

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 13 November 2024 10:52  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Application Comments - 3/2024/0817 FS-Case-662015309

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Lancashire

[REDACTED]

**Planning Application Reference No.:** 3/2024/0817

**Address of Development:** Hawthorne Farm Persimmon Site

**Comments:** I write to object once more to the Hawthorne Farm/Place persimmon development and specifically to application 3/2024/0817.

The developers of this site appear to have no regard for the council, planning laws, existing residents feelings or common sense. Their only motivation would seem to be profit. In attempting to squeeze too many houses on a problematic site they have caused all of the issues they are now facing and the objections they are receiving. They now seem to be attempting to make these issues go away by putting in repeated applications until they get their way.

By building up the entire field that existed before they began building they have created a monster on the boundary with Park Avenue whereby the new ground level of their site looms over existing gardens and properties. By then choosing to cram as many profitable houses as possible onto the site they have then exacerbated the problem by having 2 storey buildings with the gable in addition in ridiculously close proximity to the boundary on top of a man made hill of their creation. In doing so they themselves have caused the issues that are taking so long to resolve as there is no answer to them that is safe or acceptable in their current form. We were not naive enough to believe that the field would be built on at some point but never expected such flagrant disregard as we have seen from persimmon.

In this application they have provided cross sections of the land carefully avoiding the narrow section between [REDACTED] of their site. This section does not have room for the proposed 3 in 1 slope and will be much steeper than this risking land slip and meaning their proposed solution to water run off is unlikely to work. The field as previously explained was significantly lower than [REDACTED] which prevented [REDACTED] from flooding. Persimmons proposal is for a steep slope running onto our lawn that would rely on water soaking into a 15cm pipe to avoid it flooding [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] point – [REDACTED] The plans talk of the maintenance of this strip of sloped land to reassure us that it will be kept in good order. We know however that existing boundary strip areas on the site are not being maintained so can only assume [REDACTED] will be the same. The plans do not now seem to explain what sort of fence we can expect to be built between the new builds and the strip of land [REDACTED] [REDACTED] and so we cannot comment on the impact of this.

Whilst the application is difficult to understand as the written explanation of the landscaping and planting planned seems to differ from that on the drawings it would seem that Persimmon would like to plant a hedge that would be 8M tall on top of the now ridiculously built up field [REDACTED]

██████████. This would mean a roughly 10 m high barrier to light that would – if maintained in the same way as existing boundary strips be allowed to become unkempt and loom ██████████. The distance between ██████████ 2.5 – 3M and the developers are suggesting fitting a pathway and fence in adjacent to the house leaving only 1.5-2M for the grassed slope, drainage, culvert and an 8M hedge. This is clearly and plainly ridiculous and should not be allowed. It will cut out all sunlight ██████████. They even describe the provision of this hedge ██████████ be an unusable dead patch of mud.

The only solution I can see is for one less house to be built on each of the rows leading onto the Park Avenue boundary which would mean that there would be room for a suitable slope, appropriate access to the houses, less of an impact on loss of light and room for the drainage solutions to work. This would surely be an appropriate compromise if Persimmon are in fact not all about profit as they claim and would make the elevated field much more palatable for existing residents.

I would ask – as I have on previous objections without reply or taking up of the request – that the planning officer get in touch, come and see how horrific this development is going to be for us if allowed to continue and let common sense prevail and block the application.

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED] >  
**Sent:** 11 November 2024 15:36  
**To:** Planning  
**Cc:** Nicola Hopkins  
**Subject:** Planning application 3/2024/0817...Approval of details reserved by conditions18 (landscape phasing scheme) and 19 (landscape management plan) of planning permission 3/2019/1104.  
**Attachments:** 20240702\_105850.jpg; 20240702\_110405.jpg; 20240702\_105556.jpg

 **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...

I write to further object to the above and related applications. [REDACTED] and the border of this site, I understand if it may be felt that it is not my place to object. However I do object on the following grounds...

When we were advised by planning that Persimmon were continuing with this development, despite no planning permission being finalised, we were advised that it was at their own risk. I would suggest that they never felt there was a risk so forged ahead. Now 38 of the 39 completed properties are sold, paid for and occupied with all profits to Persimmon. This was a risk that certainly paid off as although there are many aspects of these houses that have not conformed to the proposed plans, not least is the heights and drainage, they got away with it. If approved they will continue to get away with it.

No doubt they are very confident that this will also be the case with plots 40 to 57. They are submitting numerous applications to mitigate height and the overbearing, but not accepting that they have built in breach of what was submitted. They have said they have no intentions of reducing the heights, yet these heights as agreed by RVBC, are too high and will have a negative impact upon existing residents. Within this latest application a Laurel hedge is proposed in places along this boundary and will be allowed to grow to 8 metres. We actually wondered if that was a typo?...over 26 feet! If a member of the public allowed a hedge on a boundary to grow to that height and on complaint refused to reduce it the council would be expected to take action.

The housing association 'Snug Homes' website showed plots 53 to 57 to be 'on hold', this has recently changed stating they are 'coming soon'. Do they know this is all about to be approved? The only consequence of total disregard for the planning department and residents it affects is a delay in building, nothing more.

I have a [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] has been in touch with me regularly and is extremely upset and stressed by all this. [REDACTED] said to me today and I quote, 'there is nothing they can do to make this right, they have destroyed my ability to enjoy my home and garden'. [REDACTED] but at this meeting at the back of [REDACTED], did [REDACTED]. It was only later that another resident identified the officer. Please see the attached photographs [REDACTED]. I think the planning [REDACTED] with a long piece of

wood. This 8 foot pole is being used to demonstrate what the 8 foot fence [REDACTED] inches [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] has not got the means to object, but I can assure you [REDACTED] does, as is the case with many of the residents on this boundary, [REDACTED]. These are real people, this is wrong and should not be allowed to happen.

Then there is the matter of light, legislation is in place to protect people from situations such as this. How can a permission be granted where there exists a right to light? We cannot see how an 8 foot fence will not affect light levels when placed so close and high upon the boundary, never mind an 8 metre thick Laurel hedge. Can it be shown with light testing that the existing properties will not be affected?

The strip of land between the new properties and Hawthorne Place has not been touched by the maintenance staff. The showhouse and entrance areas are looked after and the grass cut, but where the public don't see is already totally overgrown with weeds. This will no doubt continue, rendering the drainage on these boundaries useless.

Thank you for taking the time to read my email, I hope you are able to properly consider all the points and take into account the situation these residents have been placed in. This is not a NIMBY situation, it's a situation caused by developers' total disregard for people and greed for profit, while riding roughshod over our local council.

Please could you kindly acknowledge receipt of this objection as a delivery receipt is not usually received.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED] >  
**Sent:** 11 November 2024 17:13  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Subject: Planning application 3/2024/0817...Approval of details reserved by conditions18 (landscape phasing scheme) and 19 (landscape management plan) of planning permission 3/2019/1104.

 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.

I am writing as a [REDACTED] who is affected by the Persimmon development. It is beyond belief that they raised the ground [REDACTED] which will make the houses block out our light and cause much depression amongst our neighbours. I cannot understand why this was done, apart from greed by cramming more properties in. Why could they not have put bungalows along this boundary and stood back a few metres? Their excuse about drainage is not acceptable as it is common practice to pump water uphill to a reservoir such as they have made and then flow from there to the inadequate drains by number 47 which is only 18" diameter.

I think they should either pull down the houses and reduce the height, or at least make them into one storey properties and the thought of a tall hedge against us is a monstrous idea and not allowed.

The current plans should not go ahead.

Best wishes,

[REDACTED]