

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 04 August 2025 13:46
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0363 FS-Case-736667401

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0363

Address of Development: Land off rear of Pendle street east

To: Ribble Valley Planning Committee
Re: Planning Application 3/2025/0363

Dear Planning Committee,

I am writing to object to planning application 3/2025/0363, which proposes the development of 19 affordable dwellings on land off Pendle Street East, Sabden. As a resident of this village, I have deep concerns about the suitability and impact of this development. These concerns relate both to personal experience and to clear planning issues outlined in the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.

1. Conflict with the Ribble Valley Core Strategy

Key Statement DS1 – Development Strategy

Sabden, as a Tier 2 settlement, should only accommodate development that meets proven local housing needs or supports regeneration. Our village has already seen significant growth through developments like Cobden Mill, Victoria Mill, and Black Hill View. The applicant has not shown any specific, unmet need that this new proposal would satisfy, nor does it offer any regeneration benefits.

According to the 2021 Census, Sabden already had 12% of its housing stock designated as social housing, a higher proportion than many other rural villages in the Ribble Valley. For comparison, Clitheroe stands at 13.2%, but much larger and better resourced. In contrast, Pendleton has just 1.4%, West Bradford 0.8%, and Bolton-by-Bowland 1.9%. These figures demonstrate that Sabden has already delivered a disproportionately high level of affordable and social housing relative to its size, while many other rural areas in the borough have contributed far less.

Key Statement DS2 – Sustainable Development

This proposal fails to deliver sustainable development. Sabden lacks essential infrastructure, has

limited public transport, and already faces challenges around drainage, parking, and road safety. Building on this greenfield site will only worsen existing problems.

Key Statement EN2 – Landscape

The site lies within the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and borders the Sabden Conservation Area. This development would harm the landscape and permanently change the village’s rural character, rather than protecting or enhancing it.

Key Statement EN5 & Policy DME4 – Heritage Assets

The development would negatively impact views into and out of the Conservation Area. It would obstruct views of historic buildings and erode the village’s heritage setting, particularly from key approaches to Sabden.

Policy DMG1 – General Considerations

The development does not protect the amenity of local residents. It would increase traffic and noise, reduce privacy, and result in overdevelopment of an already densely built part of the village. The green space currently provides a much-valued buffer between homes.

Policy DMG2 – Strategic Considerations

This proposal doesn’t meet the criteria for housing outside settlement boundaries. It is not essential to the local economy or wellbeing and doesn’t address an unmet need. Sabden has already delivered more than its fair share of housing.

Policy DME6 – Water Management

The proposed drainage plans rely on connecting to a combined sewer, which United Utilities has previously said is not acceptable. The Flood Risk Assessment is flawed, with inaccuracies in its assumptions about water flow. The site has a long history of surface water issues, which this development would make worse.

Policy DMG3 – Transport and Mobility

Sabden lacks the infrastructure to support new housing of this scale. Public transport is limited, there are few job opportunities in the village, and there are no proper cycle routes or footways. This development would increase car dependency and worsen traffic congestion, particularly at the Pendle Street East junction.

2. Local and Personal Concerns

Overdevelopment and Strain on Infrastructure

Sabden has taken on several developments in recent years. Without upgrades to roads, parking, drainage, and local services, we simply cannot support another housing estate of this size.

Traffic and Road Safety

The proposed access point is unsafe. Visibility splays do not meet the 43-metre standard for a 30mph road. The applicant’s traffic survey failed to reflect peak activity levels, such as when football or bowling matches are held. The access road is already narrow, frequently used by children, and often congested. Adding more traffic would compromise safety for everyone.

Loss of Parking and Community Space

Many residents rely on the informal parking spaces at the gable end of Pendle Street East. These would be lost under the proposal. Allocated parking for some houses is limited, and there is no clear provision for visitor parking or electric vehicle charging. Replacing a well-used green space with hard surfacing is not acceptable.

Drainage and Flooding Risks

The site and nearby properties already suffer from poor drainage and surface water flooding. The current system cannot cope, and further development will put additional strain on an already inadequate network, increasing flood risk.

Conclusion

This application is inappropriate for Sabden. It is unsustainable, does not reflect local needs, and contradicts the policies set out in the Ribble Valley Core Strategy. It would increase pressure on already overstretched infrastructure, reduce road safety, and permanently damage the character and landscape of our village.

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

Yours sincerely,



Sabden Resident