

**Objection to Planning Application 3/2026/0153**  
**Proposal: Formation of a stone access track and improvements to an existing access**  
**Location: Land off B6478, Slaidburn**

Dear Sir / Madam,

I write to formally object to the above application in my capacity as the [REDACTED] of the application site, operating [REDACTED]

This objection relates to procedural defects and failures of land control, which are material planning considerations affecting the validity of the application.

**1. Failure to Notify an Agricultural Tenant**

The application documents indicate that:

Certificate B has been completed  
Notice has allegedly been served on other parties  
No notice has been served on [REDACTED]

This is incorrect. No notice has been [REDACTED]

This represents a failure to comply with sections 13 and 14 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015, which requires all agricultural tenants to be properly notified.

**2. Incorrect Ownership Certification**

The application suggests:

The land is to be sold to the applicant  
That control is sufficient to implement the development

However:

No notice to quit has been served  
[REDACTED] remains in force  
The applicant does not have vacant possession or unrestricted control

As such, the development cannot be lawfully implemented in its current form. This raises serious concerns regarding the accuracy of the submitted ownership certificate and whether the application has been validly made.

**3. Prematurity and Deliverability**

Planning permission should not be granted where:

Control of the land is uncertain  
Existing lawful agricultural uses would be prejudiced  
The proposal depends on termination of a tenancy that has not occurred

Granting permission in these circumstances would be premature and risks authorising a scheme that cannot be delivered without infringing third-party legal rights.

**4. Impact on an Existing Agricultural Use**

The proposal would:

Remove land from agricultural grazing  
Introduce incompatible uses  
Disrupt ongoing lawful agricultural operations

**Conclusion**

Given the failure to notify an agricultural tenant, uncertainty over land ownership and control, and the ongoing lawful Farm Business Tenancy, I respectfully submit that:

The application is procedurally flawed, and/or should be refused or declared invalid until these matters are lawfully resolved

I request the Local Planning Authority give these issues significant weight in its determination.

Yours faithfully,



**Objection to Planning Application: 3/2026/0153**  
**Proposal: Formation of a stone access track and improvements to an existing access**  
**Location: Land off B6478, Slaidburn**

[REDACTED]

Dear Sir / Madam,

We write to formally object to the above planning application on behalf of the [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] which [REDACTED] the application site.

Our objection is based on the following material planning considerations.

**1. Mischaracterisation of the Development**

The application description refers only to "Formation of a stone access track and improvements to an existing access". However, the submitted Proposed Site Plan and Design & Access Statement clearly demonstrate that the development is intended to facilitate a permanent agricultural show and event site, including:

- A looped vehicular circulation route
- A central "main ring"
- Areas identified for temporary marquees, trade stalls and livestock
- Grass parking areas
- Infrastructure designed to accommodate large volumes of vehicles and pedestrians

This represents a significant intensification of use, and potentially a material change of use of agricultural land, the impacts of which have not been accurately described or fully assessed within the application.

**2. Harm to Residential Amenity**

[REDACTED] dwelling. The proposal would result in:

- Increased agricultural and event-related traffic movements
- Noise and disturbance from vehicles, machinery, event set-up and dismantling
- Increased activity during unsocial hours, particularly around show periods
- Loss of rural tranquillity

No noise assessment, activity management plan, or amenity impact assessment has been submitted. Statements within the Design & Access Statement asserting "no negative impacts on surrounding amenity" are unsupported by evidence and should be afforded limited weight. This conflicts with Core Strategy Policy DMG1 (Amenity) and paragraphs 135 and 187 of the NPPF, which require development to safeguard neighbouring living conditions.

**3. Impact on the Forest of Bowland National Landscape**

The site lies entirely within the Forest of Bowland National Landscape, where the statutory duty is to conserve and enhance natural beauty.

The proposal introduces:

- Over 4,000m<sup>2</sup> of engineered stone track
- Formalised access splays and bound surfaces
- Urbanising features into open countryside

This is not minor or incidental development. No Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment has been submitted to demonstrate compliance with Core Strategy Policy EN2 or NPPF paragraph 176. The proposal would erode rural character and set an undesirable precedent within a protected landscape.

**4. Public Right of Way Safety and Amenity**

Public Footpath FP 034 0019 crosses the application site. The proposed site plan shows vehicular routes, event infrastructure and parking areas in close proximity to the PROW, with no physical segregation or mitigation.

This raises serious concerns regarding:

Pedestrian safety  
Conflict between vehicles and walkers  
Degradation of the amenity and enjoyment of the PROW

This is contrary to Policy DMG1 (Access and Amenity) and the NPPF requirement to protect public rights of way.

#### **5. Highway Safety and Traffic Generation**

The proposal relies on:

Reduced wall heights rather than full visibility compliance  
Temporary signage and volunteer traffic marshals during events

This implicitly acknowledges that the access is substandard for the scale of traffic anticipated. Moreover, the development facilitates increased vehicle movements rather than addressing a purely existing need. The highway and traffic implications have not been robustly assessed.

#### **6. Drainage and Surface Water Flood Risk**

The Flood Risk Assessment acknowledges surface water flooding in multiple return periods. However:

No detailed surface water drainage strategy is provided  
No assessment of runoff impact from extensive new hard surfacing  
No consideration of off-site or downstream impacts

The conclusions dismiss flood risk on the basis of event duration rather than hydraulic consequence, which is inadequate for decision-making.

#### **Conclusion**

For the reasons above, the proposal fails to comply with the NPPF and the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and would result in material harm to residential amenity, landscape character, highway safety, and public rights of way.

We therefore respectfully request that planning permission is refused.

Yours faithfully,

