

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 04 September 2025 16:15
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0672 FS-Case-746605017

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0672

Address of Development: 12a knowsley road

Comments:

The proposed new fences create a difficult and “out of site, out of mind” barrier to the new owners and their legal responsibility to the maintenance of the watercourse banking area, trees, shrubs etc. This is also compounded in the fact that they have not included any gates in the fences to access the lower portion of each garden so clearly may suggest to the new owners it’s a “boundary fence”.. This was the reason no fencing was specified on the original plans and certainly will not make the boundaries clear to new owners, as [REDACTED], [REDACTED] sold, who thought [REDACTED] “belonged to the council”. Whilst I fully accept the responsibility is on the individual owner to understand the boundaries on their properties the fences now erected have created areas that are unclear and could create potential issues in the future that will be difficult to rectify once the developers have gone and the properties sold.

I would also say the fencing that has now been erected creates a another issue. The developer Mr Coupland had been informed and agreed to repair the banking on his land which is his responsibility, during development [REDACTED] had pointed the collapsed area out to him. Since then [REDACTED] has had several conversations with the builder but all those have resulted in no action. This is also despite several letters and emails sent at the beginning of the project to and from LCC Flood Defence team to the developer..This was regarding the damaged banking that has now reduced water flow by nearly 50%. This is now causing the erosion of the opposing bank when substantial rainfall increases the flow drastically. Now the area has been “screened off” it will be difficult to access the banking with machinery given the small narrow”maintenance path”.

In addition I would comment that the erection of the fence reduces the car parking area. The main comments from the Highways Agency on the re-submitted plans was that the number of car parking spaces must include a turning circle so that vehicles are not reversing into the highway. The fencing has reduced the area so that the 7 spaces of regulation size and a turning circle agreed at planning will be difficult to achieve.

[REDACTED].

These comments follow several emails concerning these issues already sent to RVC planning who have visited site.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 04 September 2025 18:49
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0672 FS-Case-746662056

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0672

Address of Development: 12a knowsley road
wilpshire

Comments:

The fences create a difficult and “out of site, out of mind” barrier to the new and owners and their legal responsibility to the maintenance of the watercourse banking area, trees, shrubs i mentioned before. This is also compounded in the fact that they have included no gates in the fences to access the lower portion of each garden so clearly may suggest to the new owners it’s a “boundary fence”..

This was the reason no fencing was specified on the original plans and certainly will not make the boundaries clear to new owners. This was found when [REDACTED] sold, who thought the land behind [REDACTED]. Whilst I fully accept the responsibility is on the individual owner to understand the boundaries on their properties the fences now erected have created areas that are unclear and potential issues in the future will be difficult to rectify once the developers have gone and the properties sold.

The developer Mr Coupland had originally agreed to repair the banking on his land [REDACTED]. Since then [REDACTED] with the (Builder) but all those have resulted in no action. This is also despite several letters and emails sent at the beginning of the project to and from LCC Flood Defence team to the developer.. This was regarding the damaged banking that has reduced water flow by nearly 50%. This is now causing the erosion of the opposing bank when substantial rainfall increases the flow drastically. This makes the repairs prior to the sale of the properties difficult to get to having now “screened the areas off” with a tiny access path which no machinery can possibly access.

Also the comments from the Highways Agency on the re-submitted plans state the number of car parking spaces must include a turning circle so that vehicles are not reversing into the highway. as can now be seen the area that the fences now encroach on has been reduced and that the 7 spaces of regulation size and the turning circle agreed at planning may be difficult to achieve if these fences remain.

Both issues are linked to this application of fencing.

Thanksyou

These comments form similar concerns allready emailed to the planning dept at Ribble Valley.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 05 September 2025 06:22
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0672 FS-Case-746719826

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0672

Address of Development: 12a Knowsley road wilpshire

Comments: I would like to comment on the erection of the boundary fence by the applicant. All the properties including the former showley brook care home that have the brook as their legal boundary line ([REDACTED]) have a responsibility under riparian ownership to look after and maintain the undergrowth and banking maintenance to reduce the risk of flooding and banking erosion. The banking on the side of 12a Knowsley road has collapsed over the years and [REDACTED] by mr coupland that this would be repaired . It was never done. (Letters have been sent to the applicant/builder from Lancashire county council flood risk management team to remind the developers about their responsibility) Now with the fencing erected this would be very difficult to do.. Under the original application it was stated no fencing was to be erected along the rear of the properties . In doing so is very confusing to the new purchasers as to their future responsibilities of banking/ brook care. The fencing erection gives the illusion that the property boundary stops at the fencing , which it does not . If the boundary line is changed , who will then be responsible for the future maintenance of the banking and brook which will lead to future erosion of the banking and increase the risk of surrounding property flood damage .