

**From:** Planning  
**Subject:** FW: Application 3/2024/0290 Part approval of details reserved by Conditions 9 (surface water sustainable drainage scheme) of planning permission 3/2019/1104 in relation to plots 1-39 only.

**Sent:** Tuesday, April 23, 2024 4:40 PM  
**To:** Planning <planning@ribblevalley.gov.uk>

**Subject:** Application 3/2024/0290 Part approval of details reserved by Conditions 9 (surface water sustainable drainage scheme) of planning permission 3/2019/1104 in relation to plots 1-39 only.

 **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.

For the attention of the planning department:-

We write to object to the above application submitted by Persimmon Homes after the refusal of planning application 3/2022/1116 and the further submission of application 3/2024/0196.

This objection should be read in conjunction with my previously submitted application attached to planning application 3/2024/0196.

This application, if approved, would set a precedent in allowing developers to build in blatant breach of planning permission and to the detriment of existing residents. The situation we are now stuck with at the border of Hawthorne Place should have been stopped as soon as we raised the issues fourteen months ago. These being the same issues that we predicted now present themselves at the Park Avenue border.

We do not understand how a whole complete drainage scheme can be approved in part when so many aspects are as yet unanswered. Can this drainage scheme work in isolation of the drainage in the area where plots 40 to 57 are proposed when ultimately it all drains to the Eastern side of the development? Is this viable?

Again we ask and in fact plead that proper independent measurements are done throughout the site. We all cannot be absolutely certain that all is as it should be without a proper survey. As mentioned in my previous objection we do not feel it at all sufficient to rely on the planning officers opinion.

This new plan connects a 'land drain' along the South to the culvert at the Eastern border. This was not part of the original plan when run offs etc were calculated. There is no information on this application, as yet, to show that this addition will not overwhelm the old culvert which then runs under the gardens along the back of Hawthorne Place and Park Avenue and beyond Waddington Road. As also mentioned in our previous objection these residents would then not only be left at risk

of flooding but that going forward they would be expected to maintain a culvert at their own expense that previously was not an issue.

This plan simply shows a 'land drain' to the Southern border, what exactly does this mean? Is it a proper drain, a wrapped pipe, a ditch filled with stones, soakaway? There is no information at all on what this would be. In addition to this the new residents whose gardens back onto Hawthorne Place are also experiencing drainage problems in their garden and intend to fit drainage measures to combat this. We can only imagine that this will then drain into the buffer zone causing even more water to quickly and easily enter an area which already floods.

As with the French drain to the Eastern border the land drain will not be suitable to be adopted by United Utilities leaving it to a private maintenance company to make sure it is operational. However, as yet, there is no maintenance plan on this application. This is a grave concern given all the horror stories in the media as regards maintenance companies not carrying out work and not being held accountable.

Another issue is privacy along the Southern border due to the new properties being built too high and too close causing them to be overbearing to existing properties. In way of screening a Laurel hedge has been planted on the buffer zone. Obviously this currently affords no privacy screening whatsoever and it will be a number of years before it is established enough to do so. However is it at all feasible to plant a substantial hedge over a drain which requires maintenance? How will this work? If it is not possible to plant over the drain what will be done about the total lack of privacy?

Also this drain will run under the main entrance road and presumably under the service road for plots 52 to 57? How will it therefore be maintained in these areas, particularly if these roads are adopted by the local authority.

When residents attended the meeting with Persimmons Technical manager the first words out of his mouth with the new plan in hand was that the LLFA have fully approved their new plan and they therefore anticipated the LPA will approve it also. This has now been shown to be completely untrue. The LLFA have not approved it but on 18/04/24 made the following comments...

**The Lead Local Flood Authority is currently unable to recommend the discharge of condition 9 on planning decision 3/2019/1104 on the basis of: The applicant has failed to provide clear evidence of how the proposed soakaway at the end of the filter drain along the southern boundary has been designed with supporting infiltration rates. The applicant should provide further information that demonstrates the future access and maintenance of the proposed filter drain along the southern boundary in regard to the planting of vegetation within the buffer strip. The applicant has failed to provide evidence of how the proposed filter drain along the eastern boundary has been designed, in order to demonstrate that the proposed drain will not increase flood risk or increase the overall discharge rate from the development given its proposal to connect to diverted culverted watercourse.**

It has also now been established that the site management have lied about the drain they put in along the Southern border claiming it was a pipe wrapped to avoid it becoming filled with silt and properly connected to the storm drains taking the water away. After this continued to fail causing flood after flood, stress and upset for the residents here the matter was raised with Persimmons Technical manager at the meeting. He carried out a site visit and confirmed that the drain here was merely a soakaway and was not connected to anything. How therefore can residents be reassured that sufficient drainage will be installed? Will the LLFA inspect the drainage on site in person?

This whole situation risks causing discord between neighbours with flooding, privacy and boundary issues, all emotive subjects. Whereas if Persimmon had not built against planning permission it would not now be this sorry situation of mitigation and correction, but instead one of proper planning aimed at maximising residential amenity all round.

The application form refers to a covering letter, but as yet there isn't one?

I again respectfully ask that LLFA as always and RVBC reject this application as it is undermining and insufficient.

Please could you kindly acknowledge receipt of this email and thank you for taking the time to read and consider our objection,

A black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area of the letter.

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 24 April 2024 10:33  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Application Comments - 3/2024/0290 FS-Case-608637660

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Lancashire

[REDACTED]

**Planning Application Reference No.:** 3/2024/0290

**Address of Development:** Land off Hawthorne Farm Hawthorne Place Clitheroe BB7 2HU

**Comments:** I comment on this application in conjunction with my response to application 3/2024/0196 (Case 601454082). This new application whilst adding a new french drain does nothing to alleviate our concerns that any run off from plot 46 will run [REDACTED] which will be the new low point and cause flooding. They showed us another new set of cross sections which acknowledges the mistakes commented on in the previous application but I note that these are not included in this application.

Representatives of Persimmon visited our houses last week and acknowledged that there was not room for the proposed 3:1 gradient in the distance between the house and our boundary. This is concerning as steeper slopes will exacerbate the flooding issue and the risk of land slippage would become a possibility - along with being outside of the proposed planning consent application. The representatives were open to discussion about building our garden levels up to help alleviate this problem but clearly without firm agreement to this we cannot rely on this discussion.

I would again ask that a representative of the planning department visit [REDACTED] to see just how close and high the neighbouring property is and see in person how what is and has been built differs from the proposals.