

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>

Sent: 15 June 2021 16:51

To: Web Development <webdevelopment@ribblevalley.gov.uk>; Planning <planning@ribblevalley.gov.uk>

Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2021/0332

Title: [REDACTED]

First Name: [REDACTED]

Surname: [REDACTED]

Is your address in Ribble Valley?: [REDACTED]

Enter a postcode or street: [REDACTED]

Choose Address: [REDACTED]

Selected address: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Locality:

County: Lancashire

uprn: 10093890208

usrn: 31802306

ward: E05005315

Planning Application Reference Number: 3/2021/0332

Address of Development: Clitheroe Golf Club
Whalley Road
Clitheroe
Lancashire, BB7 1PP

Your Comments: Before I go into reasons for why this planning proposal should not go ahead, please see below background around the golf courses adverse actions and attitudes towards the residents on the estate so far (this is not an exhaustive list):

- General harassment and vitriol towards the residents for buying a house on an estate next to the course. Specific statements include:
 - o Telling one resident they hoped they were getting a hard hat for their birthday.
 - o Telling one resident that the members are enjoying looking at women sunbathing in their gardens.

o Abusing a qualified arborist and residents family for simply pruning branches of an oak tree. Even though this had been pre agreed, not that any permission was required as the branches were overhanging.

- Blowing copious amounts of leaves from the fairway into residents gardens (video can be provided).
- Driving recklessly fast down the service track causing copious amounts of dust into residents gardens and houses. This has continued even though the residents have politely requested them to slow down. (video can be provided)
- Being angry at residents for cutting down their own leylandii (that were dying), which in all likelihood was due to the acidity of the septic effluent from the golf club, which isn't up to regulation.
- Refusing to let residents cut down trees that had been condemned by the council that could realistically have fallen on the properties at any minute.

Reasons for planning being refused:

- The proposed nets are unlikely to stop many balls from entering the residents gardens, due to the location of the nets and current tee bed. This can even be seen using the golf clubs own risk assessment document. If they are unlikely to provide any protection, this renders them almost entirely useless. The limited balls I get tend to travel over the trees and for my specific house, to hit the roof. Please note this proposed solution wouldn't have stopped a ball smashing a window [REDACTED] [REDACTED] For your information, the golf club refused to pay for this damage in its entirety.
- The nets are likely to have a hugely claustrophobic effect on residents families in the gardens reducing light and the feeling of being encaged. Given the attitudes and behaviours of the golf club, this is likely the main reason of them erecting the proposed solution.
- There is an abundance of diverse wildlife in the proposed area. This includes, squirrels, woodpeckers, pheasants, hedgehogs and bats to name a few. It is likely to have some form of an impact on this wildlife. E.G. being trapped in the net and destruction of their natural habitat.
- Mature trees will require drastic pruning for net to be erected. Ironically as mentioned above, the golf course have previously abused residents for cutting two secondary branches off an oak tree that was overhanging the residents land.
- The net will be seen from most areas of the estate and even Whalley Road, especially during winter ruining the natural woodland due to the man-made structure.
- During Autumn a huge amount of leaves fall from the mature trees meaning the entire net is likely to be covered after autumn meaning no light would pass through whatsoever. This would create an even more claustrophobic scene.

Please see other proposed solutions below:

1. Angled / L Shaped Net closer to the tee protecting the housing estate - A strategically positioned angled or L shaped net between the first house and the tee of vast height would provide much more protection to the residents of the estate. This would also not have a negative impact on the wildlife or residents amenity.
2. Move the 1st hole tee bed forward – Move the first tee in line with the first / second house on the estate and move the practice greens to where the start of the first fairway currently is. This would require no or limited netting meaning no impact to any wildlife or amenity.
3. Move the 1st hole green forward – Make the first hole a Par 3, having the green adjacent to the first house in the middle of the current fairway. Players would then use irons, and no balls would enter the estate. For the second hole, they could then tee off from around adjacent to the second house and use the current second hole green, making the second hole a Par 5. This would require no or limited netting meaning no impact to any wildlife or amenity.

To conclude, the planning application is likely to provide little to no protection to the residents but will simply damage wildlife, reduce light and damage the current woodland. Solution 2 and 3 will have less impact in all areas and will actually address the root cause of the risk, and will future proof the golf club from any insurance claims going forwards. The golf club seem to essentially do what they wish and not consider the impact on any residents or wildlife for this or previous planning applications. The course states on their website they have a total yardage of 6531 yards which is likely to encompass around 110 acres of land. They only have 4 houses backing on to the course at any point, and they want to put a net right on their boundary, which seems at best unnecessary and at worst spiteful.