

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

23 March 2025

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

Attention: Stephen Kilmartin

Reference Planning application 3/2025/0095

Land at Higher Road Longridge PR3 2YX

Dear Sir,

We are concerned about the negative impact of the above proposal to change the use of land, and which clearly seeks to exploit planning requirements and damage an AONB to create a building where there is no need. We would like to raise the following points.

1. The proposal would have a negative visual impact and in no way enhance the area or location. The proposed property would have a negative visual impact in the direction of Lower Road and Knowle Green. Although the elevation drawing of Higher Road looks to have no impact on the street scene, as existing five bar gates are shown, this would not be the case as access requirements and vehicular movement would change it and be a negative on the environment. The very existence and change of use of the land will change the sense of place forever. The proposal does not compliment the environment.
2. This proposal does not advance architectural thinking and while it purports to sit in the contours of the land it is in no way a marriage that is sculptural or attractive. There is no technological innovation as all the proposed technologies are tried partial solutions to negate environmental impacts. There is no raising of standards of design.
3. There is no need for a dwelling in this location. This will not solve housing needs of any kind. It will destroy heritage by its imprint on the location.

4. There is nothing attractive about the bunker box design with large windows to enhance the views for the sole benefit of the occupiers. While the submitted elevations seek to disguise the visibility of the property the large viewing windows indicate that on some elevations it will be clearly visible. A truer innovative approach might be to place the dwelling subterranean and use periscopes to take images of views to screens the size of windows! Of course, the latter would consume energy.
5. Air source heat pumps and solar power may be used to reduce the carbon footprint, but these are only partial solutions. The property is large and would bring all the negatives of human habitation, waste management, energy consumption, light generation, and the requirement for services such as transport, parking, deliveries and collections. This is not innovation; it is pollution not beneficial to the area. An AONB would be converted to meeting suburban values and manicured surroundings.
6. The environment is being modified to disturb the natural ecology, the way the land drains is being changed and structural barriers created. There will be impact on all wildlife including nocturnal creatures as light pollution and noise impacts the area from ongoing human occupation.
7. The development on the proposed location is not in the public interest and serves to benefit only the developer/occupier. While the design is opulent it does not advance science or give a guide for the future. It will have a significant detrimental effect on the public benefit of the area. It is clear from the details in the proposal that no expense has been spared in trying to disguise the negativity of such a building, but this does not change reality and the true negative impact. I hope that the planning department will act for the greater good and maintain an undamaged space with flora and fauna preserved for future generations.

Yours faithfully

A solid black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area.