

Nicola Gunn

From: Paul Slinger <newtoninbowlandparishclerk@outlook.com>
Sent: 29 June 2025 12:50
To: Planning
Subject: 3/2025/0061 Clerk Laithe, Slaidburn Road, Newton BB7 3DY

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.

Thank you, for your consultation on the planning application to change the use of Clerk Laithe barn from a residential accommodation with working area and new build bed and breakfast annex into a five bedroom children's home.

Whilst the Parish Council understands the need for such facilities in Lancashire, we cannot support and strongly object to the application for what will be the second of such facilities in our very small village.

The existing children's home, for which we can't locate a planning application for change of use, has created several issues for the village including dangerous parking for which the Parish Council and local residents are regrettably left to police.

Approving this application would result in two of the largest properties in the village both approved by planning as intended for residential use and families being used to support Lancashire's vulnerable children. Changing this from residential use permanently will see yet another of our properties out of residential use. The nature of these properties and also means the contribution to our small community would be at best minimal.

Planning permission was originally granted to convert Clerk Laithe Barn from agricultural into residential with a percentage of work/employment.

Subsequently, a new build annex, referred to in the planning statement as Barn 2, was granted on the basis of increasing the B&B facilities attracting tourism and income into local area whilst also supporting a local family living in the main residence. This additional extension was never a "barn" and almost doubled the size of the property within the footprint, yet other applications within the Valley designed to attract families and increase residential bedrooms have been refused often on much smaller developments.

In 2012 permission was granted to erect a brand-new annex to attract tourism to the village this would've supported our pub which is the only amenity now left within the community. Subsequently, the application to join the existing barn and new annex was approved for use as a bed and breakfast reception again to support tourism and sustainability. Other applications to do similar within the community have subsequently been refused.

Only a few years ago in 2020 and 2021 permission was refused to create a farm shop which would've supported our local farmers provided local employment and attracted tourist from outside the village into our community. This was refused on the basis of car parking and traffic – but yet this application seeks to do the same but without any contribution to our economy. Whilst resulting in an additional building this would've had a positive impact on the whole Hodder Valley with no other farm shops available.

In terms of the proposed works to our earlier point Barn 2 is not a barn and is a newly constructed annex granted for the purpose of bed and breakfast. The property is already a substantial size and therefore the need for further extension in addition to the link appears to be driven by revenue and we believe over development with additional roof lights and windows only necessary to expand the accommodation accommodate five children.

The planning statement references that none of these changes are permanent and are easily changeable. The parish council would question how the installation of new windows and roof lights and the construction of a car park with the removal of garden is not permanent?

It is unclear how this application supports Ribble Valleys core strategy as it contributes nothing to the community or it's current assets, has no footpath from the property to the village, as highlighted by Lancaster County Council as a bus service that is at best infrequent, remove bedrooms which could of housed children to support our struggling schools, would be located in a village with no amenities for children, and to DMG2 specifically this has nothing to the local economy social well-being of the area no enhances the ANOB. In permitting the use of another large property in the village for use with Emergency housing for vulnerable girls the parish council feels that Ribble Valley and parish Council have already supported young vulnerable people within our community and the local demand referenced is not something needed within a 10 mile radius of the property.

The planning statement refers to local employment and use of local contractors. Work has already been undertaken to widen access to the site, undertaken by non-local contractors therefore it is difficult to understand how 'local' the use of supplier would be. In terms of employment given the nature of the proposal it is highly unlikely that there would be trained, qualified individuals within the village meeting the needs of such a highly specialised enterprise, who would then at best, if living in Clitheroe, have a 7-8 mile commute via car.

With villages across the country struggling to maintain their amenities such as pubs schools and village halls this again would deal another blow to our local community given the proposal would not as originally proposed as part of the original planning application support our pub and Village Hall nor at clear in the planning statement see children from what was granted as a family home attend our schools.

In terms of the national planning policy framework decisions should be responsive to local circumstances and support housing developments that reflect local needs. It is difficult to understand how a children's home, the second in a small village, aligns to the policy in an area that requires residential housing for young and retiring tenant farmers to maintain our community and avoid being one where are housing stock is turned into commercial enterprises and holiday rentals.

Whilst the remoteness of the village is cited as a positive for up to 5 vulnerable boys, the village has no facilities and although in the planning statement it states access to open landscapes there is no permitted footpath leading from the property and is over 7 miles away from the nearest town/supermarket meaning more traffic on top of that scene as granted by the HARP scheme with Police and Emergency services often over 20 minutes away. The remoteness may be attractive but is also, often in winter, a challenge as our roads can be impassible.

References made in planning statement that there is a local need for this facility. In a village where there are less than 6 children under the age of 16 it is difficult to see how this development would contribute to the sustainability of our community and in fact would have a severe detrimental impact for generations to come.

DM 12 transport considerations should minimise the need for travel. All staff and children will be required to drive to the property as there is no footpath and the bus service is at best and infrequent and whilst a cycle shelter has been recommended the Parish Council find it difficult to understand who will cycle over the fells to the property.

DMB1 supporting business growth and local economy. This is and has been a thriving bed and breakfast enterprise diversifying and contributing positively to the local economy again the Parish Council cannot see how a home where the children are not part of the community will be unable to use the pub and get to the local shop in the next village on foot and the loss of residential use can contribute positively to the local community or economy.

The planning statement also references the low levels of pollution and noise to help create a better emotional healing environment. The proposed United Utilities HARP scheme which will last for circa 10 years in the village will certainly not provide that low traffic, quiet low pollution place. environment.

