



Nicola Hopkins  
Director of Economic Development and Planning  
Ribble Valley Borough Council  
Council Offices  
Church Walk  
Clitheroe  
Lancashire  
BB7 2RA


13<sup>th</sup> May 2026

Dear Ms Hopkins

I am writing to you to object to the planning application No. 3/2025/0922 for change of use from Agricultural Building to a Single Residential Self Build Dwelling and associated curtilage together with hard standing.

 we feel that it will impact on us.

The original planning application for this was rejected and we hoped that this would be the end of the matter.

Point 2.2 refers to the building being granted for agricultural use, the building was put in by Mr McSorley but has never been used for agricultural use. On the contrary Mr McSorley stayed in it illegally at times. Before Mr McSorley bought the land 2 farmers,  both rented the land and it was used to grow hay and had sheep grazing. Prior to that more than 50 years ago it was used for poultry.

There is a reference 2.3 that the site is no longer feasible for agricultural use with no explanation why it isn't, on the contrary we have discussed with a local farmer and there is no reason why it cannot be used again for agricultural use once the junk that Mr McSorley has dumped on it is cleared up.

4.3. DS1 refers to proven local needs. The applicant does not live in the area; this is not regeneration, simply trying to get planning permission to change a purpose built shed into a house.

4.3. DMG3 refers to public transport links. There are not any public transport links in Wiswell.

5.7. states that the building was there when the applicant bought the land, it wasn't, Mr McSorley built it, there was an old shed there, not fit for any use. It also states that the shed is fully insulated, only because Mr McSorley put insulation in so that he could if he wished stay in it. Why would an agricultural building need to be insulated!

5.16 refers to the applicant not being able to buy or rent alternative accommodation on the open market. Given if this is the case, which is arguable, surely it doesn't justify building and have on a field.

As things stand at present it is a small field bordered by other small fields, all used for agricultural use. They provide biodiversity as does the hedge which he proposes is cut back. It is presently in character with the area surrounding it. A new dwelling on this field would seriously detract from the rural character of the surrounding area and would introduce further urbanisation.

Yours sincerely

