

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 07 November 2025 23:09
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0845 FS-Case-763703247

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0845

Address of Development: The Village Hall, Franklin Hill, Brockhall Village, Old Langho BB6 8HY

Comments: I am writing to object to the above application on ecological and legislative grounds relating to the likely presence of great crested newts (*Triturus cristatus*) and the failure of the submission to demonstrate compliance with relevant law, policy, and technical guidance.

The site lies within close proximity to the Brockhall Zoo lake, a large and long-established waterbody that provides high-quality breeding habitat for great crested newts. The surrounding grassland, hedgerows, woodland edges, and unmanaged margins across Brockhall Village represent optimal terrestrial habitat within the 500-metre radius specified in Natural England's Standing Advice. Given this ecological context, there is a clear and reasonable likelihood of presence, triggering specific legal and procedural requirements that have not been met.

Under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended), great crested newts are a European Protected Species. It is an offence to deliberately capture, kill, injure, or disturb these animals or to damage or destroy their breeding sites or resting places. The local planning authority has a statutory duty under Regulation 9(3) to ensure its functions are exercised in compliance with the Habitats Regulations. The Council must therefore have sufficient ecological information before determination to be confident that no offence is likely.

Natural England's Standing Advice states that surveys are required where ponds occur within 500 metres of a development site and where suitable terrestrial habitat exists. No such survey, eDNA sampling, or Habitat Suitability Index (HSI) assessment has been provided. The absence of seasonally valid survey data prevents lawful assessment of impacts and compliance with both the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and the Habitats Regulations.

Relevant case law, including *R (Woolley) v Cheshire East Borough Council* [2009] EWHC 1227 (Admin) and *Morge v Hampshire County Council* [2011] UKSC 2, confirms that where there is a reasonable likelihood of a protected species being affected, survey evidence must be available before permission is granted. It is not acceptable to defer such matters to planning conditions.

Where a development may affect great crested newts, the three licensing tests under Regulation 55 must be capable of being met prior to consent being issued:

1. The proposal must serve an overriding public interest;
2. There must be no satisfactory alternative; and
3. The development must maintain the species at favourable conservation status.

There is currently no evidence before the Council to indicate that any of these tests could be met in respect of this proposal.

The applicant has also failed to demonstrate compliance with CIEEM Guidelines for Ecological Impact Assessment (2018) or to provide a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) addressing amphibian protection measures during site clearance and groundworks. The absence of such documents introduces a clear risk of disturbance, injury, or mortality during construction.

In addition, no lighting design plan has been submitted. Artificial illumination associated with new buildings and car parks can disrupt nocturnal movement, foraging, and breeding activity of great crested newts, as well as other protected species such as bats and owls. A full lighting impact assessment, compliant with ILP Guidance Note GN01/21, is therefore required to ensure that light spill into adjacent habitats is minimised.

To ensure compliance with statutory obligations and established professional standards, the following baseline evidence is required prior to determination:

- A desk-based habitat and pond survey within a 500 m radius;
- A Habitat Suitability Index (HSI) assessment following Oldham et al. methodology;
- Seasonally valid presence/absence surveys and population size class assessment if presence is confirmed;
- A CIEEM-compliant Ecological Impact Assessment (EclA) evaluating magnitude, sensitivity, and significance of impacts;
- A detailed Mitigation and Compensation Strategy capable of meeting the Regulation 55 licensing tests; and
- A Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment in accordance with the statutory metric to demonstrate at least 10% gain secured for a minimum of 30 years.

The application, as it stands, is inconsistent with Ribble Valley Core Strategy Policies DME3, EN4, and DMG1, and with paragraphs 180–182 of the National Planning Policy Framework, all of which require planning decisions to safeguard biodiversity and ensure that legally protected species are not adversely affected.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 08 November 2025 11:28
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0845 FS-Case-763765172

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0845

Address of Development: Cheery dr brockhall village

Comments: We live in a residential village which does not need a new office block which would increase traffic and the offices near the avenue hotel are not full at present !
Also this looks like a scam to change the use to a house as soon as it can be !
Please refuse this application

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 11 November 2025 14:44
To: Planning
Subject: Planning application no: 3/2025/0845

⚠ 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.

Having reviewed the planning application (3/2025/0845) relating to the proposed demolition of offices and construction of a replacement office building I would like to raise my objection to this application. The current plan is a 3 story building [REDACTED] compromise my privacy and light.

In proposal 5.13 & 5.14 the occupants of a 3 storey office building will be able to look [REDACTED], [REDACTED]. This structure will also significantly impact the light during the day.

Furthermore Brockhall village is a residential area. The building works will significantly impact the outlying road surfaces and create pollution within the village. In addition the area to the side (now with planning agreed to be fenced off) had previously been used as play area by the local children. Consequently several children openly play on the roads up to the play area, the extra traffic during construction is a significant safety risk.

Overall I do not believe that the development of the village hall is in the best interests of local residents. I wholly disagree with the statement 5.3 that the development has a local need or that it provides any regeneration of the area. The current business does not deal with local residents and increasing the office footprint will only add congestion and safety issues on what was envisaged as a purely residential area of the village.

Kind regards

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]