

PLANNING	
18 JAN 2022	
FOR THE ATTENTION OF	



15 January 2022

Director of Development
Council Offices
Church Walk
Clitheroe
BB7 2RA

Dear Sir,

Application No. 3/2021/1248 and 3/2021/1249

I once again find myself objecting to plans to change the use of The Duke of York, Grindleton, from a public house with living accommodation to residential use. Plans for this change of use were refused in 2019 and again in 2020 and nothing has changed since that time and nor has the owner made any reasonable attempt to sell the pub as a going concern.

The villagers of Grindleton made offers to the owner of The Duke of York to buy this pub [REDACTED]. This is an historic Grade 2 listed inn and as such should be retained for the villagers and not turned into yet more private residential accommodation by an owner [REDACTED]. There is now no public house in the village as The Buck Inn has also since closed. Villages without shops and pubs become commuter villages in my opinion. If The Duke of York was retained as a public house it would provide employment for several people and improve the economic, social and environment conditions in the area as set out in Key Statement 2 DS2 of the Development Plan policy.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Pubs are the focal point of a village, where everyone can get together as a community and with regards to The Duke, the villagers wanted to take on this enterprise and run it for the good of the community. Yes there is The Pavilion in Grindleton for the use of the villagers but this is not really the same as having a thriving pub/restaurant.

Grindleton is in the Forest of Bowland AONB and if visitors are to be encouraged to the area public houses/restaurants are absolutely necessary. There are no longer any shops or cafes in the village, no public toilets, no pub so why would visitors bother to come?

I fear that once planning permission is granted for residential use the current owner will not stop at one dwelling but will request amendments to allow more houses to be built on this quite large plot of land.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Council Offices

Church Walk

Clitheroe

BB7 2RA

Fao Adrian Dowd



16 January 2022

Planning Application No. 3/2021/1248

Proposal: Change of use from Public House with living accommodation to residential use. Demolition and replacement of single storey extensions, alterations to vehicle access and landscaping. Following refused applications 3/2019/0049 and 3/2020/0219.

Location; Duke of York, Grindleton Brow Grindleton BB7 4QR

Dear Sir,

I am writing, yet again, to object to this proposed application. I enclose copies of my letters of 12 February 2019 and 2 April 2020.

My objections still stand and for the same reasons. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

I note that he still intends to demolish the single storey building and alter the vehicle access which would suggest that he still intends, at some stage, to proceed with his plans for scaffolding garages etc on the site.

[REDACTED]

I cannot understand why Mr Stansfield is so eager to pursue his plans for developing commercial/ industrial buildings on the site, when there are plenty of more suitable sites relatively close on the Industrial areas nearby

The traffic problems on The Brow have worsened due to the increased number of cars parked on the left side of the road, coming up the Brow, forcing drivers to move into the middle of the road and face collisions with cars etc coming round the corner down the hill. Thus I object to changing the vehicle access, which will exacerbate the situation.

Yours faithfully,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Ribble Valley Borough Council

Council Offices

Church Walk

Clitheroe BB7 2RA

FAO director of economic development and planning.

1 April 2020

Applicant Mr S Stansfield

Planning Application No 3/2020//0219

Proposal: Change of use from Public House with living accommodation (A4 drinking establishment) to residential Use (C3 dwelling) Resubmission of application 3/2019/0049

Location: Duke of York Inn Grindleton BB7 4QR.

Dear Sir,

I shall not repeat my objections to Mr Stansfield's planning application No 3/2019/0049 . I enclose a copy of the letter that I sent to you then. This application was turned down. For this reason I cannot see why you are contemplating resubmitting virtually the same application. Mr Stansfield is claiming to change the use from Drinking establishment to residential use.

[REDACTED]

In addition, it will give Mr Stansfield permission to continue to store equipment, and materials on the car park, as well as his lorries and scaffolding equipment and continue to create noise and disturbance in our pleasant rural village.

[REDACTED]

I object to Mr Stansfield 's application because there is now a viable alternative to his plans. Grindleton Village have managed to obtain the funding to develop and open a village pub/cafe in the premises. This will be of far greater value to the village.

[REDACTED]

Surely, if your remit is Economic Development and Planning, a village resource would be preferable to plans, already rejected, which will spoil the heart of our village.

Yours Faithfully,

[REDACTED]



Ribble Valley Borough Council

Council Offices

Church Walk

Clitheroe BB7 2RA

12 February 2019

FAO Adam Birkitt

Applicant Mr S Stansfield

Planning Application No: 3/2019/0049

Grid Reference: 375906 445495

Proposal: Change of use from Public House with living accommodation to one dwelling with business use. Demolition of existing single storey extensions and construction of a new single-storey extension. Construction of new two-storey three car garage with business storage above. Construction of three new two storey holiday lets. Location: Duke of York Inn, Grindleton Brow, Grindleton BB7 4QR.

Dear Sir,

I wish to express my objections to these proposals based on a number of reasons.

1. Whilst I appreciate, that the main building is in need of repair, it is a listed building at the very heart of the village in a designated conservation area. I am concerned about the impact of the extra three two storey buildings on a rather cramped site, in close proximity to the road (The Brow). Despite pretty architectural designs and photogenic representations in the planning proposals, I think they will spoil the open approach to the village and I feel that they are too big for the proposed placement.
2. I am concerned about the validity of the claims for the need of such holiday lets. I support the need to develop tourism in the Ribble Valley but Grindleton is not a particularly tourist venue. It has no shopping or catering facilities or even many attractions open to tourists. Much has been made of the Village Pavilion but that is of little value for short stay tourists because all the daytime activities are health and special interest groups who attend on a weekly basis. The few evening activities, like the Film Club, The WI etc., are for members and the occasional social occasions are

all ticketed and sold in advance. Tourists turning up for the weekend or during the week, would be hard put to find entertainment within walking distance.

3. I am also concerned that Mr Stansfield's primary interest is in the main property and the garages and storage at the rear of the car park. I note that their construction is listed before that of the holiday lets in his submission. I am worried about whether these holiday lets will be constructed and how long they will remain as 'holiday lets' before they are sold as houses.
4. I am very perturbed about Mr Stansfield's plans for the garage building and storage areas at the rear of the car park. These will, to all intents and purposes, be industrial buildings associated with his building trade. Indeed his application does mention scaffolding, which is noisy and dusty. In addition it is likely to involve loading and unloading at antisocial times. i.e. early in the morning and in the evening. I feel that these plans will change the nature of our essentially rural village. If I may be pedantic about semantics, his plans are more industrial than commercial. A further problem that worries me is Mr Stansfield's intention to lower the level of the garden at the rear. Perhaps I am being cynical but this would make it very easy to extend his 'building stores' in the future.
5. This leads me to my greatest disquiet, that of increased noise and traffic. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] I have seen a considerable increase in the amount of through traffic. The secondary school has increased its numbers and there are more buses and parents' cars. However, these are at predictable times. The Brow is a particularly dangerous stretch as cars and other vehicular traffic are inevitably accelerating to get to the top of the steep hill and there is a sharp bend. I am very worried that the construction of the three 'holiday lets' together with the demolition of the single-storey building will move and narrow the entrance to an increasingly busy car park. The construction vehicles and cars will have a very restricted view of traffic moving in both directions whilst pulling out.
6. In addition to the difficulties of the egress to the car park there are two further points I wish to make. Firstly, I am very concerned about the inevitable increase in the number of vehicles on the site. Not only will there be the construction vehicles but also the vehicles renting the 'holiday lets' Not everyone comes to such a venue in one car. There may be two or more per let. Then there will also be the cars of the people who are going to be working in the offices/ businesses to be developed in the attic of the main building. That is going to mean many more cars, vans, etc. Where are they going to park given that we already have a problem with parking in the village, given the nature of its history and ancient building pattern? I think Mr Stansfield has underestimated the parking requirements [REDACTED]
7. Finally, although perhaps not in your list of material considerations, whilst worrying about the increased noise and volume of the traffic, may I make a plea for the pedestrians. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] I can vouch for the fact that virtually every day when I step outside my front door, I am greeted by children walking past to and from the primary school and to the Play Area and dog walkers as well as older people, strolling through the village I have come to know so many neighbours and villagers from their dogs and their daily walks I see from the plans that the footpath along to the Millennium wood will be impacted by the 'holiday lets'. What impact will it have on the access to the road

down to Greendale Mill, also used by walkers? The wood is such a huge asset to our village. [REDACTED] and supported the plantation of trees in any way I could. I am saddened at the prospect of any damage to the wildlife of this precious place.

In conclusion, I feel that Mr Stansfield is attempting to cram too much on the site, which will spoil the heart of the village. I am sure that it would be possible to develop this historic and focal point of Grindleton in a much more sympathetic and appropriate manner.

Yours faithfully,

[REDACTED]