

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 01 August 2025 14:49
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0363 FS-Case-736070406

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0363

Address of Development: Land off Pendle Street East Sabden BB7 9EQ

Comments: I object to this application for the following reasons.

1. There doesn't appear to be any evidence that 19 extra affordable houses are required by the residents of Sabden. We already have a number of affordable housing sites- Black Hill View managed by Onward Homes, Cobden estate managed by Calico, flats next to the car park plus the flats at the bottom of Clitheroe Road.
2. Access to the site is off Pendle Street East leading to Pendleside Close (cul de sac) and there is only one way in and out so access to this proposed site will cause congestion, especially since it is opposite the Bowling Club when the road is regularly congested when there are bowling matches or when there are football matches. The football field is to the rear of Pendleside Close.
3. This proposed development will generate more traffic with potentially 38 more cars (2 per household) travelling along PSE and Watt Street onto Whalley Road. The volume of traffic has been increased over the past few years due to the housing development on Victoria Grove.
4. There is a limited bus service in Sabden therefore most journeys are by private cars and the proposed development will add to the number of vehicles in and out of Sabden.
5. At the moment there is parking for 6 cars on the unadopted road and if this development goes ahead, 2 of these places will be lost leading to more parking on PSE. Cars already park along here and up to the junction with Watt Street affecting safety issues.
6. The 2 village schools are at capacity with waiting lists. More properties will exacerbate the problem of finding a local school for the additional children which this proposed development will house.
7. GP surgery - it is already difficult to obtain appointments at the Sabden Medical Centre.
8. It is unclear how the developers plan to dispose of surface water. At a public meeting a representative of the developer suggested water may be discharged into Sabden Brook which may cause flooding.

I feel this application will have a detrimental effect to the village of Sabden and it's residents.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 01 August 2025 19:12
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0363 FS-Case-736151587

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0363

Address of Development: Land
off Pendle Street
BB7 9EQ

Comments: I do not wish for this planning to go ahead we have lived here for 7 years .
We find Sabden as a quiet place to live and love the community here , everybody knows everyone and feel safe to live in the village .
The roads will be even busier, the noise will be unbearably depending on the age group this will attracts.
There will be no room in the local schools here also the local doctors surgery .
Being part of sabden community is so deliteful and if the planning goes a head it would put a strain on the community , there is a lot of retired people live here and wouldn't feel safe in there own homes .Once you get one bad family it attracts others to join and if this happens its to late , you will then see a lot of houses up for sale then you are defeating the object .

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 01 August 2025 19:59
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0363 FS-Case-736161190

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0363

Address of Development: Land at read of pendle street east bb7 9eq

Comments: Dear Planning Committee,

Re: Planning Application 3/2025/0363

I am writing to object to the above planning application for the proposed development of 19 affordable dwellings on land off Pendle Street East, Sabden. My objection is based on a combination of personal concerns as a local resident and wider planning considerations, as set out in the Ribble Valley Core Strategy. I respectfully urge the Planning Committee to consider the following points when determining this application:

1. Ribble Valley Core Strategy Non-Compliance

Key Statement DS1 – Development Strategy: Sabden is a Tier 2 settlement, and as such, development must be intended to meet local housing needs or provide regeneration benefits. Sabden has already accommodated substantial housing growth in recent years, including Cobden Mill, Victoria Mill, and smaller developments like Black Hill View. The applicant has failed to demonstrate a specific unmet housing need for this location, and no regeneration benefit has been presented.

Key Statement DS2 – Sustainable Development: The proposed development does not meet the standards of sustainable development. Sabden lacks essential infrastructure, has limited public transport, and is already struggling with parking, drainage, and access issues. Development on a greenfield site will exacerbate environmental pressures rather than improve them.

Key Statement EN2 – Landscape: The site lies within the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and directly affects the visual character of the adjacent Conservation Area. The proposed development would not conserve, protect, or enhance the local landscape. It would result in the loss of a valued green space that contributes to the character of the village.

Key Statement EN5 and Policy DME4 – Heritage Assets: This application will have a detrimental impact on the setting of the Sabden Conservation Area. Views from the south of the village and key entry points will be altered significantly, with rear elevations of heritage properties obscured and the rural entrance into Sabden urbanised.

Policy DMG1 – General Considerations: The proposed development fails to safeguard the amenities of nearby residents. It will lead to increased traffic, noise, loss of privacy, and overdevelopment in an already densely populated area. The current green space provides a buffer between properties.

Policy DMG2 – Strategic Considerations: This development fails to meet any of the exceptions that would permit new build housing outside the main settlement boundaries in Tier 2 villages. It is not essential to the economy or wellbeing of the area, nor does it meet an identified need. Recent housing approvals and completions in Sabden have already addressed local housing demand.

Policy DME6 – Water Management: There is no evidence that the site can be sustainably drained. The applicant proposes connecting to the combined sewer, a solution deemed unacceptable by United Utilities in the past. The Flood Risk Assessment is flawed, making incorrect claims about drainage routes and water dispersal. The site has long-standing surface water problems that would only be worsened by impermeable housing surfaces.

Policy DMG3 – Transport and Mobility: Sabden lacks the infrastructure to support this type of development. There is poor access to public transport, limited employment in the village, and no dedicated cycle routes or pathways. The application would increase car dependency and put further strain on already congested village roads, particularly at the junction of Pendle Street East.

2. Local and Personal Concerns

Overdevelopment and Infrastructure Pressure: Sabden has undergone significant development already. The village cannot support another high-density estate without improved infrastructure, including roads, drainage, parking, and community facilities.

Traffic and Safety Risks: The proposed entrance to the development is unsafe. Sight lines do not meet the necessary 43-metre standard for a 30mph road. The applicant's traffic survey was done when football and bowling activities were not active, underestimating normal conditions. The access road is narrow, already congested, and often used by children playing safely. The development will drastically reduce this safety.

Loss of Parking and Amenity Space: Residents of Pendle Street East already rely on informal parking along the gable end of properties. These spaces will be lost under the proposed plans. Allocated parking for numbers 27 and 29 is inadequate, and no provision is made for visitors, large vehicles, or electric charging. Converting a green space used by the community for parking or development is unacceptable.

Drainage and Flood Risk: There is clear evidence of water logging and flooding on the site and nearby properties. The current system cannot cope. Adding further pressure to a combined sewer system risks localised flooding and environmental degradation.

3. Developer's Track Record and Community Trust It is worth noting that the developer owns another residential property in Sabden that houses residents over the age of 55, who pay a maintenance fee for upkeep. However, during this past winter, it was local Sabden residents who cleared the ice and snow and gritted the paths. This raises concerns about the developer's long-term commitment to property maintenance and community wellbeing.

Conclusion The proposed development is unsuitable, unsustainable, and inconsistent with both local needs and the policies of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy. It would result in the loss of important green space, intensify pressure on inadequate infrastructure, compromise road safety, and fail to

conserve the unique character of Sabden village.

For these reasons, I strongly urge the Planning Committee to refuse this application.

Yours sincerely,

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the signature of the sender.

Ribble Valley Borough Council
Council Offices
Church Walk
CLITHEROE
BB7 2RA

Dear Sir / Madam

PLANNING APPLICATION: 3/2025/0363
LAND TO THE REAR OF PENDLE STREET EAST, SABDEN, BB7 9EQ

We are writing to object to the above planning application, based on the following reasons:

Overdevelopment

What evidence has the developer, or Onward Homes, provided to demonstrate that these homes are needed to meet the needs of Sabden residents? We already have 5 social housing schemes within the village, namely Black Hill View, Cobden Close/Mill Court, the developments on Padiham Road and Clitheroe Road, as well as Littlemoor for the over 55's. Sabden has a disproportionate amount of social housing compared with other Ribble Valley villages and the proposal to build more must be questioned. The Cobden Close development, in particular, houses residents from outside the village, with no local connections. Is this because there is no local need or is Calico not adhering to the local connection policy and placing unsuitable applicants in their properties from outside the area? I am enclosing the Calico list for Cobden Close and Mill Court, from the Ribble Valley affordable properties booklet, showing the number of mixed properties they own on this site, which is more than enough to meet the needs of our village, yet these properties are not all occupied by our local residents. This requires investigation, as it is clear from the number of issues with anti-social behaviour at Cobden Close/Mill Court that something isn't working with the social housing element of this development, given the well-documented frequency of police visits. All the other housing association schemes in the village seem to be trouble-free and contribute positively to our community. If the village were to have another 19 homes dedicated to social housing, we do not believe that this will serve the people of Sabden and there is a real risk we could have an entire estate filled with residents who have no connection to our village whatsoever which will lead to further anti-social behaviour problems.

Drainage

The Flood Risk Assessment provided by the applicant identifies the area as being in flood zone 1, which highlights the vulnerability of the site. It has been well documented on previous applications that surface water run-off from the hills above the site and ground water is a significant issue for residents on both Pendleside Close and Pendle Street East. In its present form, the meadow forming the bulk of the proposed development site naturally captures and holds a large amount of groundwater that runs off the hills behind the site and we have concerns that developing this site will increase surface water run off by removing the ground's natural ability to hold water. The presence of marsh and bog serves to evidence the amount of groundwater naturally retained in this field at present.

Previous applications, and indeed this application, have also determined that the site is unsuitable for a sustainable drainage system due to an impervious clay layer beneath the topsoil layer. We also note that United Utilities have previously objected to any surface water being discharged into the existing combined sewer system. From the newly submitted plan, it is apparent that the applicant is intending to discharge water into the existing combined sewer system. Whilst we trust that United Utilities's position on this will not have changed, we also object on the grounds that this is both unsustainable and damaging to the environment.

The health of the country's rivers has been well documented recently and indeed the government has committed to reducing the amount of sewage discharge into river by 50%. From data readily available online, figures show that combined spillages from water treatment works in Whalley (where Sabden's wastewater is treated), overspilled for 5138 hours in 2024 made up of 667 separate spills. That's 214 days out of 365 in the year where untreated sewage is being discharged into the river Calder. Putting surface water into the drainage system only serves to compound this problem and to approve an unsustainable application like this would be both irresponsible and environmentally damaging. In its current form, the development proposals are unsustainable and should be refused on these grounds alone.

We also object to the wording and some of the detail providing within the Flood Risk Assessment provided by the applicant and believe it to be misleading. The document provides a calculation of what it claims to be imperviable areas on the existing site and claims that the development will be an improvement to the amount of water entering the existing drainage system. We reject this on the basis that it is essentially nonsense. Firstly, much of the area they have included in their calculation as currently impermeable are naturally permeable or drain onto permeable surfaces. Secondly, they have also negated to factor into their calculation, the surface water from the road gullies and rooftops for the new properties in the meadow. Suggesting that the proposal would be an improvement appears to be a deliberate attempt to mislead. The fact that the application also refers to the site as 'brownfield' is also misleading. The site is an undeveloped meadow which up until fairly recently was used for grazing livestock. It has been agricultural in the near 50 years we have resided in the village. The only small part of the site that has previously been developed is the garden which used to belong to no. 27 Pendle Street East which now forms access to the site.

Road Safety

We don't believe that the current junction is suitable for a housing development. I note the difficulty [REDACTED] in getting out of that junction safely when I park [REDACTED] the rear of Pendle Street East, particularly at busy periods such as the bowling matches, competitions and football matches.

Parking is often very busy on Pendle Street and when vehicles park up to the junction, which they often do, visibility is completely obscured for vehicles travelling up Pendle Street East towards Pendleside Close. Visibility is also partially obscured for vehicles travelling from Pendleside Close although this is generally less problematic as vehicles approaching from this direction are usually travelling considerably slower.

From the new application, we can see that the visibility splay for the proposed junction is inadequate for a 30mph road and has been reduced from the previous application. We can see that the application's justification for suggesting a reduced visibility splay is appropriate is a single traffic survey carried out on 12th December 2024 where they have calculated the average speed of vehicles as being 18mph therefore, in their view, a 30mph visibility splay was not required. Having [REDACTED] [REDACTED] and seen the speeds that some people travel, I reject the applicant's

suggestion that visibility splays can be reduced. Delivery drivers and traffic to the football matches are the worst offenders and I regularly see vehicles fly past in excess of 30mph, usually travelling up Pendle Street East towards Pendleside Close, where pulling out of the proposed junctions gives zero visibility of approaching traffic. I would urge anyone deciding this application to visit and make this manoeuvre in their vehicle to experience this for themselves. Come on weekend when the football is on or a weeknight when there is a bowling match on to get a real feel for how it will be.

Furthermore, the plan provided by the applicant shows how a Lancashire refuse wagon would access the site. Whilst we acknowledge this manoeuvre is possible from the diagrams provided by the applicant, it also clearly demonstrates that this turn would not be possible if there was a vehicle parked outside no. 27 Pendle Steet East which is likely to be most days. The only option would be for a large vehicle to mount the footpath at the side of the bowling green and to drive over the grass verge. The applicant ought to be asked to add some parked vehicles to their plan and show how the truck would make the turn.

This does not just apply to the refuse wagon. Removal vehicles, emergency vehicles, deliveries, plant, machinery are all going to have the same issue. The only solution would be double yellow lines to prevent parking close to the junction which then impacts on an already difficult parking situation on the street.

Additional Traffic on unsuitable roads

Aside from the unsuitable junction onto Pendle Street East, the proposal to introduce 19 additional properties on this site will also have a significant impact on the amount of traffic existing the junction of Watt Street and Whalley Road. The recent developments at Cobden Close and the Victoria Mill have also led to a significant increase in traffic using this junction and the construction of additional properties will only serve to compound this issue, particularly at school drop off and pick up times where traffic is already a significant issue. Furthermore, the development will also have a further detrimental impact on the already dire traffic situation of traffic travelling through the village on the main Burnley to Clitheroe route which has become virtually untenable over the past few years with long jams of stationary traffic often building up at the give way on Bull Bridge on Padiham Road, increasing both road, noise and air pollution. Building large volumes of houses in rural location with few work opportunities and poor transport links does not appear sustainable in terms of reducing reliance on personal vehicles.

Parking / Loss of parking

The parking problems on Pendle Street are well documented and have been evidenced on previous applications for development of this site. Pendle Street East in particular gets completely double parked when there are matches on at either the bowling club or football pitch off Pendleside Close. Once parking is taken, vehicles resort to parking on pavements or the grass verges which on occasions have blocked access for emergency vehicles travelling to Pendleside Close and the football club.

This application, if passed, will create further issues as it will cause the loss of parking spaces to the two properties at 27 and 29 Pendle Street who have enjoyed private off-road parking for 6 vehicles. Whilst the application looks to provide two parking spaces for each of these properties, there is a loss of parking and there is no guarantee that either of these properties would want to park away from

their properties. Does the applicant have the right to take this land that has been in the exclusive possession of these two properties?

The lack of parking, combined with the inconsiderate parking already witnessed by visitors to the football and bowling club will also undoubtedly cause issues at this junction if the development goes ahead as this junction will provide additional opportunities for people to park their vehicles half on the pavement as they do at present. When the applicant was asked about this at the recent residents meeting held on the 31st July, he said it would be up to the local authority to deal with parking enforcements if this became an issue.

Impact on Local infrastructure

Whilst I appreciate there is a national requirement for additional housing, new developments need to be considered in places with infrastructure that can cope or be amended to cope. We do not believe Sabden falls into this category. Both the village schools are full and children and parents in the village have already been told their children cannot be accommodated. Our understanding is that the only primary school in the Ribble Valley that currently has spaces is Barrow. This application is aimed at families with young children, so are they expected to travel the 10-mile round trip to Barrow Primary School? The doctor's surgery also appears to be overwhelmed with wait times to see a doctor increasing dramatically in recent years. It is clear that recent large-scale developments in the village have pushed existing infrastructure in term of roads, schools and health facilities to their upper limit, with no obvious capacity for expansion.

Sustainability

Sabden is an isolated village with limited public transport, hence the reason it is a Tier 2 settlement. With very little employment opportunities in the village and the inadequacy of public transport, cars are the only effective mode of transport. The increase in traffic which 19 dwellings will have on the area will be massive and certainly not in line with sustainability. Furthermore, the plans make no provision for cyclists or those with reduced mobility.

Inappropriate Design

The design, incorporating densely packed, modern looking properties, constructed from non-traditional materials is contrived and takes no design cues from the established and historic character of the properties in the conservation area or surrounding character buildings in the village. The properties are sited close together, abutting adjacent properties on Pendleside Close, have very small private amenity spaces and would appear cramped and out of character with their immediate surroundings and the quality of development in the village, which is designated as a Conservation Area.

This proposal will have a significant negative impact on the visual outlook of the village as well as the conservation area. The views into the conservation area from the south of the village, from both the footpath leading round the rear of the proposed site and the road leading into the village over White Hill from Read, will be detrimentally affected. The rear of the conservation area properties will no longer be visible from this direction detracting from the aspects which led to the area being designated as a conservation area in the first place.

Paragraph 134 of the NPPF states: 'Development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes.' The proposal is clearly not well-designed, does not respond to existing local character and surrounding context and should be refused. The properties recently constructed on the Victoria Mill site should be viewed as a blue-print for how a new development can be constructed without detriment to the character of a village.

Policies

The applicant claims that the proposed development meets various statements and policies set out in the Ribble Valley Core Strategy, but I would argue the following:

Key Statement DS1 – Development Strategy:

Sabden is a Tier 2 settlement and as such, development will need to meet proven local housing needs and/or regeneration benefits. Given the recent housing developments which have been recently completed in the village, local housing needs have been met, and I do not believe this development will deliver any regeneration benefits.

Key Statement DS2 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development:

I do not believe this development will improve the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area. Sabden is a small village with limited employment opportunities and given that the site is greenfield, the environmental conditions will worsen with development, along with the obvious fact that a sustainable drainage system has not been demonstrated in the application.

Key Statement EN2 – Landscape:

As the proposed development is situated in a Conservation area, I believe that the landscape and character of the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty will be compromised. I do not believe that this development will protect, conserve or enhance the area.

Key Statement EN3 – Sustainable Development and Climate Change:

Given that Sabden is a rural village with cars being the only viable transport means, this development will have a negative impact on reducing the Borough's carbon footprint, and I again refer to the fact that a sustainable drainage system on this site is not viable.

Key Statement EN5 – Heritage Assets:

As there is a requirement for all development proposals to make a positive contribution to local distinctiveness/sense of place, what will this development deliver to the village?

Key Statement DM12 – Transport Considerations:

Sabden is a rural village with very limited public transport and therefore cars are needed to travel. There are no cycle paths or footpaths linking Sabden to any of the neighbouring settlements. I believe this development will significantly increase traffic into an already congested area of the village as there are no other means of transport.

Policy DMG1 – General Considerations:

I believe that if all the points are considered under this policy, the development does not meet any of the criteria.

Policy DMG2 – Strategic Considerations:

Within the tier 2 villages and outside the defined settlement areas development must meet at least one of the following considerations:

- 1. The development should be essential to the local economy or social well being of the area.*
- 2. The development is needed for the purposes of forestry or agriculture.*
- 3. The development is for local needs housing which meets an identified need and is secured as such.*
- 4. The development is for small scale tourism or recreational developments appropriate to a rural area.*
- 5. The development is for small-scale uses appropriate to a rural area where a local need or benefit can be demonstrated.*
- 6. The development is compatible with the enterprise zone designation.*

I do not believe that the development meets any of the requirements. Sabden has seen significant new housing developments since the Core Strategy was adopted and therefore the local needs housing has been met, so there is now a risk of over-development in the village.

Policy DMG3 – Transport and Mobility:

In making decisions on development proposals the local planning authority will, in addition to assessing proposals within the context of the development strategy, attach considerable weight to: the availability and adequacy of public transport and associated infrastructure to serve those moving to and from the development.

- 1. The relationship of the site to the primary route network and the strategic road network.*
- 2. The provision made for access to the development by pedestrian, cyclists and those with reduced mobility.*
- 3. Proposals which promote development within existing developed areas or extensions to them at locations which are highly accessible by means other than the private car.*
- 4. Proposals which locate major generators of travel demand in existing centres which are highly accessible by means other than the private car.*
- 5. Proposals which strengthen existing town and village centres which offer a range of everyday community shopping and employment opportunities by protecting and enhancing their vitality and viability.*
- 6. Proposals which locate development in areas which maintain and improve choice for people to walk, cycle or catch public transport rather than drive between homes and facilities which they need to visit regularly.*
- 7. Proposals which limit parking provision for developments and other on or off street parking provision to discourage reliance on the car for work and other journeys where there are effective alternatives.*

I do not believe that this development meets any of these considerations.

Policy DME3 – Site and Species Protection and Conservation:

The proposed development is on green belt land and as such the biodiversity of the locality will be significantly diminished.

Policy DME4 – Protecting Heritage Assets:

The development borders the conservation area and as such the proposal will affect views into and out of the setting. This proposal will have a significant negative impact on the visual outlook of the village as well as the conservation area itself. The views into the conservation area from the south of the village, both from the footpath leading round the rear of the proposed site and also from the road leading into the village over White Hill from Read will be affected greatly. The rear of the conservation area properties will no longer be visible from this direction detracting from the aspects which led to the area being designated a conservation area in the first place. As Sabden is in an area of outstanding natural beauty, it should be protected from excessive development. I do not believe the development will conserve or enhance the character and appearance of the locality.

Policy DME6 – Water Management:

The application does not meet this policy in any way because the site cannot be sustainably and effectively drained. To allow more surface water into the already overloaded combined sewers would undoubtedly lead to further environmental problems with our waterways.

Key Statement H1 – Housing Provision:

As per Ribble Valley Borough Council's most recent 5-year Supply Housing Statement and the associated Housing Land Availability Survey (March 2025), it is clear that the borough is on target to meet the delivery of 5,600 homes across the borough by 2028, having already reached 5,320. The number of all known sites in the 5-year land supply availability, with full or outline planning permission, or where works have already commenced is 1,579. The land at Pendle Street East is not included within this statement and therefore to approve this application would lead to an unnecessary oversupply and overdevelopment of our borough.

The applicant refers to the previous outline planning application 3/2013/0440 and reserved matters approval 3/2017/0351, but this new application is completely different and should be treated as such. Since the earlier applications were considered, it has become apparent that the site cannot be properly drained, there are issues with access to the site, and the impact of creating a new junction would put road users, cyclists, pedestrians and those with reduced mobility at considerable risk due to the proposal to reduce the visibility splay.

In September 2022, in the High Court, Ribble Valley Borough Council v the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government and Oakmere Homes, it was ruled that RVBC's application of local planning policy was correct. Nicola Hopkins, the council's director of economic development and planning, said: *"Our Core Strategy sets out what can be built in the borough and where, shaping infrastructure investments and determining future development. It seeks to direct housing to sustainable locations and protect the borough's open countryside, which is a top priority. The original High Court ruling and this recent appeal decision confirms the correct application of our Core Strategy and that development in the countryside will only be allowed when justified by local need."*

We urge Ribble Valley Borough Council to adopt the same approach when considering this development and reject the application, knowing that the Core Strategy is robust enough to defend any application which is not appropriate or sustainable.

Yours sincerely,





Calico Housing
Centenary Court, Croft Street
Burnley, BB11 2ED



Location	Type	Client Group
Clitheroe: Colhirst Drive Kay Street Monk Street Woone Lane	1 x 2 bed 1 x 2 bed 1 x 2 bed 1 x 2 bed	Families
Cobden Close, Sabden	1 x 4 bed house 3 x 2 bed houses 7 x 3 bed houses	Families
Mill Court, Sabden	1 x 2 bed house 5 x 3 bed houses Flats 1,2,3,4,5 - 7 Flats 1,2,3,4,5	Singles / Couples / Families
Cobden Close, Sabden	Flats 1,2,3,4 - 17	Singles / Couples

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 02 August 2025 18:10
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0363 FS-Case-736299187

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0363

Address of Development: Land off Pendle Street East, Sabden BB7 9EQ

Comments: I wish to object to the planning application for 19 affordable dwellings on land to the rear of Pendle Street East, Sabden due to the unsuitability of the site.

My reasons are as follows:

1. Sabden has had several new developments over recent years and the population of the village has grown accordingly. Where is the justification for further development? I would hope that planning would only be considered if a need for residents of Sabden and their wider families could be proven.
2. Traffic and parking along Pendle Street East / Watt street has increased as a result of recent development. It is often difficult to traverse Pendle Street East at any time of the day due to cars parked along each side. An additional 40 cars will only exacerbate this, especially at key times of the day. As these are to be family houses many homes will have at least 2 cars. Parents bringing children to school by car add to the congestion often parking on the junction of Pendle Street East and Watt Street. It is then difficult and in some cases dangerous for pupils walking to school and trying to cross the road. Access to the site is narrow and this plus the parked cars along Pendle Street East will cause any emergency vehicles to have difficulty attending incidents. Many additional cars are often parked around the access area due to the thriving Bowling Club and also the Football Club all adding to the congestion.
3. Flood Risk - Inadequate surface water drainage will lead to an increased risk of overflow of the combined sewer network at peak rainfall times. Climate change has certainly increased the amount of heavy rainfall in this area.
4. Lack of School Places: Our village schools are full as are the local secondary schools, where are additional children to attend school? If they are to travel out of Sabden this will only increase congestion again!
5. Access to Health Care: Further pressure will be put upon services already stretched to the limit by additional patients.

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 02 August 2025 20:30
To: Planning
Subject: FAO KATHRYN HUGHES (DEVELOPMENT PENDLE STREET EAST)

 **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.

Dear Council/Planning Department,

I am writing to formally object to the proposed development of 19 new homes in Sabden for the following reasons:

1. **Traffic and Parking Impact:** With an average of 2.4 cars per household, the development could add around 50 additional vehicles to Pendlestreet East, significantly worsening existing traffic and parking issues.
2. **Access and Road Safety:** The nearby junction on Watt Street is already congested due to recent developments on either side. The proposed access road is opposite a key pedestrian route used by schoolchildren, which is already hazardous due to double parking. Increased residential and construction traffic will pose a serious safety risk. In addition emergency vehicles e.g. Fire engines and ambulances will struggle to access the site especially if there is a football match or bowling competition taking place.
3. **Strain on Local Services:** Local schools in Sabden are already oversubscribed, forcing residents to seek placements in surrounding villages such as Read and Simonstone. The development is likely to appeal to young families, putting further pressure on education and healthcare services that are already stretched, particularly GP access.
4. **Environmental and Aesthetic Concerns:** The proposed red-brick housing design does not align with the village's countryside character. Additionally, the development site is marshy and serves as a natural runoff point for surrounding fields. Hard landscaping may increase flood risk by preventing infiltration. If water is discharged into Sabden Brook, it risks polluting local waterways, especially if United Utilities cannot manage the additional load.

Given these concerns, I urge the council to reconsider the approval of this development in its current form.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Sent from [Outlook](#)

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 03 August 2025 20:21
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0363 FS-Case-736460653

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0363

Address of Development: Land off Pendle Street East, Sabden, BB7 9EQ

Comments: Dear Sir / Madam,

I would be grateful for you to consider my objections for the proposed development of 19 houses with associated parking and a new access road on the land to the rear of Pendle Street East, Sabden, BB7 9EQ.

The first application for the develop this site was rejected only 18 months ago and this included less houses though the issues remain the same for the following reasons;

1. Congestion of Pendle Street East

The proposed development will use an access road leading from Pendle Street East. Pendle Street East is an already congested road with cars using both sides of the narrow street for current residential parking. The development will not only increase the road traffic on this already busy road but the access being at the top end means that all residents to the new development will have to use the road. Children from the local Primary school have to cross this road (which does not have any crossing) usually through parked traffic. My concern is this could lead to further accidents and congest the road even further.

2. Watt Street Access

Recent housing developments within Sabden have all used Watt Street as an access. This has significantly increased road traffic through this part of the village and as all roads that feed off it are cul-de-sac's then the proposed development will have to use this road too. I am concerned this will lead to an increased danger to pedestrians.

3. Increased pressure on the infrastructure of the village

The development will add to the already groaning infrastructure of the village. The local primary school is at full capacity, Sabden and Whalley medical practice patient waiting lists are already extensive and resident parking is at a premium. The new development will exacerbate this even more.

4. Parking Capacity within the development

From the plans, houses No 6 and 7 don't have any off road parking. This will mean residents will have to park within the cul-de-sac. Access to the development is via a one lane entry road between existing properties (No; 27+29) creating a nasty bottle-necked, blind sided T junction.

5. Drainage issues

There are potential issues with flooding as the proposed site is unsuitable for the application of soakaways and there are no waterways within the local vicinity. Surface water will have to be pumped to the sewage connection to the northwest of the site to prevent flooding and run-off affecting existing properties. This has also been identified as an unresolved issue by the Lead Local Flood authority.

6. Reducing the biodiversity of the area

Six trees would have to be removed from an area near a local Primary school and alongside a popular local footpath. By developing on a 'green site' the local bird, small mammal and insect populations would be hugely impacted. The proposed development indicate a provision for 'extensive tree planting, native hedgerow planting, shrub and ground cover planting and wildflower grassland that would enhance the landscape fabric and biodiversity' within the Landscape and Visual Impact assessment though this is not apparent or indeed true when the aforementioned document is viewed.

I feel the application for planning permission needs to be rejected on the grounds stated above.