

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 24 March 2025 21:01  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0095 FS-Case-699267731

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]


**Planning Application Reference No.:** 3/2025/0095

**Address of Development:** Higher Road, Knowle Green

**Comments:** I am no [REDACTED] to the proposed planning site, [REDACTED] and know the land well.

I object to the proposed planning application on the following grounds....

- 1) it lies within the National Landscape of the Forest of Bowland, for which there have rightly been stringent planning laws , which protect the unique nature of this area. The planned building in no way fits into the character of buildings in this area.
- 2) The site is agricultural pastoral land . If planning permission is given , this sets a dangerous precedent for any field with a good view to be built on, by anyone with sufficient funds to throw at it.
- 3) These fields are some of the remaining fields in the Ribble Valley that are not intensively farmed , and as such are home to a wide variety of wildlife, such as badgers, foxes, bats, deer, voles..., native grasses,mayflower, and a hedgerow with wild primroses. A building of this scale will disturb a rich habitat which has been there for hundreds of years.
- 4) The application mentions a car park for viewing the Roman road which passes over the plot. However, , the development will cover much of the site of the Roman road , and there is no evidence that any undisturbed road which is left , will be of a quality to attract tourists! Surely this is just a ploy to get planning permission on the back of tourism!



24 March 2025

Stephen Kilmartin  
Planning Department  
Council Offices  
Church Walk, Clitheroe  
Lancashire BB7 2RA

Subject: Objection to Planning Application No: **3/2025/0095**, Grid Ref: 364169  
438922, Location: Land at Higher Road Longridge PR3 2YX

Dear Sir,

We are writing to formally object to the proposed development of a contemporary dwelling as outlined in the above planning application. As residents of the Ribble Valley for [REDACTED] years and the Forest of Bowland AONB for the [REDACTED], we have serious concerns about the impact this development will have on our local area.

The proposed design is not in keeping with the character and historic nature of the surrounding properties. Conservation areas and AONBs exist to preserve the landscape's unique aesthetic and heritage. The introduction of a modern structure would undermine this and set an unwelcome precedent for further inappropriate development.

While we acknowledge the efforts to get the application accepted as exceptional design quality (NPPF 84e), architectural opinions on "good design" are subjective and not universally shared by the public or even experts. Many of the local buildings date back to the 17th and 18th centuries - would this new build stand the test of time and still be regarded as an exceptional design in years to come?

Additionally, the ecological survey notes that the proposed site may serve as a nesting area for red-listed bird species. From personal observations, we can confirm that Lapwings and Curlews nest in these fields, and the area is also home to the Brown Hare, which was not accounted for in the survey. The proposed ecological mitigation efforts to achieve a net biodiversity gain are commendable, but their success depends on strict long-term adherence. How will these plans be enforced over the required 15-year period? What safeguards exist if funding runs

out, ownership changes, or commitments are not upheld? There have been past instances where the council has struggled to enforce decisions despite court rulings in its favour.

Most importantly, approving this development would open the door to further speculative applications, undermining the AONB's protections. Other local landowners have had similar applications refused primarily due to the area's designation. Allowing this proposal would set a precedent, encouraging more applications that chip away at the natural beauty and ecological integrity of our landscape.

We urge the planning department to reject this application to preserve the natural beauty, ecological significance, and heritage of our area.

Thank you for considering our concerns.

Yours sincerely,

A solid black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area.

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 24 March 2025 18:58  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Application No: 3/2025/0095

 **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.

Dear Mr Kilmartin,

I write to lodge my objection to the above planning application on Land at Higher Road, Longridge PR3 2YX. The points of objections are as follows:

1. The NPPF referenced in the planning application is outdated. What is referenced in the NPPF in the Landscape and Visual assessment do not correspond to the actual updated NPPF. For example quoted Paragraphs 180 and 182 in the application do not correspond to the actual document.
2. There is no permit for waste water discharge into Cowley Brook and no sequential risk assessment for increasing the likelihood of flooding downstream. This contradicts NPPF Paragraph 178 (b). There is an existing risk of surface water flooding at the Moor Hey properties downstream of the Land.
3. The scale of development is arguably not limited. The plans for a 4 bedroom private house in a Natural Landscape in an agricultural field consists of 6 WCs, 4 separate living areas, a gym, a sauna. This contradicts NPPF Paragraph 189.
4. The development is not in the public interest being a private dwelling house, with no impact on the local economy, further development outside the area (unnecessary development of a car park for a Roman road which has existed since Roman times without a carpark).
5. In Core Strategy 2008 – 2028, A Local Plan for Ribble Valley, Adoption Version Policy DMG2, the application is not consistent with the following:
  1. The development should be essential to the local economy or social well-being of the area - **no such need identified.**
  2. The development is needed for the purposes of forestry or agriculture - not applicable.
  3. The development is for local needs housing which meets an identified need and is secured as such - **no such need identified.**
  4. The development is for small scale tourism or recreational developments appropriate to a rural area - **no such need identified.**
  5. The development is for small-scale uses appropriate to a rural area where a local need or benefit can be demonstrated - **no such need identified.**
  6. The development is compatible with the enterprise zone designation. DMH3 - not applicable.
6. The application contradicts Core Strategy 2008 – 2028, A Local Plan for Ribble Valley, Adoption Version Policy DMH3. There is no local need identified.

7. It remains accessible only by car in contradiction to Key Statement DMI2 and Policy DMG3 of the Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework. I would like to see the applicant walk up Stoneygate lane from the nearest bus stop at Halls Arm Business Centre, or cycle along the hilly Higher Road into Longridge as part of their commute.

8. The development is not isolated. In addition to the existing dwellings north of the development, there is New Drop Inn. Not mentioned are 5 separate dwellings south of the proposed development. The plot is not as isolated as the planning statement leads you to believe.

9. The proposal to excavate and preserve a section of the Roman road appears optional at present.

Most importantly, this application sets a precedent for development of agricultural land in a National Landscape. The applicant also owns 2 other parcels of adjoining agricultural land which can be subject to a future application for change in use.

I would be grateful if the above points could be considered and the application rejected primarily due to the setting of a precedence of building on agricultural land in a National Landscape.

Yours sincerely



[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 30 March 2025 11:23  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0095 FS-Case-701028723

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

**Planning Application Reference No.:** 3/2025/0095

**Address of Development:** Land at Higher Road

**Comments:** We strongly object to further urbanisation of this AONB. What is the justification for destroying rural landscape in order to build 1 house?  
There are no barns/sheds or other permanent structures on the site and there never have been. The possibility of a public parking lot only adds to the reasons to firmly reject this application.