

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 12 April 2026 14:54  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Application Comments - 3/2026/0247 FS-Case-826198169

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Lancashire

[REDACTED]

**Planning Application Reference No.:** 3/2026/0247

**Address of Development:** Spout Farm, Preston Road, Longridge, PR3 3BE

**Comments:** We oppose the planning application for the below reasons:

Point 2.1

The red line outline in the PWA Planning Application is incorrect. Figure 1 shows an embellished red line that grabs more land than officially belongs to Spout Farm. Land registry document LAN242913 shows the correct boundary. The one in the application encroaches on the public open space (POS) owned by the Sandpipers Development, and also on land and gardens owned by numbers [REDACTED] Spout Lane, [REDACTED] we specifically wanted that [REDACTED] [REDACTED], and with the property being in a conservation area which was very important to us, we knew there would be wildlife frequenting the space and were told it would be landscaped. Our purchase land registry documents reflect this arrangement, as do other Spout Lane residents.

Point 2.3.2 says the estate has been developed fully by Create Homes. This is absolutely not the case. The developers are no longer trading, and have failed to comply with planning. We expected Planning Enforcement to assist with this, but it is still ongoing, over 2 years from our initial complaints. As a result of Create Homes no longer trading and obstructions/objections from [REDACTED] [REDACTED] the residents of the Sandpipers Development have formed a Residents Association to attempt to resolve the many outstanding issues.

Point 2.4.2 Figure 2 the street view hasn't looked like that for years. Again the PWA Planning Application document is using images that do not reflect the current status of the development. We also wish to point out that the swing gate of Spout Farm has been moved further forward and is so close to the road, that it is now hazardous when vehicles are turning in and out, when there is a vehicle waiting to enter at the locked gate. With regard to the public right of way that passes through Spout Farm to Pinfold Lane, there is a chain with bollards across the yard, which gives the impression that there is no access to the stile and footpath, and it has been like that for all of the almost 4 years that we have lived here.

Point 2.5.3 the statement regarding exceptional public transport connectivity is true. However, in order to get to it, you have to cross a road that is notorious for speeding traffic, only recently there was a hit and run accident. To cross to the bus stop towards Longridge you have to wait ages, and

often you have to pick your dog or children up to move quickly in order to avoid the speeding vehicles. There was supposed to be a footpath being provided by the developers sweeping left out of Spout Lane to the bus stop towards Preston, but that too has not been completed as a result of Create going bust and their failures to submit the correct planning applications.

The incomplete site still has many issues down to the Create Homes going bust and the original land owners deliberate obstructions.

It is ironic that the PWA Planning Application from Denis Lambert paints the picture that everything on the Sandpipers Development is complete, when he impeded progress for Create to finish the site at every opportunity. Many of the outstanding issues are being looked at by planning enforcements legal team and Ribble Valley Borough Council. The application and motives for it are flawed and suit the narrative of the application and it's saleability, not the existing residents.

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 12 April 2026 15:12  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Application Comments - 3/2026/0247 FS-Case-826192000

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Lancashire

[REDACTED]

**Planning Application Reference No.:** 3/2026/0247

**Address of Development:** Spout Farm  
Prston Rd  
Longridge  
PR3 3BE

**Comments:** We [REDACTED] of the Sandpipers estate in Longridge. We have seen notification of the above planning application posted to the street lamp.

One objection to this application, namely (i) the site boundary mentioned in application 03/2026/0247 contradicts the Land Registry title LAN242913. There is an overlap and probably results from the applicant's insistence that the land belongs to him and not Create Homes even though he agreed to an independent surveyor to look at the site boundary. He did not like their findings and still does not agree the boundary. This probably is why the roads and sewers have not been made up and adopted. I believe the applicant is one of the reasons that Create Homes are no longer active and are trying to wind up the company.

The planning document submitted as part of application 3/2026/0247 also contains multiple statements used to justify the application but are factually incorrect and furthermore are known to the applicant.

Point 2.3.2

The Sandpipers estate has not "been developed in full by Create Homes". There are unfinished roads, pavements and unadopted water and sewer pipes.

Point 2.4.2

With reference to the public right of way (PRoW) through the land in question, I have been asked on a couple of occasions where the PRoW beginning is and have been told that they cannot find the route through Spout Farm. This therefore is not a current benefit.

Point 2.5.3

Reference to the site benefiting from "exceptional public transport connectivity" and providing "future residents with ready, direct access to higher-order services", there is no direct access to the bus stops because there is no safe crossing, on a road which is already on record of speeding drivers and the grassed land from the green metal fence, crossing the entrance to the site and all the way

down to the bus stop belongs to LCC. Footpath has not been and is unlikely to be put in.

Point 2.5.4)

The applicant does not own the land directly in front of Plot 34, 33 and 32 of The Sandpipers estate. This is in fact shared access to these plots and an area of public open space.

Point 3.5.1

With reference to adjacent residential developments now being “complete”. How can this be as there are no made up roads and pavements. These and the sewers have not been adopted.

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 13 April 2026 07:59  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Fwd: Formal objection to Planning Application 3/2026/0247  
**Attachments:** Planning objection\_Spout Farm PR3 3BE\_13 April.docx; Planning objection\_Spout Farm PR3 3BE\_13 April.docx

**⚠ 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.

Hello

It seems I have attached my objection to my email (Mon, Apr 13, 2026 at 7:44 AM) twice in error.

The two attachments are one of the same.

Regards

[REDACTED]

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Date:** Mon, Apr 13, 2026 at 7:44 AM  
**Subject:** Formal objection to Planning Application 3/2026/0247  
**To:** <[planning@ribblevalley.gov.uk](mailto:planning@ribblevalley.gov.uk)>

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Maya Cullen  
Senior Planning Officer  
Ribble Valley Borough Council

Dear Ms Cullen

**Re: Formal objection to Planning Application number: 3/2026/0247 / Address of Development: Spout Farm, Preston Road, Longridge, PR3 3BE**

I am a neighbouring Spout Lane resident (Ribble Valley address).

Please find enclosed an attachment which is my formal objection to Planning Application number 3/2026/0247.

I am submitting in writing with an attachment as the Ribble Valley Borough Council Planning Application site does not seem to facilitate the use of images and two images within my formal objection form a key and significant part of my objection.

Yours sincerely

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the sender's name and signature.

**Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2026/0247**

**Address of Development: Spout Farm, Preston Road, Longridge PR3 3BE**

Dear Ms Cullen

**Re: Permission in Principle application – Spout Farm, Longridge, PR3 3BE (up to 9 dwellings)**

I write as a neighbouring Spout Lane resident to formally object to the above Permission in Principle application for up to 9 dwellings at Spout Farm.

My objection is based on the following material planning considerations.

### **1. Incorrect site boundary and land ownership**

The red line boundary submitted with the application conflicts with Land Registry title LAN242913 and includes land not within the applicant's control, specifically land forming part of the Sandpipers' development.

This raises a fundamental issue as to whether the application has been properly made. It also undermines the accuracy of the stated site area and the credibility of the assessment presented in the Planning Statement.

The Planning Statement (5.1.3) refers to the application site as measuring approximately 0.69 hectares which is clearly wrong when based upon incorrect boundaries.

The image on the left, below, shows the boundary depicted within the planning application, whereas the image on the right shows the relevant boundary according to the Land Registry.



The obvious main area of difference is shown by the red circles. The yellow highlighted section on both plans shows the location of a short access road which serves the two properties within the blue circle.

If the applicant's purported boundary in that location was right (which it is not, as demonstrated by the Land Registry plan), those two homeowners would have no means of accessing their properties, as the access road would be within the applicant's land and would most likely be blocked off by the applicant.

The applicant is effectively seeking planning permission to develop land that he does not own. According to [the GOV.UK website](#):

***Can a planning application be made on someone else's land?***

*The planning system entitles anyone to apply for permission to develop any plot of land, irrespective of ownership. However, an applicant is required to notify owners of the land or buildings to which the application relates, as well as any agricultural tenants, in accordance with [article 13 of the Town and Country Planning \(Development Management Procedure\) \(England\) Order 2015](#). When making an application, an applicant is required to sign a [certificate confirming the ownership of the land](#) to which the application relates and that the relevant notices have been served.*

*Paragraph: 027 Reference ID: 14-027-20140306*

*Revision date: 06 03 2014*

As far as we are aware: 1) the applicant has not notified the owners of the intention to apply for planning permission to develop land not owned by him; and 2) the applicant has not signed a certificate confirming land ownership and that the relevant notices have been served. On that basis, the application is invalid.

If planning permission is granted, there will inevitably be a formal boundary dispute and the potential for an already acrimonious relationship between the applicant and neighbouring property owners to intensify and worsen. The applicant will almost certainly immediately encroach on land not owned by him if permission is granted, which will deprive two houses of access to their properties. All of this is likely to require significant legal expenditure for those affected.

In summary, the applicant is seeking permission to build on land clearly not owned by him. The required formalities have not been followed by the applicant, so the application should fail on that basis alone. Further, the ramifications of permission being granted are significant for the affected neighbouring property owners and that must be given real consideration.

**2. The site is not appropriately characterised as previously developed land**

The Planning Statement places significant weight on the site being “predominantly previously developed land”. This is not an accurate reflection of the site in its current condition.

While there are remnants of former nursery use, substantial parts of the site are now open and have blended back into a semi-rural character. These areas do not function or appear as previously developed land and should not be treated as such simply because of historic use.

The proposal therefore relies on an overstated interpretation of brownfield status to justify development.

### **3. The site forms part of the countryside edge, not the built-up area**

The Planning Statement describes the site as “unequivocally urban”, which does not reflect its actual position on the ground.

Spout Farm clearly marks the edge of Longridge, beyond which lies open countryside. The site provides an important transitional boundary between built development and rural land.

Development of this site would extend the settlement edge southwards and erode this boundary, conflicting with the spatial strategy of Ribble Valley Borough Council and the core objective of protecting the countryside from incremental encroachment.

### **4. Permission in Principle is not appropriate for this site**

Permission in Principle is intended for sites where the suitability of location, land use and amount of development are clear and uncontroversial.

That is not the case here.

There is significant uncertainty regarding:

- the extent of the site (given the boundary issues);
- the amount of development (1 to 9 dwellings is a wide and undefined range);
- the relationship to the settlement boundary and countryside.

Granting Permission in Principle in these circumstances would establish the acceptability of development without properly resolving these fundamental issues.

### **5. The scale of development cannot be meaningfully assessed**

The application seeks permission for between 1 and 9 dwellings, which prevents any meaningful assessment of the “amount of development”, a matter which is expressly relevant at the Permission in Principle stage.

A proposal at the upper end of this range would have a materially different impact from a single dwelling, particularly in a sensitive edge-of-settlement location.

This level of uncertainty is inappropriate and weighs against granting Permission in Principle. The scale of development is left deliberately vague

### **6. Housing land supply does not outweigh site-specific harm**

While the Planning Statement relies on housing land supply considerations and the presumption in favour of sustainable development set out in the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government National Planning Policy Framework, this does not override the need to properly assess site-specific harm.

In this case, the adverse impacts include:

- the erosion of the countryside edge;
- the extension of the settlement boundary;
- the incremental loss of open land character.

These harms are not outweighed by the limited contribution of up to 9 dwellings.

## **7. Access and highway considerations**

References to accessibility by public transport in the Planning Statement (paragraphs 2.5.3 and 2.5.4) do not reflect the current on-site conditions.

The Planning Statement downplays concerns about access onto Preston Road and treats these matters as issues for later consideration. However, as someone who regularly uses this road, I do not believe this is a trivial issue that can safely be deferred.

Preston Road is already busy, with regular traffic, peak-time congestion and vehicles travelling at varying speeds. Visibility at existing access points is already limited. Introducing additional residential access serving up to nine new dwellings will only make matters worse

The bus stop for services towards Longridge is located on the opposite side of Preston Road to the Spout Lane entrance. There is no formal pedestrian crossing or controlled point of access at this location. Preston Road is a well-used route with variable traffic speeds, and the absence of a designated crossing limits safe pedestrian access to this stop.

In addition, it is understood that a footpath was to be provided along the frontage of the Spout Farm site to connect to the bus stop serving routes towards Preston. At present, this route remains incomplete and is not in a condition suitable for regular pedestrian use.

The Planning Statement also refers to a public right of way crossing the site. On site, this route is currently obstructed by physical features including cones and a chain, which restrict ease of access. This raises questions as to its current usability as a functional pedestrian route.

Taken together, these factors indicate that pedestrian safety and access to public transport and local routes is constrained in practice, which is relevant to the assessment of the site's suitability for residential development.

## **8. Factually Incorrect Statements**

Points 2.3.2 and 3.5.1 of the Planning Statement describe the Sandpipers development as having "been developed in full by Create Homes" and as a "substantial residential development that is now complete".

This does not reflect the current position on site. The development includes unfinished drainage systems, roads and pavements, outstanding adoption processes, and identified breaches of planning conditions which have not yet been resolved. In addition, neither the developer (Create Developments (Longridge) Limited), nor its director(s), are currently responding to the residents, Lancashire County Council and Ribble Valley Borough Council to resolve these significant outstanding issues and Create Developments (Longridge) Limited is subject to postponement of strike-off action at Companies House.

Accordingly, the Planning Statement appears to rely on an inaccurate characterisation of nearby development, which undermines the weight that can be placed on it in support of this application.

## **Conclusion**

For the reasons set out above, the application:

- relies on an incorrect site boundary and unclear land ownership;
- mischaracterises the site as previously developed land;
- seeks to develop a countryside-edge location;
- is not suitable for Permission in Principle due to uncertainty over location and scale.

I respectfully request that Ribble Valley Borough Council refuse the application.

Yours sincerely

██████████