



DIRECTOR OF RESOURCES
11 MAY 2026

8 May 2026

12 MAY 2026

Via email and recorded delivery

Dear Sirs

Objection to Planning Application - 3/2026/0172 – Proposed erection of a detached dwelling with single garage and store – Land to rear of Pimlico House, Gisburn Road, Gisburn BB7 4ES

We are [redacted] which [redacted] [redacted] the proposed development site. Previous applications by Mr Richard Wilson for this site have been rightly refused and I have listed these for ease of reference on the attached addendum.

We wish to object to this re-hashed proposal for this site on the following grounds.

Previously, when Duckworth's had a building on the site it was a single storey building. This proposal is for a two storey property. The proposed property will take light [redacted] and [redacted] areas of [redacted] and will remove [redacted] and [redacted]. There will be an impact [redacted] which we have not had previously. We have never [redacted] to the [redacted] and in fact, chose this property for that very reason. This would therefore represent a loss of amenity for us.

We have always enjoyed a light and open countryside view from [redacted] as previously there was only [redacted]. What is being proposed [redacted] of a [redacted] which [redacted] will be particularly imposing. This removes the amenity of [redacted]. There has never been a two storey building on this site. The proximity of this [redacted] obvious concern to us. This new proposal now also includes a door and window in the gable end which [redacted]. This will remove privacy to the [redacted]. A drive and garage immediately on the other side of our [redacted] will bring unnecessary noise and disturbance [redacted] and [redacted] and [redacted]. Coming out of [redacted] [redacted] which has not existed before [redacted] and [redacted] and blocking our [redacted] views causes a loss of the amenities of peace, quiet and privacy.

Mr Wilson's proposal goes to great lengths to establish that the new property will blend with the current development of Stable Close and I would strongly disagree with that. The building will be "squashed" [redacted]. It includes a single driveway, none of the properties on Stable Close have single driveways, all the properties are nicely spread out at least two driveways apart. The detached properties of Stable Close of which there are two are larger four bedroom properties, so the proposal is out of step. It will be a standalone property.

The proposed street elevation on the plans appears to be stretched and gives the impression of space around this building – I don't believe that is the case. Mr Wilsons proposal says that this

application will allow sight into the conservation area of Pimlico House and surrounds, but in reality, most of the view will be blocked by the 2 storey house. Where the garage is proposed there is no view of Pimlico House so nothing has been gained (only that I will have [REDACTED])

The proposed structure will take away parking and turning for the Pan Ash business. This was a requirement of a previous planning permission to be granted. Where will deliveries to Pan Ash business be loaded/unloaded/turn around? Where will their customers park? We would envisage large delivery vans either using Mill Lane as turning or parking. There is very limited parking on Mill Lane. The proposed dwelling takes away the facility for turning within the curtilage of the retail unit. The development is next to the junction with the A59 which would be dangerous to either reverse out onto Mill Lane into traffic or to reverse into the site on the junction with the A59. This development adds a further entrance/driveway onto Mill Lane, so there will be 3 entrances onto Mill Lane within 75 yards. This must create a traffic concern.

At what depth will the foundations of the new property need to be dug? We have concerns about the stability and proximity [REDACTED] and our existing amenities such as drains and cables. The new structure is to be made of "stone" and will therefore require deeper footings. Any previous structure on the site was built around "posts" to which cladding was added there were no foundations as such. This can easily be seen on site. The site has a dirt floor.

What about surface water run off? Pan Ash has a concrete yard which already stands deep in water when it rains heavily. A further building on the site will take away the ability for rainwater to drain into the ground slowly.

It would appear that Mr Wilson who owns the site is more concerned with generating a profit from this site rather than the wellbeing of the people who already live in this part of Gisburn, the fact that this is a conservation area and with no thought into the impact of his proposals. It is not necessary to "in fill" this site which will be to the detriment of ourselves and the area. My proposal to Mr Wilson would be to leave the site to nature to increase biodiversity and enhance this area -in a natural way which would be to the benefit of the residents in the locality, conservation area and the entrance to the village.

Please accept the above as our objection to the planning application in question.

Yours faithfully

[REDACTED]
ALL.

ADDENDUM

Planning application 3/2021/0857 was refused on two points:

1. The proposed building is incongruous and conspicuous and harmful to the setting (and views into) of Gisburn Conservation Area and the setting of listed buildings because of its overtly modern and utilitarian form and its materials. This is contrary to Ribble Valley Core Strategy Key Statement EN5 and Policy DME4 and DMG1.
2. The proposed building has a harmful impact on the residential amenities of 1 Stable Close in respect to overshadowing, overbearing and overlooking impacts. This is contrary to Ribble Valley Core Strategy Policy DMG1.

Planning Application 3/2021/1098 was refused on the following point:

1. The proposed building is unduly prominent, incongruous, and conspicuous and harmful to the setting (and views into) of Gisburn Conservation Area and the setting of listed buildings because of its size and overtly modern and utilitarian form. This is contrary to Ribble Valley Core Strategy Key Statement EN5 and Policy DME4 and DMG1.

Planning Application 3/2022/0144 was refused on the 2 following points by Ribble Valley Council (and on appeal by the Planning Inspectorate).

Ribble Valley Borough Council:

1. The proposal is considered contrary to Key Statement EN5 and Policies DMG1 and DME4 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy insofar that approval would result in the introduction of an anomalous, discordant, incongruous, poorly designed and unsympathetic form of development that fails to respond positively to the inherent character of the area, also resulting in injurious and harmful impacts upon the setting of, and views into the defined Gisburn Conservation Area.
2. The proposals considered to be in direct conflict with Key Statement EN5 and Policy DME4 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy insofar that approval would result in a form of development, that by virtue of its design, external appearance and overall configuration would result in significant harm to the setting of nearby listed buildings.

Planning Inspectorate on Appeal (amongst a number of points):

13. I have already concluded that there would be harm to the character and appearance of the area. For the same reasons there would be harm to the CA and the setting of the Grade II listed buildings by virtue of the inappropriate design, and intrusion into the views of the CA and listed buildings whose boundaries are almost contiguous with each other.
14. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the proposed development, would harm the significance of the CA. Similarly, I conclude that the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the setting of nearby listed buildings at Pimlico House and Pimlico Barn.
16. The proposed development would provide public benefits, in terms of a modest contribution to the supply of housing and development of a currently vacant parcel of previously developed land, in a location with easy access to local services. However, these benefits would be limited and would not outweigh the harm to the designated heritage assets. 17. As such, the proposed development would

conflict with Core Strategy Policy Key Statement EN5 and Policy DME4 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy. These seek to conserve and enhance heritage assets and seek to protect views affecting the setting of the CA and the setting of listed buildings

18. Whilst I have noted the conditions suggested by the Council, these would not overcome the harm caused by the overall form of the building. Nor would conditions which would address the discrepancies between the plans. I have not been provided with any example of other development which may have been approved, as such I cannot give any weight to these setting a precedent.