faith... it is also against the law.

Barn owls (*Tyto alba*) are a Schedule 1 protected species under the Wildlife and Countryside Act

1981.

It is a criminal offence to disturb or destroy their nesting site.

Developers cannot simply ignore nature in pursuit of profit!

I implore the council to do the right thing.

If this application is approved without a full ecological survey, you will be failing in your duty to uphold the law and protect our environment.

The Ribble Valley prides itself on its natural beauty! Are we really prepared to sacrifice that for the sake of unchecked development?

Proverbs 12:10 says,

“The righteous care for the needs of their animals, but the kindest acts of the wicked are cruel.”

It would be a cruel act indeed to allow this to proceed without proper regard for the owls who have made this building their home. I urge you to refuse this application until a full ecological assessment is carried out, proving beyond doubt that these birds will be protected.

We must all answer to a higher power, but in the meantime, the council must also answer to the people of this village.

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 17 February 2025 15:48  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Application Comments - 3/2024/1016 FS-Case-688329483

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Lancashire

[REDACTED]

**Planning Application Reference No.:** 3/2024/1016

**Address of Development:** 1 to 7 The Picture House George Street Whalley BB7 9TH

**Comments:** Please accept this correspondence as a formal objection to this application which has been submitted following several previous applications and finally appears following the request of the authority to 'regularise' the as built development. We can only assume that the alternative would be

to carry out formal enforcement procedures as since the construction work began It is clear that the developer/applicant has continued to blatantly flout the planning process.

This is evidenced by the abject failure to have the majority of the planning conditions from the original consent in 2021 formally discharged. The authority have already stated their disapproval of the as built situation within the application ref 3/2024/0304 which was decided at committee on 17 September 2024.

Nothing has changed with regard to the construction of the development in the intervening months since this decision and the current validation of the application which has now been submitted.

This application includes statements prepared by the agent which are extremely brief but also highly contentious with regard to the justifications for the as built condition of the development. The costs of materials and the timescales for the development are not acceptable reasons for the variations carried out. It is fair to interpret the decisions made by the developer during the construction process as putting profit over procedure and ignoring the important aspects of the development which were carefully assessed by the authority in the original approval. There have been several 'muddled' application attempts by the applicant/developer to gain approval which have all been either refused or the applications have been withdrawn. This application is nothing but consistent in it's approach and paucity of detail to seek approval.

It is important to highlight the key issues which the authority need to pay close attention to in their assessment of the development. It is hoped that the case officer is fully aware of these matters as local residents have been raising their deep concerns for many months. Many of the residents live in the adjacent cottages which have grade 2 listing status and any assessment of the development has to take into account the very important matter of impact on the listed buildings as well as the impact the alterations have on the application building which has a townscape merit designation within the conservation area.

Reference to the officer's report from the original approval highlights these aspects and the same

assessment procedure must surely be carried out in order to demonstrate a consistent approach by the authority as the planning policies have not changed since 2021. The case officer placed great weight on the importance of the alterations to the rear of the building due to the proximity to the houses/listed buildings and the impact on the conservation issues

## SUMMARY

1. The rear stair well has been completed as an incongruous open canopied arrangement and not enclosed by glazing and timber boarding.
2. The rear stair well has been externally and internally finished with an aluminium standing seam cladding system and not zinc (heritage material).
3. The rear stair well has lighting installed to a level which is completely unacceptable which is only exacerbated by the fact that it has been left open to the elements.
4. The privacy screening to the terrace level has not been installed.
5. The rear boundary wall situation is not as the approved details and the new rendered wall to the stair has an unacceptable bulk and appearance
6. The large dormer to the street elevation has been externally finished in aluminium standing seam cladding and not zinc (heritage material)
7. UPVC windows have been installed to the entire development. This (as highlighted by others) remains highly contentious in the conservation area and the authority have already stated that these are unacceptable (app ref 3/2024/0324). The windows are not compatible with the historic character of the area and we reiterate the point that they only serve to undermine the integrity of the original design and the character of the building.  
The applicant's 'study' of the area is a futile attempt to justify the installations. It's apparent that the applicant has failed to listen to the authorities stance on this matter in advance and during the construction work.
8. The apartment layouts have been amended since the approval which raises concern over the level of occupancy and the car parking arrangement.
9. The crass action of engraving the developers name into the stone turrets of the building is an extremely distasteful act of architectural vandalism.
10. The removal of the historic lead cupola from the roof is also a highly insensitive act of destruction.

It is clear that the applicant /developer has consistently demonstrated their failure and basic inability to properly carry out a highly sensitive redevelopment on one of Whalley's most important heritage buildings in a manner that follows the planning procedures and pays due regard to the community concerns as a whole.

[Redacted]

**Subject:** FW: Fwd:  
**Attachments:** IMG\_7636.jpg; IMG\_7637.jpg; IMG\_7808.jpg

[Redacted]

**Sent:** 18 February 2025 14:17  
**To:** Planning <planning@ribblevalley.gov.uk>  
**Subject:** Fwd:

**⚠ 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.

Apologies

The photos relate to application ref 3/2024/1016  
1 to 7 The Picture House George Street Whalley BB7 9TH

Regards

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

**Date:** Tue, Feb 18, 2025 at 2:15 PM  
**Subject:** Fwd:  
**To:** planning <planning@ribblevalley.gov.uk>

Good afternoon

Please can these photographs be uploaded to supplement the objection correspondence I issued yesterday.

Kathryn Hughes as advised that I email the photos direct.

Regards

[Redacted]

