

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 19 January 2025 16:05  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Application Comments - 3/2024/1043 FS-Case-679926658

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Lancashire

[REDACTED]

**Planning Application Reference No.:** 3/2024/1043

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

**Comments:** I wish to appose this application. Having 5 new dwelling on Pewter House Carr Lane would mean the possibility of up to 10 extra vehicles or more using the road when its already just manageable as it is. [REDACTED],  
[REDACTED] and [REDACTED] its rural quiet peaceful location. [REDACTED] my  
[REDACTED] to Pewter House and when I asked about an old post on the  
telegraph pole relating to planning, I was assured that they did not intend on going ahead with any  
more plans at Pewter House. If I was told they were planning on 5 more dwellings I certainly would  
not have [REDACTED] There are also a lot of walkers that come into the area and  
its lovely and tranquil having more vehicles on this road will have a negative impact. The area would  
be much busier and much noisier.

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 20 January 2025 13:03  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Application Comments - 3/2024/1043 FS-Case-680158794

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Lancashire

[REDACTED]

**Planning Application Reference No.:** 3/2024/1043

**Address of Development:** Pewter House Farm, Carr Lane, Balderstone

**Comments:** Re Planning Application 3/2024/1043.

This is the 6th re-submission of this planning by the Applicant. Each of these Applications has been refused. Nothing has changed since the most recent refusal.

The supporting statement dated September 2024 from WBW surveyors is the same statement used in support of Application 3/2024/0763 which was refused on 4/11/2024. It does not include 3/2024/0763 within the planning history. The information in that report was considered by the Council in its decision to refuse planning. We do not see how this can assist the Applicant in relation to this re-submission. The same applies in relation to the letter to the Highways Agency dated 19th August 2024.

Further, the supporting letter from 49 Architecture continues to contain statements that are factually incorrect. The proposal does not create a reduction of traffic to and from the site. The data provided by the Applicant is not accepted. This has been made clear in relation to each and every of the 5 previous applications. There has never been any level of agricultural traffic on Carr Lane. The low level operations continue on the land adjacent to the proposed site which remains in the ownership of the farmer. The building of 5 additional residential properties with 10+ vehicles and the associated traffic from visitors/deliveries would amount to a significant intensification of traffic on Carr Lane. We would ask the Council to re-visit comments made and information provided on this point.

As far as passing places are concerned, the Applicant claims that 2 additional formal passing places have been put in place with the agreement of the land owners. We would comment as follows:

- Neither passing place is within the ownership or control of the Applicant. As a result there is no way of ensuring the future maintenance or existence of either.
- The passing place by Carr Lane Cottage is wholly inadequate. It does not align with the dimensions in terms of length suggested in the Applicant's accompanying documentation, and in fact being on a slope it has already been partially washed away down Carr Lane as water runs off the fields (see photo showing the stones washed from the surface lying on the centre of Carr Lane towards the

parked vehicle). A trench is forming along the edge of the area which also sits right on top of the entrance to a public footpath (photo below). There have also been vehicles parking at this point when making visits to the cottages (photo available).

- The passing place constructed nearer to the junction with Commons Lane is equally rough in construction and as noted above there is no certainty it will be maintained.

Carr Lane continues to be a winding, unlit single track lane with ditches along the side at some points and poor visibility in parts. Stables open directly onto the carriageway and parking for residents means vehicles reverse onto the road. It is used by dog walkers, walkers and horse riders and it forms part of a public footpath with is a stile providing access (directly onto the area roughly cleared as a passing place on the slope by Carr Lane Cottage). On occasion there are children playing in the lane. It is not suitable as safe access to a further five homes with 10 or more vehicles and associated visitors/deliveries.

In any event, we note from the Delegated Report relating to the refusal of 2/2024/0753 that the Council confirms that the proposed passing place is located outside the confines of the Application site and is outside the scope of Class Q of the GPDO. On this basis the Highways Authority continued to object to the proposed development. Nothing has changed that could alter that decision.

It appears that this Application is simply a re-submission of the previous applications. The Applicant has resubmitted the same supporting statement from September 2024, a structural survey from March 2024 and a letter to the Highways Agency from August 2024. All of this information was provided to the Council previously and the Application was refused. We would ask that the Council refers back to our comments on the previous Application(s) in relation to the veracity of information submitted in support. The only new pieces of supporting documentation appear to be a letter from A49Architecture dated 23/12/2024 and the required Bat Survey. Our comments on paragraph 3 of the A49 letter are set out above. As far as the proposed building itself is concerned we would simply point out that the Council has considered the Application and found repeatedly that the proposal would not fall within the necessary planning legislation.


We would ask that this 6th Application also be refused.

(photographs will be emailed - cannot seem to attach to this section)

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 20 January 2025 13:10  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** 3/2024/1043 Pewter House Farm  
**Attachments:** IMG\_1557.jpg; IMG\_1556.jpg

 **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.

F.A.O Ben Taylor

Dear Ben

Please find attached photos referred to in comments submitted in relation to the proposed development at pewter House Farm 3/202401043

I would be grateful if these photos could be put with the comments as submitted.

Many thanks

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]