

**From:** Contact Centre (CRM) <[contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk](mailto:contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk)>

**Sent:** 08 July 2021 15:22

**To:** Web Development <[webdevelopment@ribblevalley.gov.uk](mailto:webdevelopment@ribblevalley.gov.uk)>; Planning <[planning@ribblevalley.gov.uk](mailto:planning@ribblevalley.gov.uk)>

**Subject:** Planning Application Comments - 3/2021/0595

**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:** 100012409426

**usrn:** 31802103

**ward:** E05005308

**Planning Application Reference Number:** 3/2021/0595

**Address of Development:** land at Preston road  
Ribchester  
PR33XL

**Your Comments:**

Re: Planning application No: 3/2021/0940

Dear Rebecca

Thank you for your letter informing us of the proposed planning application for the erection of a building for Heliculture and log cabins for holiday lets on the field in Ribchester PR3 3XL. We note this is a reapplication following planning refusal on 14th April 2021.

Our property backs onto and is directly overlooked by the proposed building area and we have a number of concerns that we wish to put forward in objection to this application.

Firstly, we wish to point out a number of anomalies on the application document that we feel are

inaccurate and do not demonstrate a serious commitment to a "countryside attraction".

The application item No:-

6. States the proposed site is vacant but this is not the case as it is still used as agricultural land occupied (and has been for all the time we have lived here ) by grazing sheep and lambs.
8. States NO to new or altered access to or from the public highway but the proposed plans clearly show a new roadway for use by significant NO's of vehicles from and to the public highway this includes altered pedestrian access as currently there is no public access to this field.
9. States vehicle/cycle proposes 16 spaces. The plans looks to include 17 spaces plus minibus parking space and 4 areas for cycling storage/racks
10. States the site is NOT adjacent to trees or hedges. As residents we know the trees and hedgerows do surround the proposed development and the building will back onto Boyces brook and hedgerows. We note also that the tree report is from July 2020 and relates to a previous application for another area of the field.
11. States NOT within an area at risk of flooding. It sits however in the same field that falls into flood zone 2&3 with Boyces brook running around.
12. States NO protected priority species or important habitats or biodiversity features nearby yet previous reports highlighted a number of features in the very same field.
16. States a proposed gain of 6 residential units and indicates "social, affordable or intermediate rents". Are holiday let's now residential units or is this the proposed long term intention for this development?
18. States NO increase in employees on proposed development site. Surely a Heliculture business breeding snails, offering tutorials and tourist visits as well as 6 holiday let's requiring cleaning after use and the maintenance of a holiday site would require employees.
19. States hours of opening as NOT RELEVANT. We and our neighbours would find it VERY relevant to know the intended hours of opening and access to site.
20. States proposal does NOT involve carrying out industrial, commercial activities and processes. Surely Heliculture and holiday let's are a commercial activity and HVHC plant and machinery within the building referenced in the design and access statement further suggests industrial activity and process.
25. We question what has been declared on this point as the land to which the application relates is still in agricultural use and sheep are grazing currently.

Our concerns are as follows:

A major concern despite relocating the proposed building site is that of flood risks. Ribchester has had a number of floods which have caused devastating affects for the village residents and businesses.

We note the re submission of this application now shows the development site to be in another part of the field directly adjacent to the identified flood zones 2 and 3. Whilst this may be in an area of lower risk of flooding the proposed drainage is still through soak-away and there is no assurance that this development will not cause an increased flood risk off site in flood zone 2 and 3. This part of the field is at high risk of pluvial flooding when heavy rainfall is unable to soak-away and fluvial flooding. As mentioned, our property overlooks this site and we have often observed the fast and furious flow of water in Boyces Brook pooling into the field during heavy rainfall. This was very high, fast and overflowing its banks during the last flood in the village which occurred last year.

The application proposes a larger development covering an area of 85000 sq m (previously 6630 sq m) The plan shows that foul water from the 6 lodges and the proposed building will drain into a bio disc (18 population). We understand this will serve 16 bedrooms. The effluent at the end of this process is discharged as soak-away. Given that the proposed usage of facilities on site include 6x3 bedroom lodges (18 bedrooms), visitors, school children, heliculture staff and jet wash use (indicated in the noise report) there is likely to be significantly increased soak-away. Given that flooding can be caused by soak-away, the additional surface water drainage and discharge of effluent from bio disc waste especially at times of heavy rainfall could increase risk of flooding and

**pollution. There is no mention of how surface water run off from this development could cause impact elsewhere and how this will be mitigated. Surely it cannot be claimed therefore to be "wholly" outside of any flood risk when directly adjacent to a high risk area.**

**The application also states that there will be no altered vehicular access from Preston road. Again this is of concern as the proposed use indicates a significant increase in vehicular access to the site and likely also pedestrians. This stretch of road is narrowed due to parked cars on one side of Preston road. This only allows single lane traffic and vehicles from each direction need to give way to each other which often causes congestion. Vehicles accessing and leaving the proposed site would add to this congestion and could increase the risk of accidents. In addition access requirements for emergency vehicles and bin collections could also be hampered due to the single file traffic. Visitors and holiday makers to the site could also be at risk as this access point and side of road has no pedestrian pavement.**

**The application also states that the land is "vacant". We have lived at our property for 35 years now and have observed with pleasure the sheep that graze on this land, also the deer and the many birds.**

**The report also indicates that there is no evidence of Bats within the proposed site but we regularly observe Bats flying in and around the area. Lighting from 6 holiday lodges and an industrial unit and an increase road surface requiring even more lights would surely have an adverse impact and disturb their roosts even if they only use the area for foraging resources.**

**We are also concerned about the noise this level of activity would create with extended road surface, increased traffic, school visits and holiday makers and the impact this has on health and well-being for us and our neighbours.**

**The snail building directly overlooks our property [REDACTED] and cannot be described as in keeping with the character and rural nature of the area, neither does its repositioning ensure minimal visual impact.**

**We feel strongly that what has been submitted in this application does not address the concerns that we as local residents have regarding the flood risks to Ribchester. There is no assurance or measures of mitigation mentioned in this application that address any flooding risks other than claiming it to be outside of any flood risk.**

**For a village that has had it's fair share of floods recently, what benefits to the local community could this development bring that could outweigh any flood risks and why can't it be reasonably located in an area at less flood risk? The noise assessment makes reference to a site visit in an existing facility in the area. Why therefore is there a need for another Heliciculture and why can this existing site not be developed further?**

**We hope these objections are considered and contribute to the council making the right decision not to approve this planning application**