

**Nicola Gunn**

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 14 September 2021 20:49  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Hawes Water Aqueduct Resilience Programme

 **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 Mr. Macholc,

Re Planning Applications Nos. 3/2021/0660 and 3/2021/0661

I would like to make comments regarding the two applications as detailed above which I believe will be coming before the planning committee shortly.

**ROUTE 1.**

I object to this this proposal on the following grounds.

- 1.This scheme will increase traffic through our tiny village which is already congested from residents and frequent visitors throughout the week to a very popular village in the Ribble Valley.
2. It will impact on local air quality from the emissions, dirt and dust.The village already has to contend with emissions from the nearby cement works.
- 3.There will be increasd noise disturbance .Our village already has considerable noise nuisance from the quarry on a regular basis.
- 4.The safety of pedestrians particularly school children and vulnerable adults will be compromised.
- 5.The high volume of traffic currently impacts on local businesses. Chatburn is already described by locals as a 'car park'
- 6.Ribble Lane is the main access road for local schools and residents from Grindleton who use the facilities in the village.
- 7.The scheme which we are informed will run for a minimum of six years will have a negative impact on those living on Ribble Lane and the resident's mental health and well being. Studies show that air pollutants have an effect on a person's well being. The link between life satisfaction and happiness is very strong. High exposure to air pollutants will result put people at risk of developing asthma, pneumonia and other respiratory conditions. Poor air quality can aggravate any pre existing health issues such as asthma and heart problems.
- 8.The scheme will cause loss of privacy, loss of light from high sided vehicles as they attempt to pass cottages on the Lane.
9. Ribble lane is not a main road as the name suggests and is frequently subject to road repairs as is the approach road Crow Trees Brow. There are often water leaks

on Crow trees brow and Ribble Lane. As I write this there is yet another massive water leak with traffic lights required on Crow Tress Brow.

10. It is questionable whether the road structure on Ribble Lane will be sufficient to support such large construction vehicles. Many vehicles already use the pavement for access which is unacceptable.

11. During inclement weather which is frequent in Chatburn, given we live in the shadow of Pendle Hill, surface water and ice will create difficulties for HGVs particularly as they descend down a steep hill to cross the river. In winter particularly, Ribble Lane is inaccessible due to slippery conditions even with gritting.

12. Visibility is poor on Ribble lane because of a bend. Clear visibility I would consider is essential for safe transgress of these enormous construction vehicles down Ribble Lane.

## **ROUTE 2.**

This is the preferred option for the following reasons.

1. The outlined route is via a purpose built wide road for HGVs which the cement lorries use for access to their site.
2. It is a straight road without houses and lined by thick hedges which will mop up carbon from the traffic. Pedestrian movement is minimal on this link road as there are no pavements.
3. The road is already cleaned regularly which will reduce the impact to the surrounding environment.
4. More and more consumers are making green choices and businesses too are under going efforts to reduce their carbon footprints. This option will reduce the carbon footprint in Chatburn.
5. It is acknowledged that the building of a temporary bridge will require the removal of some vegetation and there may be disruption to flora and fauna. It is considered that the risk to human life would be more disruptive and harmful and that eventually the bridge would be removed and the land returned to its original state.

I hope you will consider the above comments when making your decision regarding the proposed options before it goes to the planning committee.

Above all it seems clear to me that Option 2 is the only fair and realistic option to adopt for such a massive project which will be ongoing for years.