

## Nicola Gunn

---

**From:** Planning  
**Sent:** 13 September 2021 13:33  
**To:** John Macholc  
**Cc:** Planning  
**Subject:** R&U Planning Applications 3/2021/0660 and 3/2021/0661

**Categories:** xRedact & Upload

[REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 13 September 2021 12:19  
**To:** Planning <planning@ribblevalley.gov.uk>  
**Subject:** Planning Applications 3/2021/0660 and 3/2021/0661

### External Email

This email originated from outside Ribble Valley Borough Council. Do **NOT** click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and are sure the content within this email is safe.

Dear Sir,

I am writing to raise some points for your consideration in respect of the proposed Haweswater Aqueduct Resilience Programme (HARP) and in particular, the two Applications before you (Planning Applications 3/2021/0660 and 3/2021/0661) concerning the impact of this development on the Ribble Valley.

United Utilities has submitted Application 3/2021/0660 (Route 1) which brings Heavy Goods Traffic / Construction vehicles down Pimlico Link Road from the A59 as far as the hospital roundabout and then towards Chatburn as far as Ribble Lane crossing the Railway bridge (previously weight restricted) as far as Ribble Lane. The route follows Ribble Lane down towards the River, crossing at Chatburn Bridge and then through West Bradford towards Waddington and up the Fell Road.

There are many reasons why this proposal should be declined:

**Physical Impact of Traffic on Village (s)** - To suggest bringing such an increased volume of Heavy Traffic through Chatburn and West Bradford suggests a complete unawareness of the infrastructure through which this traffic will travel. Anyone familiar with the area will have experienced watching (or waiting) for two vehicles to pass in either direction on Ribble Lane. Even for conventional saloon cars, this is a difficult task. It would be informative to ask the drivers of the local bus service how easy it might be to negotiate this Lane and River Crossing. Once over the river, the country lane towards West Bradford would be completely unsuitable for heavy traffic to pass by. It is narrow and winds through blind bends with foliage overhanging the road as a canopy in places. Any traffic control on that stretch will have a knock on effect for the whole area. The suggestion to restrict parking on Ribble Lane (and other stretches of the route) is not viable as this would merely displace traffic into other areas of an already overstretched

village. The impact of parking restrictions on local businesses could be catastrophic, sounding the death knell for many as shoppers would simply transfer their allegiance to Clitheroe. The buildings (homes) along this route are of stone construction in the main and the increased volume of heavy vehicles may cause vibrations, damaging to the fabric of these dwellings.

**Environmental Impact**

Route One mentions the Environmental impact and given the times in which we live, this has to be a huge consideration. However, the term environment encompasses the surroundings in which **all living creatures operate and live**. In other words, people come into this equation. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] must give pause for thought when planning suitable vehicle routes. United Utilities actually divert the route away from Pimlico Link Road to travel through a populated area which is home to old and young alike. The impact of CO2 and SO2 emissions in a built up area is considerably greater than that in an open area with a natural carbon soak provided by trees and vegetation. Any ecologist would support this. It seems that the possible impact on the health of villagers is taking second place to the desire to use an existing river crossing - itself totally unsuited to such volumes of traffic.

Given the longevity of this project ( estimates range between 6 and 11 years ) it would seem a wise investment to consider Route Two (Application 3/2021/0661) which, although it may have greater initial start up costs with the construction of a 'link road and river crossing', would likely be offset against the inevitable road widening, repairing, bridge strengthening, subsidence drilling which may result from Route One.

I accept there would be an environmental impact with Route Two on the local flora and fauna of the fields through which the road and bridge would travel. That is understood and is an inevitable consequence of progress. However, it is important that those charged with the final decision do not minimise the often life changing environmental consequences for those people who find that the Ribble Valley air, [REDACTED]

Please give this request serious consideration and reject route one in favour of Route Two.

Thank you for your consideration

