

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 26 August 2026 08:38
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2026/0599 FS-Case-868502066

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2026/0599

Address of Development: Boudica Park, Ribchester PR33XL

Comments: I urge Ribble Valley Planning Dept to reject the applicant's request to remove the 28 day restriction on the holiday lodges so that permanent occupation can facilitate sale of the two existing lodges and ultimately the sale of four other lodges awaiting construction.

1. The applicant claims that enabling permanent occupation would enable: "... older people or those with mobility issues, wishing to live in appropriately sized accommodation, across a single floor". However, the developer fails to mention that the site is cut off from Ribchester because it has no accessible footpaths or pavement that would enable access to the village. There is a bus stop but this would require residents to walk along an increasingly busy road to reach it.
2. The applicant states there is a footpath. However, no mention is made in the application that this is located on the opposite side of Boyce's brook. Access would require the construction of a bridge across the waterway. Yet the applicant says there are no plans for any further development. Will residents be required to wade through Boyces Brook to get to the footpath? Perhaps they should instead weave their way through road traffic on the tarmac as they are forced to walk along the road into Ribchester.
3. Since levelling the site, the developer extended the flood plain and increased the flood risk to dwellings located at Boudica Park from Boyce's brook which neighbours the site. Before the hillside was levelled, the land acted as a soak away, slowing the progression of rainfall as it drained safely away. In the five years since flattening the hill, the increase in extreme weather events, torrential rainfall and severe problems with run off have increased the flood risk to residents and businesses in Ribchester. Flooding is now an annual event in Ribchester. It used to be a rare. The development of Boudica Park has exacerbated this situation by endangering businesses and households in Ribchester.
4. In the five years since the heli culture centre was built to breed snails, the developer has created a [REDACTED]

5. Past promises to develop an educational resource and tourist attraction used to justify the initial development have not been honoured. Instead of creating employment, the continued disruption caused by heavy machinery on the still unfinished side leaves residents in disbelief that future commitments will be honoured. This casts doubt on the developer's claim that: "... residential development in this location would not result in isolated or sporadic development in the countryside, nor would it undermine the overall spatial strategy to any great degree". Really?

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 27 August 2026 20:56
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2026/0599 FS-Case-868961765

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2026/0599

Address of Development: Land at Preston Road Ribchester PR3 3XL

Comments: Re Planning application 3/2026/0599

We would want to make the following comments in respect of planning application 3/2026/0599

With regard to the application to vary condition 11 that the holiday lodges can only be used to be let to 1 person or group of people for no more than 28 days. The applicant is making a request that the lodges be occupied on a long-term basis or more permanently – in other words to be used as residences. Permission was granted on 3rd or 4th application. The decision notices clearly states - "The permission relates to the provision of holiday accommodation. The condition is necessary to define the scope of the permission hereby approved and to ensure that the development promotes sustainable tourism and contributes to the area's economy."

I see no reason why if more effort was made to improve the site both in terms of visual impact and marketing the properties could be used for the intended purpose. I am confident that many people would love the opportunity to holiday in the lodges enjoying the beauty of the area spending money in local businesses and as such bring in needed tourism. There is a clear lack of such accommodation in the Ribchester / Longridge area.

I would also note that whilst the applicant in this case is Clatz Holdings – this company (and many others) is owned and operated by the same applicant, this individual (under different company names) has regularly made applications for changes of conditions to the initial planning agreed. If this application is approved will it lead to further variation applications which results in further building on what was green belt land ? Is this not just a way of getting round planning legislation to suit your desired end goal - houses built on green belt land?

The supporting statement provided on behalf of the applicant refers to the building being used for Heliculture / a snail farm and the provision holiday lodges approval being given for 6 but only 2 being in place.

I would note initially that the “snail farm” is currently on the market to be sold as commercial premises sales details refer to extensive office accommodation, open plan workspaces and offices, mezzanine, workshop storage area with loading access. The particulars state that the building is substantially completed, with only final finishing works required including skirtings, architraves,

internal doors, and suspended ceilings. To my knowledge it has never been used for Heliculture hence why it appears that it can be put on the market for a totally different purpose for that which planning was originally agreed. Is therefore the information provided by the applicant in there supporting statement wholly accurate or may it contain errors.

Finally the initial application 3/2026/0599 which is posted on the Ribble Valley Planning Application portal states

"Original planning permission (3/2021/0595) - "Change of use of land and erection of building for heliculture (snail breeding) together with six log cabins to be used as holiday lets"

Subsequent Section 73 approval (3/2022/0530) - "Variation of condition 2 (approved plans) and removal of condition 9 (off site highways works) from planning permission 3/2021/0595 to allow the addition of a loading area to the east of the main building, and change of cladding to timber boarding"

However the supporting statement wholly refers to the removal of condition 11 and points referring to cladding and loading area don't appear. Does this mean that these elements of the application have been removed if not further information would be needed in order to comment? If not can the applicant be asked to provide further details of their request in respect of cladding and loading bay in order that comment can be provided ?

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 27 August 2026 21:20
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2026/0599 FS-Case-868975532

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2026/0599

Address of Development: Land at Preston Road Ribchester PR3 3XL

Comments: Re Planning application 3/2026/0599

With regard to the application to vary condition 11 that the holiday lodges can only be used to be let to 1 person or group of people for no more than 28 days. The applicant is making a request that the lodges be occupied on a long-term basis or more permanently – in other words to be used as residences. Permission for 6 holiday lets was granted on 3rd or 4th application. The decision notices clearly states - "The permission relates to the provision of holiday accommodation. The condition is necessary to define the scope of the permission hereby approved and to ensure that the development promotes sustainable tourism and contributes to the area's economy". I see no reason why if more effort was made to improve the site both in terms of visual impact and marketing of the properties at the right price that many people would love the opportunity to holiday in the lodges enjoying the beauty of the area spending money in local businesses and as such bring in needed tourism. There is a clear lack of such accommodation in the Ribchester / Longridge area. Is this a way of getting residential property approval through other means?

The applicant in this case is Clatz Holdings – this company (and many others) is owned and operated by the same applicant, who has regularly made applications for changes of conditions on the permission granted on this piece of land. Are they just trying to wear us down ? If this application is approved will it lead to further variation applications which results in further building on what was green belt land?

The supporting statement provided on behalf of the applicant refers to the building being used for Heliculture / a snail farm and the provision holiday lodges approval being given for 6 but only 2 being in place. I would note initially that the “snail farm” is currently on the market to be sold as commercial premises sales details refer to extensive office accommodation, open plan workspaces and offices, mezzanine, workshop storage area with loading access. The building is substantially completed, with only final finishing works required including skirtings, architraves, internal doors, and suspended ceilings. this would suggest that the premises has not been used as a snail farm and can easily be used for other commercial businesses for which planning has not been approved.

I also note that the initial application 3/2026/0599 referred to permission to allow loading area to the

east of the main building and change of cladding but the header of the application has been amended and these points no longer appear however reference is made on the application form. Does this mean that these elements of the application have been removed if not due to the lack of detail provided further information would be needed in order to effectively comment?