

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 12 August 2026 23:53
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2026/0599 FS-Case-865043244

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2026/0599

Address of Development: Preston Road Ribchester PR3 3XL

Comments: We have been very patient , but we feel that the constant changes and applications over recent times are purely trying to confuse the original application to gain what the applicat wanted originally.

The recent application requests permanent occupation of the chalet style buildings. The next application will be for more housing.

It would also appear that the snail farm has failed as the buildings are now up for sale , RVBC really need to stop this development going any further.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 12 August 2026 23:31
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2026/0599 FS-Case-865039692

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2026/0599

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

Comments: Yet again, there is another application for variance of conditions (following numerous initial applications, variance of conditions, appeals against decisions that didn't go their way, etc etc).

RVBC made the decision to allow the lodges to be 28 days occupancy only, as the whole application was based on the fact that the development might promote tourism. By removing this condition, the site would become a place for people to live. Fine in itself - everyone needs a home - but the fact remains that the site, with no pavement or disabled access wouldn't have got planning permission for residential dwellings (see decision notice on application 3/2026/0050 for refusal decision). The applicant name is different, but the applicant runs many companies, so changes names as suits. In the five years since development started, only two of the six cabins have been installed, I see no evidence of anyone staying there (and I [REDACTED]) and the proposed 'education opportunities' have never been fulfilled.

Likewise, the proposed loading bay 'to the east of the main building'. Due east (and NE) of the building is Boyce's Brook, which is a protected waterway as far as I'm aware, so I presume they can't mean this. SE of the building is an area of hardstanding, on which is another small building... which was built without planning permission (which has an enforcement order saying it should be removed, not yet resolved to my knowledge).

At the most basic level, a submission such as this, without site plan or any further detail can't be properly commented on. But the applicant has some form for making an insubstantial application to smoke out potential opposition and reduce neighbours' appetite to make objections...

I urge RVBC to ask for details on this application before opinions are sought and I think you for broadening the Neighbourhood Notification addresses. In the previous (many) applications, a lot of people directly affected haven't been consulted. Of course, by timing this in August, when many people are away (and quite a lot of adjacent properties are up for sale, because of the ongoing disruption and distress caused by this development), opposition might be more muted? Perhaps RVBC could ask for more details, by which time families may be back from their summer holidays?