

FAO: Emily Pickup

Planning Department

Ribble Valley Borough Council

Clitheroe

BB7 2RA

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

20th May 2026

Re: Planning Application No. 3/2026/0208 – Change of Use from Use Class E to Class B8

Summary of Objection

I wish to formally object to this application for change of use from Class E to Class B8 on the following principal grounds:

The proposed storage and distribution use is inappropriate within a mixed residential area located directly between two secondary schools and opposite a primary school, resulting in conflict with the surrounding land uses and harm to residential amenity, contrary to **Key Statement DMG1 (General Considerations)**.

The application site lacks any off-street loading or servicing provision, resulting in large delivery vehicles and shipping containers obstructing the public highway for extended periods. This creates significant highway safety risks and severe congestion, particularly at peak school times, contrary to **Key Statement DMG3 (Transport and Mobility)** and **DMI2 (Transport Considerations)**.

The scale, intensity, and hours of operation of the business, including activity between early morning and late evening, generate unacceptable levels of noise and disturbance, adversely affecting neighbouring residents, again conflicting with **DMG1**.

The poor maintenance of the building and inadequate waste management practices detracts from the character and appearance of the area.

The building itself appears unsuitable for intensive storage use, raising additional safety and operational concerns.

Finally, the proposal conflicts with **Key Statement EC1 (Business and Employment Development)**, as the use would be better located within a designated industrial area such as Salthill Business Park.

Full Representation

Dear Ms Pickup,

I write to formally object to the above planning application for the proposed change of use from Class E (commercial, business and service) to Class B8 (storage and distribution) at the former Harrison Engineering premises on Kendal Street, Clitheroe.

My objection is based on several material planning considerations, regarding the Ribble Valley Core Strategy (2008–2028) and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Planning Balance

In applying the planning balance, I acknowledge that the proposal may offer a limited degree of economic benefit through the continued occupation of the unit and support for a local business. This is broadly aligned with the aims of **Key Statement EC1 (Business and Employment Development)**, which supports economic activity where appropriately located.

However, this limited benefit must be weighed against the significant and demonstrable harm arising from the proposal. The evidence set out above highlights substantial adverse impacts in terms of highway safety, congestion, residential amenity, environmental quality, and the suitability of the site for the proposed use. These harms directly conflict with the requirements of **Key Statements DMG1, DMG3 and DMI2**, which form key components of the Development Plan and carry full statutory weight in decision-making.

Given the scale, frequency, and nature of these impacts, the harm is both significant and ongoing, rather than incidental or capable of mitigation through planning conditions. Furthermore, the availability of more suitable alternative locations for this type of use reduces the weight that can reasonably be given to any claimed economic benefits.

On balance, it is my view that the adverse impacts of the development would significantly and demonstrably outweigh any limited economic benefits, and therefore the proposal does not represent sustainable development when assessed against both the Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the proposed development represents an inappropriate and over-intensive use within a constrained, predominantly residential location. It would result in unacceptable impacts in terms of highway safety, residential amenity, environmental quality, and the overall character of the area. The proposal is inconsistent with key policies of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy, including **DMG1, DMG3, DMI2, and EC1**, as well as the principles of the NPPF.

I respectfully request that planning permission is refused.

Yours sincerely,

