

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 13 November 2025 12:16
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0845 FS-Case-765245352

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0845

Address of Development: The Village Hall.
Franklin Hill
Brockhall Village

Comments: Planning Application Ref. 3/2025/0845 – Proposed Redevelopment of “Village Hall”, Brockhall Village

I write as a [REDACTED] developed on the former hospital site, having moved in [REDACTED]. I would like to register my formal objection to this application for the following material planning reasons:

1. Character, Scale and Design Not in Keeping

- The village was built under strict design controls approx. 24+ years ago to preserve a consistent and coherent character.
- The proposed three-storey redevelopment is significantly out of scale with surrounding buildings.
- Its height and massing would appear intrusive and visually dominant, inconsistent with the character and form of the village.
- RVBC Core Strategy Policy DMG1 requires development to be sympathetic to surrounding buildings in size, scale, massing and design. This proposal does not meet that requirement.

2. Parking, Traffic and Highway Safety Concerns

- The existing building has limited parking and has caused minimal disruption historically.
- Expanding to a three-storey commercial use will substantially increase traffic, vehicle movements, and parking demand.
- The building sits opposite a children’s nursery, with busy drop-off/pick-up times on a narrow road already under pressure.
- Overflow parking will inevitably spread onto pavements and verges, endangering pedestrians and obstructing sightlines.
- The proposal fails to demonstrate that it can operate without harming local highway safety.

3. Village Hall History and Loss of Intended Community Use

- The building was originally intended as the community village hall when homes were sold off-plan.
- It has never been transferred to the village or used for its intended community purpose; instead, it has been continuously occupied by commercial tenants.
- This proposal further entrenches an inappropriate commercial intensification within a residential setting.

4. More Suitable Locations for Office Development

- There is ample availability of office and commercial space in Ribble Valley, Hyndburn and Blackburn.
- A three-storey office-type building is far more appropriate on established business parks and industrial estates than within a gated residential village.

5. Harm to Residential Amenity

- The proposal will increase noise, traffic, general activity, and late/early-hour comings and goings.
- The scale and height raise concerns about loss of privacy, overlooking, and light pollution.
- The cumulative impact will meaningfully reduce the residential amenity enjoyed by local households.

Conclusion

For the reasons above, I respectfully request that RVBC refuse application 3/2025/0845. The development is incompatible with village character, harmful to residential amenity, and would introduce highway and parking issues in a sensitive area close to a children's nursery.

Thank you for considering my representation.

Second Part of the Objection:

Re: Formal Objection to Planning Application 3/2025/0845 – Redevelopment of “Village Hall”, Brockhall Village

I am submitting this additional objection to provide context from earlier planning applications relating to this building and its evolution, and to demonstrate how the present proposal conflicts with the long-established planning framework at Brockhall Village.

I have lived in the village [REDACTED] before [REDACTED]. My comments below refer only to material planning considerations supported by the village's planning history.

1. Earlier Applications Confirm the Intended Scale and Role of the Building

The planning history for the Village Hall includes:

- 3/2024/0819 – subsequent alterations
- 3/2024/0635 – further minor changes
- 3/2022/0725 – change of use / internal modifications
- 3/2011/0930, 3/2010/0544, 3/2010/0545 – prior adaptations
- 3/2004/0570 – amendments to the use
- 3/2002/0687 – earlier operational development

Across these applications, one fact has remained consistent:

The building has always been treated as a small-scale, low-impact structure with limited parking and low trip-generation.

No application has ever suggested — nor has RVBC ever approved — a structure of three storeys, a major massing increase, or the kind of commercial intensity now proposed.

This establishes a clear precedent of scale, which the current application significantly breaches.

2. Historical Context: The “Village Hall” Was Intended as Community Infrastructure

From the earliest phases of the Brockhall redevelopment, the building was presented to purchasers as the community Village Hall for residents.

This expectation was part of the marketing and off-plan sales.

Although the building was never handed over to the community (for reasons well known to RVBC over the years), the original planning rationale remains relevant:

- It was planned as a community-scale building,
- not a commercial office block,
- and certainly not a three-storey structure dominating the built form around it.

At no stage in its planning history has RVBC endorsed its transformation into a large, multi-storey workplace.

3. The Proposed Height and Massing Contradict the Established Planning Pattern

The earlier applications all retained:

- single-storey massing
- modest footprint
- low visual impact

This is consistent with RVBC Core Strategy Policy DMG1, which requires new development to be sympathetic in size, scale, massing and design.

A jump from a single storey to three storeys is not “sympathetic” — it represents a fundamental change in the settlement’s built character, and sets a dangerous precedent for oversized commercial structures within the residential village.

4. Cumulative Impact on Highways and Parking

The previous applications you hold on file consistently involved low-intensity uses:

- small office
- administrative premises
- low staff numbers
- minimal parking allocation

This was acceptable in planning terms because the modest size limited its impact.

A three-storey redevelopment would:

- multiply vehicle movements
- exceed the site’s parking capacity
- displace parking onto pavements, verges and residential frontages
- worsen congestion opposite the children’s nursery during peak hours
- compromise pedestrian and child safety
- damage residential amenity through noise, traffic and obstruction

This represents a material intensification far beyond anything previously approved.

5. The Existing Planning History Does Not Support Major Intensification

Reviewing the applications listed above, one trend is clear:

- RVBC has repeatedly allowed minor, contained, and low-impact changes.
- RVBC has never permitted anything approaching a three-storey expansion.
- The existing planning history supports only small-scale community or office use, in keeping with the village environment.

The applicant cannot rely on previous permissions to justify such a drastic change.

If approved, this would break with the 20-year planning pattern and set a precedent for inappropriate commercial intensification within a residential village.

6. More Appropriate Locations Exist

Throughout the planning history of this village, larger commercial development has always been directed elsewhere:

- established business parks
- Whalley, Clitheroe, Billington
- industrial estates in Ribble Valley and Hyndburn
- Blackburn business zones

This reflects sound planning logic: Brockhall Village is not designed for large office blocks.

Conclusion

After reviewing the past applications for this property, it is clear that the proposal under 3/2025/0845 is inconsistent with:

- the building’s historic planning purpose
- the scale and design previously accepted by RVBC
- Core Strategy Policy DMG1
- highway safety principles

- and the long-standing residential nature of the village

For these reasons, I respectfully request that RVBC refuse the application.

Thank you for considering this additional representation.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 14 November 2025 10:48
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0845 FS-Case-765497012

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0845

Address of Development: The Village Hall, Franklin Hill, Brockhall Village

Comments: I object to this proposed development / planning application. I live [REDACTED] and on a number of occasions the office (Village Hall) carpark is full with the over spill of cars parking on Franklin hill which is a road without a pavement (or lighting!) . This planning application proposes to extend the office by two extra floors yet there is no proposal for additional off road car parking.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 14 November 2025 11:14
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0845 FS-Case-765500920

[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 proposal for the following reasons:-

- 1) It makes no sense to allow the demolition of a perfectly good new building and I don't believe the applicant would go to all that expense for the sake of 5 extra employees when a small extension to the current building would suffice.
- 2) In my opinion this is a blatant attempt to get around the fact that a previous application by the same applicants to build a house on this site was rejected and, if this madness is allowed to proceed, the offices and employees would be relocated to offsite premises (as detailed in the previous application) and this new replacement "office building" would be converted for residential use.
- 3) The land to the RHS of the current building as you face it is designated public open space that has now been granted permission on appeal to be fenced off (even though this was rejected by RVBC). This in my opinion is further evidence that the applicants intend to use the building as a residence and the fenced off POS will form the grounds of the property.
- 4) I believe there is a moratorium in place that states no further houses are permitted to be built on Brockhall Village (except any with existing planning permission). Furthermore I understand that a previous application by the owners of the Conference Centre to convert some of the units for use as an Air BNB was rejected on the grounds that the the original consent was for them to be used as office space and should remain as office space, not for residential use. If this development is allowed, which I sincerely hope it is not, then a similar condition should be applied stating it must remain as office premises for at least the period of the existing moratorium, if not longer if this period is extended.