

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 08 April 2026 15:16
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - Application 3/2026/0247 FS-Case-824442471

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

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

Address of Development: Spout Farm

Comments: I oppose the above planning application completely for the following reasons:

I set out observations of completely factually incorrect statements from the planning document made as part of the application - see the PWA statement.

Point 2.1

The outline red site location plan is incorrect and encroaches on land owned by the Sandpipers development. Please see title deeds with reference LAN 242913 which shows the Sandpipers boundary.

Point 2.3.2

Reference to the Sandpipers estate, this has not "been developed in full by Create Homes" the estate is currently unfinished with no roads or pavements and the developer who is attempting to be compulsorily struck off the Companies House register (I.e no longer trading) has failed to comply with planning and a breach of condition notice has been served and not complied with / responded to.

Point 2.4.2

Reference to the public right of way (ProW) through the Spout Farm property, access to this has previously been impeded by the owner of Spout Farm - current residents at the Sandpipers estate are unable to cross the right of way due to this being flooded continuously by the owner of Spout Farm with his hose pipe.

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 stop at the top of the road because (i) there is no safe crossing, on a road which is already on record of speeding drivers and (ii) the failure of the footpath promised by Create Homes past the front of the Spout Farm property. The bus stop is therefore unsafe to try to reach for all residents on foot (especially young families with push chairs / prams).

Point 2.5.4

The footpath supposedly to be put in along Preston Road to the bus stop by Create Homes has not happened. Create Homes have failed to file its accounts on time at Companies House meaning the company responsible for completing the path is imminently going to be struck off the Companies House register thereby ceasing to exist.

Point 3.3.1

Reference to the Sandpipers own site planning and approval 03/2020/0309 which, contradicts the location plan submitted on this new application - see point 2.1 above.

Point 3.5.1

Reference to adjacent residential developments now being “complete”, this is not the case due to the roads and outstanding adoptions and breach of condition notices that have not been complied with by Create Homes.

Finally, Spout Farm has erected a six foot fence in breach of planning laws and has moved their entrance fence to encroach on the land owned by the Sandpipers estate.

For the above reasons the application submitted is flawed, relies on incorrect information / detail and has drawn up plans that encroach on the land forming part of the Sandpipers development.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 07 April 2026 21:31
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2026/0247 FS-Case-824021752

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2026/0247

Address of Development: Spout Farm, Longridge

Comments: We live at [REDACTED] in Longridge. We have recently received notification of the above planning application [REDACTED] to this proposed development. We have two main serious objections to this application, namely (i) the site boundary mentioned in application 03/2026/0247 contradicts the Land Registry title LAN242913, which was provided to us by our solicitors when we purchased the property in [REDACTED]. The strip of road directly in front [REDACTED] was also detailed on Deed Plans to be shared access and to be managed by the "Management Company", namely the Sandpipers (Longridge) Management Company which is currently had it's compulsory strike off suspended due to complaints to Companies House from the Sandpipers residents and (ii) the fact that the Ribble Valley Borough Council is even entertaining further planning applications in this area when they are fully aware the residents of The Sandpipers have been left with a half finished estate with no roads, no pavements or adopted water ways due to the insolvency of the developer Create Homes.

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

Point 2.3.2

Reference to the Sandpipers estate, this has not "been developed in full by Create Homes". There are unfinished roads, pavements falling apart and unadopted water ways.

Point 2.4.2

Reference to the public right of way (PRoW) through the land in question, to our knowledge access to this has previously been impeded by the applicant - cones and a chain are currently in place. These can be seen in the aerial photograph used in the planning document! We personally have no evidence of this but it is inappropriate that this is being promoted as a benefit now that it works in favour of the applicant.

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

these bus stops because (i) there is no safe crossing, on a road which is already on record of speeding drivers and (ii) the failure of the installation of the footpath promised by Create Homes past the front of Spout Farm on Preston Road. (ironically mentioned in Point 2.5.4)

Point 2.5.4

Said footpath to be put in along Preston Road to the bus stop by Create Homes. Create Homes have applied for strike off. Not sure how this will ever be installed and be a benefit for “future residents”.

Point 3.3.1

Reference to The Sandpipers estate approved application 3/2020/0309, to the north of the new application 3/2026/0247. If the location plan of application 3/2020/0309 is compared to application 3/2026/0247 you will see that there is a contradiction in boundaries. Subsequent Land Registry title LAN242913 shows 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

Reference to adjacent residential developments now being “complete”, which is not the case due to the roads and outstanding adoptions as previously mentioned.

Best Regards

A black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of the sender.

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 08 April 2026 11:21
To: Maya Cullen; Planning
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: Planning Application No - 3/2026/0247

⚠ 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.

Hi Maya,

Please treat our comments as a formal objection to the currently proposed scheme.

Kind Regards,
[REDACTED]

Sent from [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, April 8, 2026 11:11:51 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Planning Application No - 3/2026/0247

Dear [REDACTED],

Please be advised that a decision has not been made on the above planning application.

Please confirm if you wish for the below comments to be treated as a formal objection to the scheme.

Kind regards,

Maya Cullen – Senior Planning Officer

Ribble Valley Borough Council, Council Offices,
Church Walk, Clitheroe, Lancashire BB7 2RA

Tel: 01200 425111

E: [REDACTED]

Web: www.ribblevalley.gov.uk



Ribble Valley
Borough Council

www.ribblevalley.gov.uk

From: [REDACTED] >
Sent: 08 April 2026 11:02
To: Planning <planning@ribblevalley.gov.uk>; [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED] >
Subject: Planning Application No - 3/2026/0247

⚠ 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.

Good Morning,

We write to you in relation to the most recent letter issued to some resident of the current Spout Farm estate, advising that a Permission in Principle (PiP) (3/2026/0247) has been issued for approval.

On review of the current application and proposal, prepared by pwa planning, we wish put forward our comments as stipulated within said letter.

Whilst we appreciate the commitments of Ribble Valley Council and all councils to demonstrate their 5 year plans on new housing stock, we feel this PiP needs further review, as a number of areas of the PiP application shall lead to controversy within the local community.

1. Under section 1.1.2 and after review of the Town and Country Planning (Permission in Principle) Order 2017, we don't believe a clear scope in relation to the amount of development has been submitted for approval under this PiP.
2. Figure 1. Of the PiP (Page 5) shows the current red line plan issued with the application. On review of the previous planning application (3/2020/0309) and the proposed site plan within this application, it is clear that the boundary put forward within the most recent PiP application encroaches on the site not under the control of the applicant.
3. Under section 2.3.1 the PiP application stipulates *'The site benefits from an existing, established vehicular access onto Preston Road via the private drive serving Spout Farm'* The wording of this section is key at this point. The private drive serving Spout Farm estate, as highlighted within application (3/2020/0309), as per point 1, this highlights a clear use of land that the applicant may not have the right to use. It must also be stated that whilst there is vehicular access from Preston Road onto the estate in which we reside, the access is in some what of a sorry state of repair. I am aware through ongoing conversations with Ribble Valley Council that the roads haven't been adopted and further communications continue with a our residents committee.
4. Section 2.5.4 references the mandate for Create Homes to provide a new footway to the nearest bus stop, yet the applicant believes this land still remains under their remit. It is also worth noting that unfortunately Create Homes are currently not operational as a business and currently had a postponement on a strike off action, according to companies House.

As the PiP application is made against the Town and Country Planning (Permission in Principle) Order 2017, which limits the scope of said application to location, land use and the amount of development as three core parameters. We believe there is a clear reason for rejection under the location parameter as the application uses land in which applicant does not have the right to use.

As residents of the current Spout Farm Estate, we are aware that at some point further applications may/may not be submitted and wish to stipulate whilst we aren't against the urbanisation of the area,

considerations must be given as to the impacts of the current residents and how this application and future application impact of the day to day lives of us.

Kind Regards,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Disclaimer

Tops for resident satisfaction – 78% of residents are satisfied with Ribble Valley as a place to live (2023 Residents Survey - Life in Ribble Valley)

This transmission is intended for the named addressee(s) only and may contain sensitive, protectively marked, or restricted material, and should be handled accordingly. Unless you are the named addressee (or authorised to receive it for the addressee) you may not copy, use, or disclose it to anyone else. If you have received this transmission in error, notify the sender immediately. All GCSX traffic may be subject to recording and/or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation. This e-mail is issued subject to Ribble Valley Borough Council's e-mail [disclaimer](#) which you are taken to have read and accepted.

Although the Council security checks incoming and outgoing emails (including file attachments) it cannot guarantee that the content of an email communication or any file attachment is virus free or has not been intercepted or amended as it passes over the internet. The onus is on the recipient to check the communication is virus-free. The Council accepts no responsibility for any damage caused by receiving emails from our email systems and/or hosted domains.