From: Sent: To: Subject:	Planning 27 January 2022 14:08 Planning REDACT AND UPLOAD 3/2021/1248 & 1249
Already printed for file and forwarded to officer	
Sent: 27 January 2 To: Planning <plar Subject: 3/2021/1</plar 	nning@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
	mall ted from outside Ribbie Valley Borough Council. Do NOT click links or open attachments unless you der and are sure the content within this email is safe.
Objection to the a Grindleton.	bove pair of planning applications (Listed Building consent) in respect of the Duke of York Inn,
the applicant, his	gn and Access Statement (the Statement) clearly shows regular and supportive dialogue between advisors and RVBC officers. The frequency and number of these discussions is of concern to an erver for what is a private applicant making a application.
Observations and	statements.
	Is and my correspondence with RVBC refers. Repeated assurances given that was bre building materials for his businesses at the site'. RVBC gave considerable forebearance,
(spring 2020) elici	s an operating centre for heavy goods vehicles Statements made by RVBC staff that they would look into this matter ted no confirmatory response and demonstrated no material impact upon used regularly, until late 2021 when I assume it was disposed of.

2. These fresh applications come after what purports to be an extended marketing period when the property has been offered for sale, though at a wholly unrealistic price for an empty, deteriorating public house. When I called them spring last year the agent made clear that offers would not be entertained.
3. The property has been allowed to deteriorate and no action appears to have been taken by RVBC to ensure the integrity and water tightness of the building. to support his application and inertia from RVBC - Covid 19 is not to blame.
4. RVBC officers objected to a planning application for the Buck Inn, Grindleton on the grounds that consent would compromise the setting of a listed building - the Duke of York Inn. Clear acknowledgement by RVBC that the Duke of York is a listed public house, integral to Grindleton.
5. The timing of these fresh applications might suggest encouragement to re-apply - the time delays and apparent lack of enforcement action by RVBC could be construed.
6. The property is a listed public house. It is a fundamental part of the village where the villagers have demonstrated a desire to acquire and re-open the public house with the apparent encouragement of RVBC. Sale by the applicant is a matter for him, he is free to retain the title to the building but it should not be converted to purely residential use, nor should it be allowed to deteriorate.
RVBC officers cannot reasonably object to one neighbouring application on the grounds of preservation of a public house that is a listed building, take no preservation action and shortly after decide to support said listed public house in becoming a private residence just to preserve the integrity of the building and assist the applicant.
These applications appear well constructed to secure consent with inertia or worse with RVBC officers supporting this application based on the Statement narrative.
The front, visible elevation as proposed looks acceptable, arguably an improvement on the deteriorating building of today but it ceases to be a public house and supports the action of the applicant since he acquired the building at a realistic price for a public house.
Objection confirmed.
Yours sincerely