

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 01 November 2025 14:49
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 03/2025/0845 FS-Case-761786008

Name: [REDACTED]

Address: [REDACTED]

Lancashire

Email: [REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 03/2025/0845

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

Comments: Brockhall is a gated residential community the upkeep of which falls to the residents. The increase in traffic will add to maintenance costs of the village. There is plenty of available office space already available on Brockhall at the conference centre with ample parking provided. The extra traffic and parking issues from this development is also a road safety problem on the same road as the village play park. If the business grows further employees will need to park on the roads around the park. Children of primary age cycle, scoot and walk independently around the village and to the park. This is not the right location for a growing business and the business itself does not serve the needs of the local community.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 02 November 2025 19:44
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0845 FS-Case-761979191

Name: [REDACTED]

Address: [REDACTED]

Lancashire

Email: [REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0845

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

Comments: We object to this planning application on a number of grounds

1. The addition of a significantly increased office building which by virtue of its increased height will be much more obvious, is contrary to the residential nature of the rest of the area.
2. There will be a significant increase in traffic in an area where small children attend nursery. This will have safety impacts and will also have a significantly detrimental impact on air quality. Due to the nature of the company in residence a number of vans visit the site currently. This will only increase and as none of these vans are currently electric vehicles it has to be assumed that there will be a significant increase in air pollution during office hours which is when the young children attending the nursery are in the outdoors area immediately adjacent to the route down which all these vehicles will pass. I see no impact on air quality in the planning application so can only assume it has not been considered.
3. The current site is poorly kept and a temporary fence has remained in place much longer than the time that was originally granted leading to a reduced aesthetic appearance of the area. What assurances will there be that further floutings of decisions will not occur with a further reduction in the appearance of the area?
4. Staff from the offices use the surrounding streets as 'mobile offices' conducting loud telephone calls rather than calling from within the property boundaries. An increase in staff (by 50%) will only increase this footfall and the associated disturbance of a quiet residential area

I would also like to point out that I have not received any communication from RVBC about this application contrary to the planning application which states I was informed on 24/10/2025.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 03 November 2025 21:57
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0845 FS-Case-762382209

Name: [REDACTED]

Address: [REDACTED]

Lancashire

Email: [REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0845

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

Comments: I wish to formally object to the proposed development. There is already ample vacant office space available nearby and even the conference centre and Manor Court just down the road, making further expansion within Brockhall unnecessary.

Brockhall was established as a secure, gated residential community, a place where children can play safely and freely. Increased traffic, especially near the children's playground, directly threatens that safety. The recent expansion of the shop and conference centre has already led to a significant rise in traffic and I strongly believe this proposal would only worsen the situation.

Additionally, the plans to expand operations within the village will place additional strain on the facilities that residents fund and maintain.

Kind regards
[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 05 November 2025 11:36
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0845 FS-Case-762870561

Name: [REDACTED]

Address: 3 [REDACTED]

Lancashire

Email: [REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0845

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

Comments: OBJECTION STATEMENT

I wish to lodge a formal objection to the above-referenced application on multiple grounds, including non-compliance with the Ribble Valley Core Strategy, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), and the applicant's clear pattern of disregard for previous planning decisions affecting this site.



1. Misrepresentation of Purpose – Residential Use in Disguise

This application is plainly an attempt to secure approval for what would functionally be a residential dwelling, under the guise of an "office" replacement.

The proposed layout, scale, and character of the design are entirely inconsistent with a genuine commercial office building and closely mirror that of a domestic residence.

Given the repeated refusal of earlier applications (including 3/2022/0725 and 3/2024/0635) for either a new dwelling on this exact site, or changes to the property that restrict access to it for the benefit of the local community, it is clear that this submission represents an attempt to achieve by stealth what has already been denied through due process.

Approving such a proposal would set a dangerous precedent and undermine public confidence in the integrity of the local planning framework.



2. Conflict with Core Strategy Policy DS1 and DMG2 – Unsustainable and Unjustified Development

The creation of a new building on this parcel remains contrary to Key Statement DS1 and Policy DMG2.

The site lies within a Tier 2 settlement where new development is only appropriate when it demonstrably meets an identified local need. No such need has been evidenced.

There is no economic, community, or infrastructure justification to replace the existing structure with a substantially larger building.

This proposal does not constitute sustainable development and would continue the same unsustainable pattern of expansion that has already been rejected by the Council.



3. Breach of Policy DMB4 – Loss of Public Open Space

The parcel in question forms part of an area long recognised as public open space for use by residents of Brockhall Village.

This was a key basis for refusal in prior applications. Despite those decisions, the applicants have continued to maintain fencing and plant laurel hedging around the perimeter, effectively enclosing the land and denying access to local residents.

These actions are in direct contravention of the intent of Policy DMB4, which prohibits the loss of existing public open space unless suitable replacement provision or substantial upgrading is provided—neither of which has occurred.

It is entirely inappropriate for the Council to even consider new development on a site where the applicants have demonstrably ignored prior instructions to restore the land to its open, accessible condition.



4. Conflict with Policy DMB1 – Loss of Employment Potential

The claim that the new proposal constitutes an “office” building should not be accepted at face value.

No evidence has been provided of genuine business need, prospective tenants, or the economic role such a building would play.

Equally, there is no demonstration that the existing structure has been marketed for alternative employment use in accordance with Policy DMB1, or that the current use is genuinely unviable.

Without credible marketing evidence or operational justification, the proposal must be regarded as an attempt to circumvent previous refusals for a dwelling rather than a legitimate business redevelopment.



5. Conflict with Policy DMI2 and DMG3 – Unsustainable Transport and Access

Occupants of the proposed building would not benefit from adequate walkable access to local services or facilities, making the site inherently reliant on private vehicle use.

This remains inconsistent with Key Statement DMI2, Policy DMG3, and the NPPF presumption in favour of sustainable development.

3M

6. Ongoing Breach and Non-Compliance – Need for Enforcement

The continued presence of fencing and laurel hedging, both of which were previously identified as unauthorised and contrary to planning refusals, constitutes an ongoing breach that effectively excludes public use of designated open space.

The Council should not only refuse this current application but also initiate enforcement action to compel the applicants to remove all unauthorised fencing and planting, restoring the land to its prior open condition for community use.

3M

Conclusion

For the reasons above, this application is materially identical in its effects to those previously refused. It conflicts with the Ribble Valley Core Strategy (Policies DS1, DMG2, DMB1, DMB4, DMI2, and DMG3) and the overarching objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework.

The applicants' ongoing disregard for planning control and their repeated attempts to repackage a residential proposal as a commercial development warrant strong and decisive refusal.

I respectfully request that the Council:

- Refuse Planning Application 3/2025/0845 in its entirety; and
- Take enforcement action to restore the parcel to open public-access condition, in line with previous refusals and its designated use.

3M

Submitted by:

[Redacted signature block]