

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 25 July 2025 21:54
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0363 FS-Case-734327997

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0363

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

Comments: Our concern is the amount of traffic that will be coming off the back street between no 27 and 29 Pendle St East. Pendle St East narrows at this point and with the traffic coming down from Pendle Side Close it will be an accident waiting to happen. Opposite this Junction is Sabden bowling green which causes congestion due to additional on street parking. We also get extra parking from the football ground. There is also the path which goes over to the doctors and playing fields, there is quite a lot of children playing or going to the park in this area. There are quite a few families send there children to school down the back street adjacent to the proposed site some unaccompanied, another safety issue.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 27 July 2025 14:01
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0363 FS-Case-734544310

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0363

Address of Development: Pendle St east land

Comments: I would like to register my objection to this development. Sabden does not need any more houses of this type. This is a beautiful award winning village for the reasons of its nature and beauty. Over saturation with housing will just cause issues. We do not have the infrastructure to support this. Particularly doctors etc which is hard to get appointments now but we have one small bus an hour running through each way. The land around this village just adds to the beauty of it and should be left unspoilt.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 31 July 2025 15:40
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0363 FS-Case-735777011

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0363

Address of Development: BB7 9EQ

Comments: I write to object to application 3/2026/0363 on the following grounds:

1. The development will add further pressure to the traffic on Watt Street and Pendle Street East.
2. The development will add further pressure to schools and the local surgery.
3. A development of this scale will require large construction vehicles that are wholly unsuited to the access to the site.
4. The site appears to be over 50% covered in non-porous materials which will cause further flood risks to those down the valley in Whalley and similar. There does not appear to be sufficient attenuation of this potential floodwater is what can be a very wet valley.
5. The design of the development uses materials which have been moved away from by recent developments in the village and will significantly detract from the rural AONB setting. Monotonal artificial stone is a world away from the real stone used on *all* developments seen on the approach from Watt Street and Pendle Street East.
6. The suggested boundary walling in artificial stone is completely wrong for this setting. Walling of this type is not seen anywhere in the village to my knowledge and is both out of place and out of character for this small rural location. Even the nearby mediocre Cobden Close development uses real stone boundary walls. Such poorly considered boundary walling will jar, separate, and segregate the occupants of the proposed development rather than integrating them into a close-knit village community. The develops should look at the recent Skipton Properties/Victoria Mill development to see how to successfully integrate a new development into a rural village.
7. The development appears to be designed for a suburban location. No references are made in the design language to the intended setting for the site; houses lacks chimneys, corbel stones, and use of any authentic Lancashire materials. The application does contain reference to tree and shrub planting to soften the development, but this should alongside rather than instead of high quality design.

8. Unlike the recent approved development to Cockshott Barn on Wesley Street in Sabden there appears to be no consideration to the aims of Ribble Valley to make new development as environmentally well-considered as is possible. The double-length parking bays and the bays some distance away from their properties are inappropriate for electric vehicle charging. The development does not champion 'green' additions such as heat pumps or solar panels. Affordable housing should not be designed to preclude the occupants from being able to embrace a lower cost of living.

9. Parking provisions may seem in line with normal requirements, but they do not consider the setting. 3 out of 4 access roads into Sabden have a gradient of at least 17%, so most commuters drive or take the bus. Offering bicycle sheds is not sufficient to excuse poorly provisioned parking as the narrow steep roads sadly do not encourage cycling or walking even to the likes of Padiham.

I do support moderate development on this site to ensure the village and village businesses remain viable. I also do not have any concerns over this being a 100% affordable development; Sabden has a varied population which makes it a great place to live.

This development however should be rejected on the above grounds until a more in-keeping and modest, environmentally sensitive application is submitted.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 31 July 2025 16:29
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0363 FS-Case-735806826

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0363

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

Comments: As a nearby householder we object strongly to this application on access and highways grounds. Pendle Street East already struggles to cope with a huge amount of traffic at all times of the day as it is the only access to the very well used bowling and football clubs, all residential properties on the street, in addition to being the only access to Pendleside Close and various properties at the top of the street on the road to Bull Bridge. With parking on both sides access is always a problem and on a daily basis we see HGVs negotiating the tight bend and try to turn round on Pendleside Close as they cannot do this on Pendle Street East. This is already a dangerous highways issue and any further traffic will be intolerable.

In addition, Pendle Street East itself can only be accessed from Watt Street which is already oversubscribed with traffic to St Mary's School and industrial and recreational units at Union Mill - and so is already very much a highways issue. This is a very concerning application and we ask you to reject it.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 01 August 2025 12:31
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0363 FS-Case-736004968

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0363

Address of Development: Land at rear of Pendle Street East

Comments: Planning Department
Ribble Valley Borough Council
Council Offices
Church Walk
Clitheroe
Lancashire
BB7 2RA

Re: Objection to Planning Application 3/2025/0363 – Proposed Development of 19 Affordable Homes

Dear Sir/Madam,

We are writing to strongly object to planning application 3/2025/0363, which proposes the development of 19 affordable homes near our property in Sabden. As residents [REDACTED], we are deeply concerned about the impact this development would have on our privacy, safety, infrastructure, and the broader character of the village.

We believe the application is unsuitable for the following reasons:

1. Unsustainable Drainage and Flood Risk

- The Flood Risk Assessment submitted by the applicant is misleading. It inaccurately claims surface water from impermeable areas drains directly into the gullies on Pendle Street East. In reality, surface water runs off into neighbouring properties and along the back lane.
- The proposal to discharge surface water into a combined sewer is not acceptable to United Utilities, and the site cannot support a sustainable drainage system.
- The applicant incorrectly categorises the site as brownfield when it is clearly greenfield.
- With no provision made for the additional surface water created by 19 dwellings, the risk of flooding is greatly increased — a serious concern for nearby homes like ours.

2. Road Safety and Inadequate Access

- The proposed access is currently used for resident parking and as a safe play area for children. Turning it into a road into a housing estate is dangerous and short-sighted.
- Visibility splays for the proposed junction do not meet the required standard for a 30mph road. The

single traffic survey used to justify this was conducted in December, outside of bowling and football season, and does not reflect usage.

- Large vehicles, including refuse wagons and emergency vehicles, would struggle to access the site without removing current resident parking or mounting footpaths and grass verges — none of which are acceptable or legal solutions.

3. Loss of Parking and Ownership Issues

- Numbers 27 and 29 Pendle Street East currently use land alongside their homes for multiple vehicles, including caravans and commercial vans. Two parking spaces each is wholly inadequate.
- There has been uninterrupted, exclusive use of this land for decades — raising legal questions about ownership and access rights. Has consent been sought or given?
- No provision is made for electric vehicle charging, making the proposed parking solution outdated and non-compliant with modern requirements.

4. Privacy, Noise and Loss of Green Space

- [REDACTED] by the new homes, resulting in a severe loss of privacy.
- The development would bring long-term increases in noise, traffic, and disruption, permanently altering the quiet, rural character of this part of the village.
- The proposal would destroy a valued green space used by the community — further eroding the village's character and reducing biodiversity.

5. Sustainability and Overdevelopment

- Sabden is a Tier 2 settlement with limited public transport, few employment opportunities, and already stretched infrastructure. People rely on cars, and this development will significantly increase traffic and emissions.
- There are no cycle paths or accessible footpaths connecting Sabden to nearby areas, yet no meaningful provision has been made for cyclists or residents with limited mobility.
- Sabden has already absorbed a number of housing developments recently — Cobden Close, Victoria Mill, Black Hill View, and Stubbin Vale — which more than meet the village's housing needs.
- It is reported that Sabden only need 10 affordable houses to meet the needs of the village, not 19.
- Also the calico development couldn't fill their site with local residents so rented further tenant's from further a field, what's to say this won't happen here? Given that Sabden only need 10 affordable homes. Why can't Sabden residents who need affordable homes be given the chance to rent the already developed Calico site?

6. Contradiction of Local Planning Policy

This proposal is not compliant with key elements of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy, including:

- DS1 (Development Strategy) – No proven local need or regeneration benefit; Sabden's recent housing growth has already met demand.
- DS2 (Sustainable Development) – Development will not improve local economic, social, or environmental conditions.
- EN2 (Landscape), EN3 (Climate Change), EN5 (Heritage) – The proposal lies within or near a conservation area in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and will damage both views and local biodiversity.
- DMG1–3, DME3–6 – The development is incompatible with the borough's strategy for sustainable, heritage-sensitive, and infrastructure-supported growth.
- H1 (Housing Provision) – Ribble Valley is already on track to meet its 2028 housing targets. This site is not included in the council's 5-year housing land supply.

7. Legal Precedent

In the 2022 High Court ruling (Ribble Valley Borough Council v Secretary of State and Oakmere

Homes), the importance of adhering to the Core Strategy was confirmed. It was stated that development in open countryside would only be permitted where justified by clear local need — which this proposal fails to demonstrate.

Conclusion

This application is a resubmission of a fundamentally flawed plan that has not meaningfully addressed resident concerns. The site is not viable, not sustainable, and not appropriate for this scale of development. Yes planning has been granted on this site before but that was all the other developments have now taken place in the village. It also begs the question if this site was a viable site with planning already approved why was it not developed then?

We urge Ribble Valley Borough Council to apply the same robust scrutiny that successfully defended the Core Strategy in 2022, and to reject application 3/2025/0363 on the grounds outlined above.

Yours faithfully,



11 AUG 2025

28/7/25

I am writing to OBJECT to this planning application for the following reasons.

1. PRIVACY

[Redacted]

over

loss of daylight, disturbance, noise.

2. GREEN BELT

It would have a negative impact as it is a green field of outstanding beauty. It has a bridle path which dog walkers and the general public use the outer boundaries.

3. FLOODING / DRAINAGE PROBLEMS

This field is prone to flooding with the rain draining from the hills. It is like a bog for at least 8 months of the year.

4. TRAFFIC PROBLEMS

There would be a huge problem with traffic. The houses on PENDLE STREET EAST have to park on the road. Plus the Bowling green and FOOTBALL CLUB also have to park.

5. OVER DEVELOPMENT

Sadden has had more than its share of houses. It has put a strain on the infrastructure and services. Phone signals

internet, schools, doctors etc. Sadden is meant to be a village not a TOWN.

b. QUALITY

What is the quality of the houses!!
Would it be in keeping with Victoria Mill and Pendleside Close!!