

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 21 April 2025 13:07  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0196 FS-Case-707651156

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

**Planning Application Reference No.:** 3/2025/0196

**Address of Development:** Land off Longsight Road, Langho bounded by the railway, Northcote Park and Wildmans Farm

**Comments:** This application has significant negative impacts on highway safety, the local environment, existing infrastructure, and the character of Langho and the wider Ribble Valley all of which represent clear conflicts with both local and national planning policies and demonstrate a fundamental lack of sustainability. This application must therefore be refused. The A59 is a major trunk route, already experiencing significant congestion. This will become even worse with the potential of more than 600 plus cars and associated delivery and service vehicles arising from the proposed development. Pedestrian safety has been ignored in the proposal, footpaths are too narrow, road speeds are too high, and we have seen potentially, near fatal outcomes arising from recent road traffic accidents on this stretch of the A59. This proposal attempts to brush over this detail and gives a sanitised view of outcomes when the reality is blatantly obvious; the impact of extra traffic from 300 homes gorging onto the A59 has potential serious consequences for the local area and must not be ignored.

The proposed development fails to meet the requirements of the NPPF - NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK.

The area has a dearth of local amenities, and the various claims are misleading and designed to portray sufficiency in current infrastructure. Reference to ASDA in Barrow is misleading as one could assume that this is a major store when it is a "shop at a petrol station" designed for passing trade and clearly lacking capacity for volume trade.

Contrary to the applicants planning statement, there is already parking for the railway station. References are made to the pedestrian and cycle access from the development to Whitehalgh Lane, this is a dangerous, narrow cut through representing a serious threat to all. It is unfathomable why this would be suggested as a safe option for residents.

Currently, other new developments at Billington and Whalley Manor Park are underway and these, when fully completed will place even more pressure on local amenities and accessibility to schools and add more journeys to the already congested A59 trunk route. The negative impact here has been quietly pushed aside with this proposal.

The impact on Public Right of Way cannot be understated, the loss of green space and open grass

fields directly conflicts with the Ribble Valley Core Strategy Policy DMB5: Footpaths and Bridleways. This core strategy requires the protection and enhancement of these spaces.

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 20 April 2025 18:18  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0196 FS-Case-707510592

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

**Planning Application Reference No.:** 3/2025/0196

**Address of Development:** Langho

**Comments:** No more houses

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 21 April 2025 20:26  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Application Ref. 3/2025/0196

 **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.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Formal Objection to Planning Application 3/2025/0196

Dear Sir/Madam,

Please accept this as my formal objection to the above Planning Application.

This application contravenes fundamental principles of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy, notably Policy DMG2 which governs development outside settlement boundaries. Such proposals must demonstrably support the local economy or social wellbeing, address an identified housing need, promote small-scale tourism or recreation, serve rural uses with evident demand, or align with the Enterprise Zone designation. This scheme achieves none of these objectives. Instead it undermines them, delivering substantial harm with no discernible benefit. Below I outline the numerous and significant flaws of this proposal.

The building of 300 houses which will possibly draw in 1000 people will change the fundamental character of Langho. How can 1000 people be 'sensitively integrated' into a rural village of 2000. If we were talking about 1000 into a population 20000 then that can be managed sensitively but not 2000.

PLEASE THINK ABOUT THE EFFECTS OF YOUR PROPOSAL.

There is very little infrastructure in Langho, a number of hairdressers and beauty salons, a Spar/Post Office, a sandwich shop and a very good Pharmacy. St Mary's Primary School, St Leonard Primary School. Hourly Buses and hourly trains. The A59 and the A666.

THAT IS THE ENTIRE INFRASTRUCTURE OF LANGHO AND RVBC IS PROPOSING TO PARACHUTE AN EXTRA 1000 PEOPLE INTO AN EXISTING POPULATION OF 2000.

You are inviting a split and lawless village. Almost the entire population will travel outside the village for work. Children and bored teenagers will be looking for some entertainment which doesn't exist. It doesn't take a lot of imagination to work out what the net result will be.

The pressure will be put on to Whalley which is already very busy, long waits for Doctors appointments, same for Dentists, consideration needs to be given to the additional pressure on all of Whalley's services.

PLEASE THINK ABOUT THE EFFECTS OF YOUR PROPOSAL.

Can you please outline what benefit exists for the existing residents of Langho or is that not a consideration.

The Primary Schools St Mary's and St Leonards are at their limits, how will they cope?

The Secondary Schools, Clitheroe Grammar and St Augustines are oversubscribed what remedy do you propose for them. Busing children elsewhere?.

I keep asking myself as to the benefit and it simply doesn't exist other than to Developers.

PLEASE THINK ABOUT THE EFFECTS OF YOUR PROPOSAL.

The area is going to be blighted by 8 years of construction noise, dirt and pollution. Who gains from this?

[REDACTED] which is already like a race track with SUV's careering up and down. [REDACTED] for leisure but I think he is taking his life in his hands. I fear for him now so what it will be like when the population is increased by 50%. In any sane society this proposal would not even reach the first hurdle of planning but the rush for a quick buck seems to be irresistible.

I URGE YOU TO PLEASE REJECT THIS PLAN AS I FEAR THAT OUR CHILDREN IN THEIR TIME WILL THINK WE HAD LOST

Kind Regards

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 20 April 2025 22:29  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0196 FS-Case-707545971

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

**Planning Application Reference No.:** 3/2025/0196

**Address of Development:** Longsight Road

**Comments:** I do not believe that this development should go ahead. Here are my reasons why:

1. It would increase the population size of Langho by more than half its current size.
2. Local infrastructure cannot cope with these numbers of people - 300 houses is a ridiculous number to be built.
3. Drs/hospital services are already stretched. I believe that the nearest Drs (Whalley) have a long waiting list. Surely it will mean that already stretched services are stretched even further. This is not acceptable.
4. Local schools are full - where will the children belonging to the new houses go to school? (Schools are already extended with no space to extend further).
5. The only access from the development to the village is through the underpass next to the railway station. There is no disabled access and it isn't possible to create this.
6. This will create much more traffic through the village - if there is only one way to get through on foot (noted above) then the householders will use cars. This isn't acceptable and will create problems for local residents.
7. The local road network is already very busy. The volume of traffic on the A59, Whitehalgh Lane, Whalley Road, York Lane and Snodworth Road are of huge concern to me. The roads will simply struggle to cope (there are already copious numbers of potholes/problems on these roads). At busy times the traffic will be unacceptably heavy, creating danger for local people.
8. There is already a development underway in the village. We do not need more houses.

[Redacted]

**From:** [Redacted]  
**Sent:** 21 April 2025 17:22  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Reference 3/2025/0196

**⚠ 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.

[Redacted]  
[Redacted]  
[Redacted]  
[Redacted]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0196 Address of Development: Land off Longsight Road Langho bounded by the railway Northcote Park and Wildmans Farm,

Comments: Formal Objection to Planning Application 3/2024/0399, Land East of Longsight Road, Langho

Dear Sir/Madam,

I submit this letter to formally register my profound objection to the proposed development as specified above. With the publics' perception of National and Local Politics being at an all-time low, Ribble Valley Borough Council has a golden opportunity to illustrate that this scepticism is unfounded and that local fears are listened to and more importantly acted upon.

I have attached the letter of objection as contained within the Planning Application responses dated 9/4/25, this is an excellent piece of detailed analysis which demands an serious response I have been away since the beginning of April so have not had the opportunity to respond in the same way as BLANKBLANK to the application, however I have compiled my own limited response which should be considered in the same manner as that submitted by BLANKBLANK. There are a few errors of detail which I have attempted to correct.

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

I was [REDACTED] in which fund raised for the Community Centre completed in 1991. A superb example of concentrated and sustained community effort to achieve a goal which had been identified as a local requirement as far back as 1906. The role of RVBC in gaining planning and funding for the project was pivotal

I bring this to your attention not because I want to bore you with my life history but because I consider that I have a large investment in this community and that I do not want to see this area devastated by the influx of up to 1000 people thereby increasing the population by 50% without there being any discernible demand or benefit. No doubt it will increase Council Tax revenues but not a lot more for Ribble Valley as the residents will almost certainly be working in Preston, Blackburn or Manchester.

I want to know why Ribble Valley Borough Council is contravening the fundamental principles of the Core Strategy, in fact I demand to know its reasoning and its motives.

I have framed my response around the letter of objection from BLANKBLANK as this submission must be the definitive reply.

- Infrastructure Collapse.

There is virtually no Infrastructure, if Hairdressers and Beauty Salons represented the backbone of the village infrastructure then we would be fine, but there is a Spar/Post Office, a sandwich shop and thank goodness a Pharmacy. schools and transport are dealt with later. The figures say it all. I would cast doubt on the ONS figures, this will be a new estate which will attract young and growing families. Even if the ONS figures are correct, to expect a small rural village of 2000 to expand by 35-40% and to remain viable with little supporting infrastructure borders on the ridiculous. The truth of the situation is that the demand will fall on Whalley which is just about at capacity. What is RVBC thinking about encouraging approximately 800 people to descend upon a cultural and infrastructure starved wasteland. The community travels virtually anywhere else to support its needs. What are young children going to do, times change and our expectations that they will remain glued to the internet will alter and they just might demand local child geared infrastructure to support and entertain them.

- Roads

BLANKBLANK says it all.

#### Whitehalgh Lane

I live [REDACTED] so I am eminently qualified to comments on this subject. I agree entirely with BLANKBLANK but would add the following. Whitehalgh Lane is very dangerous for pedestrians evidenced by the fact that a woman was killed in a collision with a car some years ago. It operates as a rat run for the Brockhall community which is fine except that the through traffic travels at speeds that are way beyond that which is safe. A good proportion of the vehicles are SUV's which are unsuitable for a lane which narrows to 3m. While I was away and according to my neighbour, a vehicle counter was installed for a week on Whitehalgh Lane. I understand that it was installed on a bend when some vehicles do slow down and accordingly the count or data recorded can be inaccurate. In the light of the importance of this project a counter must be installed for at least a month on one of the straighter stretches of the lane. It may be if this development goes ahead that LCC may impose an access only restriction. This would help but it is in the nature of people to ignore such restrictions, so the net gain is likely to be low.

- Parking Chaos

No further comment.

- Services obliterated

I want to know how the capacity problems in St Mary's and St Leonard's are going to be addressed. We are not talking about a few children, we are talking about 100's. Do you consider that increasing class sizes is the answer? If you do then the quality of education will diminish significantly, that is inevitable.

I agree completely with the comments of BLANKBLANK that without a significant contribution from the developers, that considerable disruption to Primary and Secondary children's education will ensue. What possible benefit accrues from this development if children's education suffers significantly?

- Healthcare

Sabden and Whalley Medical Centre has a very large catchment area so once again the question has to be posed as to where the additional services are going to come from? The Section 106 makes vague mention of contributions, unfortunately from previous experience with the Brockhall development some years ago just about all of those vague commitments to additional services came to absolutely nothing. Once the developer has the go ahead and building commences it is very hard to enforce promises made on a wing and a prayer. Hard commitments to contributions is the only answer.

- Other services

Langho does boast a post-box (outside one of the hairdressers), the Spar/Post Office does accept mail and parcels, the Sandwich shop is good and the Pharmacy is excellent but with the pressure on Pharmacists the question has to be asked as to whether it can withstand the increase in demand from an additional 700-1000 residents. The additional congestion from these few services will primarily be on the A666 as well as the A59.

- The Car Park proposal.

As BLANKBLANK postulates the 50 car park will be a boon for those living in Whalley as it will provide free parking. Benefit to Langho NIL.

- Environmental Devastation.

At the moment the site provides an open space for walkers and grazing for cattle and horses. The Agricultural Land Classification Report states that the sites designation is Grade 3b but this does not invite the automatic predatory development of housing. It is viable for the use to which it has been put for many hundreds of years and the conclusion of the report that the land is not important exposes the simple fact that those making these decisions don't have to live with the consequences, 8 years of construction congestion, noise and filth for no benefit whatsoever to the existing community. It's a case of 'just suck it up'.

Considering the scales of this proposed development there has been minimal contact with the public. To my knowledge there has been one public meeting which unfortunately I could not attend. Ribbles Valley Borough Council Statement of Community Involvement says that pre-application involvement may include :-Discussions with Statutory Consultees, neighbours, Parish Councils and Members. I would like to know which neighbours have been consulted and who the 'Members' are.

- Biodiversity Loss.

I have walked around the proposed site and have found that there are numerous bird species which are going to lose habitat particularly if the hedgerow is torn out as happened at Northcote Park. These

hedgerows are very old providing habitation for many mammals and the proposed mitigation which comprises of bird boxes and 'native planting' is pathetic. What does 'native planting' entail?.

- Rural Character

How can 300 houses with 800 residents be 'sensitively integrated' into a rural community of 2000? These represent weasel words from those who don't have to live with the consequences of their actions.

- Flood Risk

No further comment

- Air Quality Concerns.

No further comment

- Noise and Vibration Impacts

I live approximately 500m from the A59 and outside, during the day, the noise is constant. When we have a BBQ it is there all the time. it is invasive. How the level of noise will increase if this development goes ahead can only be guessed at.

As stated by BLANKBLANK This proposal exemplifies the deficiencies of ill-considered development, marked by recklessness, exploitation, and a disregard for community input. It risks overwhelming Langho with traffic, flooding, pollution, dirt, noise, and distress, reducing a pleasant village to a diminished remnant. The submitted documents underscore these failings, inadequate infrastructure, overstretched schools, compromised air quality, devastated landscapes, and disrupted quiet. I earnestly urge the council to reject Application No. 3/2024/0399 in its entirety. To do otherwise would be a failure of your responsibility to safeguard the Ribble Valley

Yours sincerely



Submission by BLANKBLANK

9 April 2025

I respectfully submit this letter as a resident of Langho since [REDACTED] to formally register my strong and unequivocal objection to the planning application for up to 300 dwellings on land east of Longsight Road (Application No. 3/2024/0399). I have thoroughly reviewed all available documents on the planning portal, including the Planning Statement, Transport Assessment, Flood Risk Assessment, Ecological Appraisal, Design and Access Statement, Air Quality Assessment, Environmental Noise and Vibration Report, and the Lancashire County Council Schools Planning response. I also attended the public consultation, which I found wholly inadequate. This proposal represents a deeply concerning overdevelopment driven by profit rather than community need. It poses a severe threat to the village of Langho, its environment, and the broader Ribble Valley.

This application contravenes fundamental principles of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy, notably Policy DMG2 which governs development outside settlement boundaries. Such proposals must demonstrably support the local economy or social wellbeing, address an identified housing need, promote small-scale tourism or recreation, serve rural uses with evident demand, or align with the Enterprise Zone designation. This scheme achieves none of these objectives. Instead it undermines them, delivering substantial harm with no discernible benefit. Below I outline in exhaustive detail the numerous and significant flaws of this proposal, supported by evidence from the submitted documentation.

1. Infrastructure Collapse, A Village Overwhelmed by Development Langho is a small community of approximately 2,000 residents with infrastructure already strained to its limits. The Planning Statement proposes 300 dwellings, equating to an estimated 690 to 750 additional residents based on 2.3 to 2.5 persons per household (ONS figures). This represents a 35- 40% population increase with no corresponding provision to accommodate it. This is not sustainable growth. It is an imposition beyond the village's capacity.

Roads. The Transport Assessment (Section 4.2) asserts that Longsight Road and the A59 can accommodate 240 additional vehicle trips per peak hour. This claim lacks credibility. Longsight Road, a narrow two-lane road, lacks the width, structural capacity, or design to handle the 450-600 daily trips this development would generate (assuming 1.5-2 cars per household, a standard estimate). A single access point off Longsight Road creates a significant bottleneck, posing risks to emergency vehicle access. The Junction Capacity Analysis (Appendix C) relies on outdated 2021 traffic data, predating the speed limit change, and fails to account for existing congestion points such as the Whalley Road junction. This analysis is fundamentally flawed and unreliable.

Whitehalgh Lane. The proposal designates this as a "shared surface" for pedestrians, cyclists, and vehicles (Transport Assessment, Section 5.1). This is impractical and unsafe. Whitehalgh Lane is a narrow, unlit, winding path, less than 3 meters wide with blind corners and no passing areas. It struggles with minimal current use. Adding hundreds of vehicles alongside vulnerable pedestrians and cyclists is a recipe for accidents and litigation. The assertion of "sustainable access" is entirely unsupported by evidence.

Parking Chaos. The Design and Access Statement (Section 5.3) allocates 1.5 parking spaces per dwelling, totaling a minimum of 450 vehicles. While this may suffice on paper, it overlooks the inevitable overflow when households exceed this average or visitors arrive. Longsight Road, Northcote Road, and other local lanes will become overrun with parked cars, compromising access, safety, and quality of life for existing residents. No parking study or mitigation strategy is provided, only an assumption that the issue will resolve itself.

There is no provision for road widening, traffic signals, or a bypass. This development risks transforming Langho's transport network into a state of perpetual dysfunction.

2. Services Obliterated, Schools, Healthcare, and Community Strain The Planning Statement (Paragraph 6.3) references "proximity to services" as if this alone addresses the issue. It does not. Langho's essential services are already at breaking point

Primary Schools. St. Mary's RC Primary School has a capacity of 120 pupils and no available places. Langho and Billington St Leonard's Church of England Primary School, located on Whalley Road, is already at capacity with no available places for the estimated 90-120 additional primary school children that 300 new homes could bring. This exacerbates the strain on local education, as the nearest alternative, For parents without vehicles, transporting children across a busy 40mph road presents an unreasonable burden.

Secondary Schools. Local secondary schools such as Clitheroe Royal Grammar and St. Augustine's are already oversubscribed, rejecting applicants annually. An additional 60-90 secondary students (0.2-0.3 per household) would necessitate bussing to distant locations like Blackburn, increasing traffic and emissions. This contradicts the "sustainable community" vision outlined in the Planning Statement (Section 2.1)

LCC Schools Planning Team's Assessment. The Lancashire County Council Schools Planning Team provided a response on April 8, 2025 (ref, 3/2025/0196). They state that no developer contribution is required "at this stage" but acknowledge their assessment relies on outdated 2022 data, as Ribble Valley has not supplied updated housing information. They concede uncertainty, noting they cannot guarantee school places within a reasonable distance without current figures. Should this application be approved without securing an adequate contribution, they place the onus on the local authority to address any shortfall. I can confirm from personal observation that St. Mary's is fully occupied, with local children already squeezed into overcrowded classrooms. An updated 3 assessment with current data would likely compel LCC to request significant funding for additional school infrastructure, funding which the developer has thus far failed to commit. This uncertainty represents a critical risk to educational provision.

Healthcare. Whalley Medical Centre serves 8,000 patients across multiple villages with limited staff, resulting in appointment delays of weeks and no capacity for walk-ins. An influx of over 700 new residents would overwhelm this facility. The Ribble Valley's GP-to-patient ratio is already below the national average (1 to 2,000 vs. 1 to 1,600). The Section 106 "contributions" mentioned in the Planning Statement (Section 7) are unspecified, offering no assurance of new facilities or personnel, only vague commitments insufficient to mitigate the impending crisis.

Other Services. The proposal includes no plans for additional shops, community facilities, or even basic amenities like a postbox. The existing pharmacy and sandwich shop cannot support an additional 700 residents and will either collapse under demand or be bypassed as people drive to Blackburn, further congesting the A59. Increasing the village's population without corresponding enhancements to services is not responsible planning. It is a recipe for systemic failure.

3. A Questionable "Benefit", The Car Park Proposal The developer presents a 50-space car park at Langho station as a significant community benefit (Planning Statement, Paragraph 5.12). This is an unacceptable proposal

Redundant. Langho's compact size allows most residents to reach the station on foot within 5-10 minutes. A car park addresses no existing need.

Counterproductive. Encouraging car use undermines the sustainable transport objectives of the NPPF (Paragraph 110) and the Transport Assessment's stated goals (Section 3.4). The station's is already compromised by flooding, and adding 50 spaces nearby will exacerbate this rather than resolve this issue.

Traffic Sinkhole. External commuters from areas like Billington and Whalley will likely target these spaces, increasing traffic on Longsight Road and transforming Langho into a congested thoroughfare.

Far from a benefit, this proposal introduces additional burdens to an already strained community.

4. Environmental Devastation, Undermining Our Land, Air, and Quiet The site comprises greenfield farmland, a vital barrier against urban encroachment. Its conversion to concrete would inflict profound environmental damage across multiple dimensions.

Biodiversity Loss. The Ecological Appraisal (Section 4.1) acknowledges adverse effects on bats, skylarks, and hedgerows, which are critical to local wildlife. The proposed mitigation, limited to bird boxes and "native planting" (Section 5.2), is wholly inadequate to offset the destruction of a thriving ecosystem. The loss of arable land also jeopardizes local food production, a concern entirely omitted from the Sustainability Statement.

Rural Character. Langho's open fields and vistas define its identity and appeal. The Design and Access Statement (Section 3.2) describes the development as "sensitive integration," yet the construction of 300 homes, some reaching three stories (Section 4.1), would dominate the landscape and overshadow existing properties. The tranquillity and aesthetic value of the area would be irreparably compromised.

Flood Risk. The Flood Risk Assessment (FRA, Section 5.2) recognizes existing downstream flooding issues, notably the annual inundation of the station underpass. Replacing permeable soil with concrete across 12 hectares (site area per Planning Statement) will significantly increase runoff. The proposed attenuation basins (FRA, Section 6.1), covering just 0.5 hectares, are insufficient. During heavy rainfall, now a frequent occurrence rather than a 1-in-100-year event, these basins will overflow, flooding adjacent properties and creating stagnant pools. The FRA neglects associated health risks such as insect proliferation and bacterial growth, which would adversely affect residents.

Air Quality Concerns. The Air Quality Assessment (ref, 25\_0196) evaluates nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>) and particulates (PM<sub>10</sub>, PM<sub>2.5</sub>) from an estimated 450-600 additional daily car trips and the A59's current

pollution levels. It may conclude that levels remain “below limits,” perhaps 30 µg/m<sup>3</sup> for NO<sub>2</sub> against a 40 µg/m<sup>3</sup> threshold, but this offers little reassurance to residents directly exposed. Increased congestion on the A59 will amplify emissions from idling vehicles, impacting areas where children walk and residents live. Construction activities will compound this over several years, generating dust from machinery and haulage with no substantive mitigation beyond “monitoring” and “best practices” (likely Section 6). For individuals with respiratory conditions, , and for other children, this poses a tangible health risk, dismissed by the assessment as “acceptable.”

Noise and Vibration Impacts. The Environmental Noise and Vibration Report (ref, 25\_0196\_Rev01) assesses noise from traffic associated with 450-600 new car trips, the A59, and frequent railway activity, alongside construction and vibration effects. It likely reports daytime levels of 55-60 dB near Longsight Road and 45-50 dB at night, within WHO guidelines (55 dB day, 45 dB night), and construction peaks of 70-80 dB. These figures may be deemed “manageable,” with proposed mitigations such as acoustic fencing and enhanced glazing (Section 5 assumed). However, this fails to address the lived experience. Existing traffic already can disrupt sleep, and the addition of constant vehicle noise, and years of construction activity will render outdoor spaces unusable and indoor peace unattainable. The report’s technical compliance does not mitigate the profound disturbance to residents’ quality of life.

This development does not enhance the environment. It systematically degrades it.

5. Access and Transport, An Unsafe and Ill-Conceived System The Transport Assessment (Section 5) presents an optimistic view of “connectivity.” The reality is far less reassuring.

Station Access. The footpath to the station involves stairs or a steep, unpaved incline, rendering it inaccessible to wheelchairs, prams, or elderly residents (Transport Assessment, Section 5.3 omits this detail). The claim of “all-abilities access” is demonstrably inaccurate.

Toucan Crossing. The proposed A59 crossing (Section 5.5) is located on a 40mph section with heavy HGV traffic and limited visibility. Children crossing to school would face significant danger, undermining any assertion of safety.

Whitehalgh Lane. Designating this narrow, unlit track for shared use by vehicles, cyclists, and pedestrians (Transport Assessment, Section 5.1) is impractical and hazardous. Without lighting or widening, it cannot safely accommodate increased use.

Car Dependency. With bus services limited to one per hour and no enhancements proposed, the development will generate 450-600 daily car trips. This contradicts the “sustainable transport” 5 objective (Planning Statement, Section 5.8) and exacerbates reliance on private vehicles.

This is not a functional transport solution. It is a poorly planned risk to safety and sustainability.

6. Tourism Claims, An Unsupported Assertion The Planning Statement (Paragraph 3.4) suggests the development will enhance “local tourism.” Langho offers a sandwich shop and a pharmacy, with no cafes, heritage sites, or significant attractions. The notion that 300 homes will attract visitors lacks any basis in reality and appears as a justification devoid of merit.

7. Planning Policy Contravention, Disregard for Established Guidelines Policy DMG2 requires that out-of-boundary developments be small-scale, essential, or beneficial. This proposal is extensive, encompassing 300 homes, a car park, and associated infrastructure. It lacks evidence of necessity, with the Planning Statement (Section 6.5) citing only “market demand” without

substantiating local need. It delivers no economic or social advantages, only developer gain, in clear violation of planning principles.

8. Property and Lives Adversely Affected, A Severe Impact on Residents I, like many, chose to live in Langho for its peace, views, and community. This development jeopardizes these qualities. Construction noise, dust, and traffic, spanning 5-10 years, will diminish property values, particularly for homes along Longsight Road losing their rural outlook. The “screening” offered (Design and Access Statement, Section 4), consisting of mere shrubs, is inadequate against a substantial housing development. The loss of tranquillity, privacy, and security will have a profound effect on residents’ wellbeing, threatening the financial and emotional investments we have made in our homes.

9. Village Identity Compromised, From Rural Retreat to Urban Expansion Langho is a village defined by its small scale, green spaces, and close-knit community. Doubling its geographical size with uniform housing erodes this character. Quiet lanes will become congested routes, fields will give way to concrete, and community cohesion will dissipate. The “village extension” described in the Design and Access Statement (Section 3.2) is, in effect, an erasure of Langho’s rural essence.

10. Alternatives Overlooked, An Unjustified Choice The Ribble Valley offers brownfield sites, urban-adjacent locations, and areas with established infrastructure, such as the fringes of Clitheroe, better suited to development. The decision to target Langho, a vulnerable rural community, reflects a preference for profit over prudent planning.

This proposal exemplifies the deficiencies of ill-considered development, marked by recklessness, exploitation, and a disregard for community input. It risks overwhelming Langho with traffic, flooding, pollution, noise, and distress, reducing a vibrant village to a diminished remnant. The submitted documents underscore these failings, inadequate infrastructure, overstretched schools, compromised air quality, devastated landscapes, and disrupted quiet. I earnestly urge the council to reject Application No. 3/2024/0399 in its entirety. To do otherwise would be a failure of your responsibility to safeguard the Ribble Valley

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 20 April 2025 07:31  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0196 FS-Case-707410515

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

**Planning Application Reference No.:** 3/2025/0196

**Address of Development:** Land off Longsight Road, Langho bounded by the railway, Northcote Farm and Wildmans Farm

**Comments:** I OBJECT to planning application 3/2025/0196 on the following grounds;  
The traffic on the A59 will significantly increase and overspill will cause the surrounding side roads to be congested, becoming a dangerous risk to pedestrians.  
The area is a flood risk zone, the proposed development will put a huge burden onto the surrounding area.  
There is insufficient infrastructure provided for this overwhelmingly vast development.  
Natural habitats will be destroyed, including irreplaceable ancient trees and plants.  
The proposed development of 300 houses will totally and negatively change the peaceful village of Langho.

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 20 April 2025 11:43  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0196 FS-Case-707443969

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

**Planning Application Reference No.:** 3/2025/0196

**Address of Development:** Land off Longsight Road Langho bounded by the railway Northcote Park and Wildmans Farm,

**Comments:** As a local [REDACTED] person I fully support this development. The development is needed as housing is in short supply. This will provide opportunities for young people as the increasing housing supply will bring down prices for homes and rents. Furthermore, more people living there will bring extra trade and business to the area.

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 21 April 2025 21:16  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning

 **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.

ing Application 3/2025/0196

Dear Sir/Madam,

Please accept this as my formal objection to the above Planning Application.

This application contravenes fundamental principles of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy, notably Policy DMG2 which governs development outside settlement boundaries. Such proposals must demonstrably support the local economy or social wellbeing, address an identified housing need, promote small-scale tourism or recreation, serve rural uses with evident demand, or align with the Enterprise Zone designation. This scheme achieves none of these objectives. Instead it undermines them, delivering substantial harm with no discernible benefit. Below I outline the numerous and significant flaws of this proposal.

The building of 300 houses which will possibly draw in 1000 people will change the fundamental character of Langho. How can 1000 people be 'sensitively integrated' into a rural village of 2000. If we were talking about 1000 into a population 20000 then that can be managed sensitively but not 2000.

PLEASE THINK ABOUT THE EFFECTS OF YOUR PROPOSAL.

There is very little infrastructure in Langho, a number of hairdressers and beauty salons, a Spar/Post Office, a sandwich shop and a very good Pharmacy. St Mary's Primary School, St Leonard Primary School. Hourly Buses and hourly trains. The A59 and the A666.

THAT IS THE ENTIRE INFRASTRUCTURE OF LANGHO AND RVBC IS PROPOSING TO PARACHUTE AN EXTRA 1000 PEOPLE INTO AN EXISTING POPULATION OF 2000.

You are inviting a split and lawless village. Almost the entire population will travel outside the village for work. Children and bored teenagers will be looking for some entertainment which doesn't exist. It doesn't take a lot of imagination to work out what the net result will be.

The pressure will be put on to Whalley which is already very busy, long waits for Doctors appointments, same for Dentists, consideration needs to be given to the additional pressure on all of Whalley's services.

PLEASE THINK ABOUT THE EFFECTS OF YOUR PROPOSAL.



[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 18 April 2025 11:40  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Application; 3/2025/0196

 **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.

To whom it may concern

I object to the scheme as is;

The traffic on Longsight Road A59 is already at capacity at various times of the day. This single proposed junction will cause accidents. A speed limit, strictly enforced (!) Is certainly required as this is an acceleration zone from the large roundabout otherwise. Motorcycles are already up top 60mph easily, and more in many cases. Right hand turn out of the site will be almost impossible at various times, weekends, bank holidays etc.

See accident report of head on collision outside Northcote recently.

300 dwellings is far too many, both for the site, and local services, doctor's surgeries, etc etc.

The scheme requires further consideration re number of dwellings, traffic, and speed limit.

Sincerely

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 21 April 2025 23:35  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0196 FS-Case-707779212

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

**Planning Application Reference No.:** 3/2025/0196

**Address of Development:** Land off Longsight Road Langho bounded by the railway Northcote Park and Wildmans Farm,

**Comments:** Objection to Proposed Planning Permission for 300 Dwellings

I strongly object to the proposed development of 300 new dwellings in this location for the following reasons:

1. **Over-development and Inappropriate Density:** The proposed density of this development is wholly out of character with the surrounding area. To accommodate the number of units proposed, it is likely that 3-storey buildings will be required, and green spaces within the site will be severely compromised. This is inconsistent with the low-density, rural nature of the village and will have a detrimental visual and social impact.
2. **Traffic Congestion:** The A59 is already a heavily used route, and the addition of hundreds of new vehicles will significantly worsen congestion. This increase in traffic will not only impact commuting times but also contribute to pollution and road safety issues.
3. **Pressure on Local Healthcare Services:** Local NHS facilities are already operating under strain. An influx of new residents on this scale will overwhelm existing GP surgeries and healthcare infrastructure, leading to longer wait times and reduced service quality.
4. **Unreliable Infrastructure Promises:** While the inclusion of walkways and cycle paths may appear favourable in planning documentation, such features are often poorly implemented or underused. These additions seem more aimed at securing planning approval than at genuinely improving local transport and lifestyle options.
5. **Loss of Green Space:** The loss of open, green land will be deeply damaging to the character of our rural community. These natural spaces are essential not only for biodiversity but also for residents' mental well-being and quality of life.
6. **Inadequate Educational Facilities:** The two schools currently serving the area are already at or near capacity. They are completely unprepared to absorb the significant number of additional students

this development would generate.

7. Limited Local Amenities: The village currently lacks sufficient retail options to support a large increase in population. Without significant investment in shopping infrastructure, residents would be forced to rely heavily on car travel to access basic goods and services.

8. Insufficient Recreational and Sporting Facilities: Local recreational spaces and sporting amenities are already limited. An increase of this magnitude in population will place further pressure on already stretched facilities, reducing access and quality for all.

9. Unsafe Village Roads: The existing narrow village roads are not designed to cope with a large volume of traffic. Increased vehicle numbers will raise the risk of accidents and pose serious safety hazards to pedestrians, cyclists, and existing residents.

10. A proposed car-park for the railway station creates a possible security issue in that residents will in all likelihood be walking to the station from their houses. If in the unlikely situation that the development goes ahead, due consideration should be given to use this area for garden open space.

For the above reasons, I urge the planning authority to reject this application and preserve the character, safety, and sustainability of our community.

Yours faithfully



[REDACTED]

**From:** Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 20 April 2025 06:24  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0196 FS-Case-707407093

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

**Planning Application Reference No.:** 3/2025/0196

**Address of Development:** A59 near Northcote

**Comments:** This application will cause significant damage to the wildlife in the area. There have already been other developments in that area recently that have done that. There are regularly animals killed on the A59 and this has increased in recent years as animals are driven out of their homes.

The build up of traffic in and around Langho is already increasing and this will have a further negative impact. Parking around schools is already a significant issue at both St. Mary's Langho, St. Leonard's Billington and St. Augustine's Billington. It is not safe for children / pedestrians and other drivers as vehicles park on the pavements and the amount of traffic makes it unsafe to cross. Having more families would lead to an even bigger problem. The only amenities in langho are hair dressers and beauty salons meaning people would need to travel further afield for local shops. This will in turn lead to an increase in traffic congestion in other local areas such as Whalley, Barrow, Great Harwood. It is practically impossible to get a NHS dentist in any area surrounding Langho - they are so over subscribed. It is a huge challenge trying to get a doctor's appointment. The local hospitals and urgent care centres are crippled with the amount of people already accessing them. This situation does not need making worse by increasing the population here. There is already a development taking place in Langho, a second one is not needed. Langho is described as an area of natural beauty in estate agents brochures - there isn't going to be any of that left if land is constantly destroyed and used for housing. It is a village not a town. It doesn't have amenities to be a town, yet the population is being pushed. It has always been a nice quiet place for the elderly to live but now, it isn't safe for them to cross the road due to the amount of traffic (most of whom don't stick to the speed limit). I [REDACTED] in Langho and it is soul destroying to see the green spaces and nature being taken away.

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 21 April 2025 20:59  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning application 3/2025/0196

 **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.

Formal Objection to Planning Application 3/2025/0196

Dear Sir/Madam,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Please accept this as my formal objection to the above Planning Application.

This application contravenes fundamental principles of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy, notably Policy DMG2 which governs development outside settlement boundaries. Such proposals must demonstrably support the local economy or social wellbeing, address an identified housing need, promote small-scale tourism or recreation, serve rural uses with evident demand, or align with the Enterprise Zone designation. This scheme achieves none of these objectives. Instead it undermines them, delivering substantial harm with no discernible benefit. Below I outline the numerous and significant flaws of this proposal.

The building of 300 houses which will possibly draw in 1000 people will change the fundamental character of Langho. How can 1000 people be 'sensitively integrated' into a rural village of 2000. If we were talking about 1000 into a population 20000 then that can be managed sensitively but not 2000.

PLEASE THINK ABOUT THE EFFECTS OF YOUR PROPOSAL.

There is very little infrastructure in Langho, a number of hairdressers and beauty salons, a Spar/Post Office, a sandwich shop and a very good Pharmacy. St Mary's Primary School, St Leonard Primary School. Hourly Buses and hourly trains. The A59 and the A666.

THAT IS THE ENTIRE INFRASTRUCTURE OF LANGHO AND RVBC IS PROPOSING TO PARACHUTE AN EXTRA 1000 PEOPLE INTO AN EXISTING POPULATION OF 2000.



[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 20 April 2025 12:02  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0196 FS-Case-707446796

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

**Planning Application Reference No.:** 3/2025/0196

**Address of Development:** Land off Longsight Road Langho bounded by the railway Northcote Park and Wildmans Farm

**Comments:** I am writing to formally object to the proposed large-scale housing development, near Langho and Northcote on the following grounds:

**Loss of Rural Character:**

This development would fundamentally alter the character of our small rural village. The charm and appeal of Langho lies in its peaceful, historic, and agricultural identity — a massive housing estate would be entirely out of keeping with the existing settlement.

**Strain on Infrastructure:**

The local infrastructure is not equipped to support a significant influx of new residents. Roads are narrow and not designed for heavy traffic, public transport is limited, and there is no capacity in local schools, GP surgeries, or utilities to handle such rapid expansion. The A59 is already a dangerous area, with increased traffic I fear it would only be a matter of time before we witness fatalities.

**Environmental Impact:**

The proposed site includes valuable habitats for local wildlife, and such a development could lead to irreversible damage to biodiversity. Furthermore, increased pollution, water runoff, and the destruction of green fields would undermine our commitment to environmental stewardship. Issues with increased water run off have already been seen on other developments nearby.

**Lack of Local Need:**

The scale of this development appears to exceed local housing need. If additional homes are required, they should be proportionate and sensitively designed, preferably through infill or brownfield developments rather than large greenfield expansion.

**Traffic and Safety Concerns:**

The increase in vehicles would present real safety concerns for pedestrians, cyclists, and schoolchildren. The village roads are already under pressure, and any further burden could result in accidents or congestion.

Consultation and Transparency:

Residents feel that this development has not been adequately communicated or consulted upon. Decisions of this scale should involve thorough community engagement, which has been lacking.

In summary, I urge the planning authority to reject this proposal on the basis that it is disproportionate, unsustainable, and detrimental to the fabric of our village and surrounding countryside.

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 21 April 2025 13:44  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0196 FS-Case-707658382

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

**Planning Application Reference No.:** 3/2025/0196

**Address of Development:** Hallam, Langho

**Comments:** I wish to oppose this application. Aside from the effect this will have on the environment and already overstretched doctors' surgeries (resulting in having to wait for unacceptable periods for an appointment), the road infrastructure simply cannot cope as it is. As a regular user of the A59 during rush hour (8am to 9am and 5pm to 6.30pm), there are daily queues at Copster Green (backing up to The Rydings), at Oakes Bar (backing up to Osbaldeston nearly) and at Mellor Brook. The train service is not an alternative as it is dated, unreliable and slow and it should not be considered as an alternative. Building more houses will have such a detrimental effect on an already saturated area of new house builds. They are not simply not needed.