

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 10 July 2026 17:28
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2026/0426 FS-Case-855781122

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Lancashire

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2026/0426

Address of Development: Ribchester C of E Primary School, Ribchester PR3 3XP

Comments: I wish to object to the proposal to add a 1.5m (plus 14cm) high ball top metal fence on top of the existing stone wall on the Church Street and Riverside boundaries of the school.

I would support the other aspects of the plan in relation to works to the roof and installation of the rooftop heat pump, these are clearly necessary works.

The basis of my objection is that railings of the proposed height are completely out of keeping with the village character and riverside appearance.

The stated aim is to 'provide safeguarding and prevent the pupils from existing (sic) the premises without staff knowledge'. I absolutely understand the need to keep our children safe, especially where children with SEND are attending the school but the application does not mention any risk assessment, evidence or justification for a fence of the proposed 1.5m height.

The photos on P11-12 of the Heritage statement do not accurately represent the visual impact of the proposal, appearing to be less than 1.5 m in height.

The Ribble Valley Core Strategy states that development should make 'a positive contribution to local distinctiveness/sense of place. It further states that 'proposals within, or affecting, views into and out of, or affecting the setting of a conservation area will be required to conserve, and where appropriate enhance its character and appearance'. I do not believe the proposal meets these requirements.

The school is situated at the end of the village before the river bank. Approaching the school from Church Street, the view of the valley which unfolds is an iconic part of the Ribchester landscape, which would be negatively impacted by this proposal.

The plan indicates that the height of the existing wall is circa 100cm, with a proposed total height of 264cm or 8 feet 8". This may be the case within the playground, which has been levelled, but on the outside the Church St wall varies between 117cm and 140cm, and the Riverside wall is 170cm plus. This means that from external view the wall and fence combined will be from 281cm to 334cm, or from 9 feet 3" to 10 feet 11".

The average height of an 11 year old is 144cm or 4 feet 8".

This feels absolutely disproportionate and not a 'positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness' as required by the local plan.

I don't believe there's any evidence or justification for fencing in our children to this degree in this location. Obviously safeguarding is important and I would not object to a lower level, more proportionate fencing, but the proposal as it stands would have a major impact on a corner of the village enjoyed by residents and visitors alike.