



15th August 2025

Dear Sir/Madam,

Re: Planning Application No. 3/2025/0588

LETTER OF OBJECTION

Introductory Comments

1. We write to object to the grant of planning permission. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED].
2. For the record, we should say that we did not receive a copy of the leaflet said to have been delivered to 2000 households in March 2025: see paras 3.30 and 3.21 of the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). We find this remarkable, given our proximity to the site [REDACTED] would be interested in the applicant's explanation. If we had received it, we should immediately have responded (as we now do to the notice letter, which is the first we had heard of the proposal).
3. In passing, it may be worth noting that, in any event, the leaflet (Appendix 1 to the SCI) is misleading in that it illustrates a bungalow - which is not a type of building proposed. Had the proposal been for bungalows rather than houses, we might not have objected, given that our principal material planning objection is [REDACTED] Indeed, we are not against further building in Whalley in principle. Some years ago, there was a proposal to build a single house on this very site and we did not object (the application presumably was rejected or withdrawn). More recently, in 2021 and 2022 we did not object to the most recent planning applications of which we had notice, as they potentially affected us (namely Applications Nos.3/2021/0583 and 3/2022/0110), because we were [REDACTED] development was on the opposite side of [REDACTED] that road.
4. Our objections, in order of priority, are:
 - (a) Loss of Privacy/Overlooking (paras 5-7 below);
 - (b) Proximity to Protected Trees/Safety (paras 8-9 below);
 - (c) Traffic Congestion (paras 10 -11 below);
 - (d) Traffic Safety (para 12 below);

- (e) Infrastructure (paras 13-15 below);
- (f) Noise Disturbance (para 16 below);
- (g) Other Matters (para 17 below).

Loss of Privacy/Overlooking

5. This is our principal objection. The proposed development would be very close [REDACTED] in between. The site plan shows no fewer than 20 two-storey house plots (Nos. [REDACTED] in two blocks of 10 along the other side of that driveway, and accordingly only a few metres [REDACTED]. From the site plan, at least 10 of these houses [REDACTED]. (Incidentally, [REDACTED] In case of any doubt, we would invite the planning officers or committee members [REDACTED]. If indeed the proposal were for bungalows at that location our objection would not apply, but it is for 10 two-storey houses.
6. Further, the illustration of that block of ten houses, as shown in the Street Scene drawings, shows only a low fence, at ground floor level. The Coloured Plan reveals that it will be only 1.2 metres high. Accordingly, in addition to loss of [REDACTED] it will be [REDACTED]. In the event of grant of the application, contrary to our objection, we would ask the planning committee to make it a condition that the fence is about 2 metres high. Is this not indeed a common condition to protect garden privacy (see, e.g., the Hawthorn Road development in Barrow where garden fences are 1.8 metres high). Please note that even if there were bungalows at that location this objection and/or condition request would still apply.
7. We would respectfully submit that the application should be rejected on this ground alone. Alternatively, if the planning committee is minded to allow some building development, we would submit that it be limited to 57 houses by refusing permission for plots 13-22 and 37-46 and requiring no building within 25 metres of the three TPO trees at the boundary. In the further alternative, allow only bungalows in that location. In any event, a 1.2 metre boundary fence is too low

Proximity to Protected Trees/Safety

8. As we read it, the application does mention the three mature Lime trees which are on the same side of Bramley Meade Hall's driveway as the proposed development and so are at its boundary, but we submit that the Tree Impact Assessment and Survey refers to these trees inaccurately or misleadingly. The arboricultural consultant says that "no trees along its boundaries" have TPOs. This is wrong. These trees are all marked as G2 on the plan. In the Report they are referred to as being off site by "the highway". But there is no highway.

They are in the verge of the private driveway to Bramley Meade Hall. All have TPOs. Their height is estimated at 25 metres. We note the root protection provision but this is to protect the trees during construction. We are more concerned by safety risks after construction. The report does not however appear to indicate how many metres from those trees the closest of the houses would be, but we would estimate much less than 25 metres. Some of the houses of plots 13-22 and 37-46 would appear to be within a few metres of those very tall trees and well within falling distance. Is there not some restriction on building new houses so close to mature trees? Would it not be good practice only to build at least as far away as their height, in this case 25 metres?

9. Indeed, they would probably be within falling distance of a [REDACTED] which is the same height and maturity as the G2 trees (and also has a TPO). This tree is not mentioned in the report and is not covered by the root protection proposal although it is closer to our house (within damaging distance if it fell)

Traffic Congestion

10. The SCI blithely brushes away traffic concerns. It seems to lay stress on changing the residents' behaviour. Apparently they will all be presented with a copy of the Travel Plan. The reality is that, as the quoted survey shows, 78% of car-owning residents of Whalley drive to work. This is our own lived experience. The proposed development provides 151 parking spaces and it is overwhelmingly likely that all will be filled, quite possibly added to by pavement parking (again see, e.g., the reality of behaviour on the Hawthorn Road development) and most of the cars will be driven daily onto the already busy local roads. Also, please note that the shortest route from this development to the Whalley By-Pass would be to turn left out of the new entrance, then left again along Wiswell Lane. Wiswell Lane is a road without marking which was lightly used before the (still incomplete) development at Lawsonsteads. The proposed link road through that development from Clitheroe Road to the by-pass remains incomplete – although there are a large number of houses and residents at the Whalley end which opens onto Clitheroe Road, which means that many of the residents of the part-built Lawsonsteads development use Wiswell Lane as a 'rat-run'. As the local highway authority well knows – local councilors have raised the concerns of residents of Wiswell Lane - this has led to serious deterioration of the surface, requiring a regular need for pothole repairs with associated disruption and delay caused by temporary traffic lights). The reality of behaviour on Lawsonsteads suggests that the pious hope of the residents of the proposed development all becoming walkers or cyclists is risible.
11. We submit that the planning committee should not consider granting any part of this application until after the Lawsonsteads development has been completed and the purpose-built link road opened.

Traffic Safety

12. The opening of a new entrance/exit onto Clitheroe Road, only a short distance

from the bridge under the by-pass, which would be approached by vehicles from the Clitheroe direction from a 'blind' left hand bend is troubling. At present, the site is only entered occasionally by farm vehicles in connection with the use of the field for sheep grazing and hay baling. The proposed new access point, for daily use by dozens of vehicles on the applicant's own estimate, or well over a hundred on ours, looks like an accident or rather many accidents waiting to happen. We believe that the very extensive off-site work proposed (reducing the speed limit, moving bus stops, traffic calming, a ghost lane at the new junction) means that the risks are plainly recognised but rather than effectively dealing with them we submit that these proposals merely demonstrate that the location inappropriate for such a development.

Infrastructure

13. In brief, leaving aside the serious traffic issues, we should raise the provision of schools and GPs, both of which are again rather blithely brushed aside.
14. As to schools, we understand them to be currently full and the applicant seems to rely on the idea that there will be falling rolls sufficient to accommodate any children from this development. Firstly, by definition this will be unproven until the future. Secondly for the sake of argument, if every two-, three- or four-bed house had at least one child or maybe two will there be capacity for 69 to 138 children? Thirdly, why should it be expected that parents will move into Whalley on the basis that they must then take or bus their children miles elsewhere?
15. As to GPs, we have no doubt that the local surgery is willing to accept more patients, given the capitation basis of NHS funding, but whether that means extra strain on the system and more delay for existing patients and any new ones is another matter. We are both patients of the local surgery. which is very good, but it can already take weeks to get an appointment (certainly if one wishes to see a particular doctor). We are fairly certain that provision was originally made in previous applications in Whalley (e.g. Calderstones and Lawsonsteads) for a new surgery and a new school. Neither has ever been built and presumably amendments were made after the event. This site might be thought, by some, ideal for provision of space for a new surgery or school but we note that the applicant does not include any space for these. Should it perhaps be a condition that they do so (recognizing that of course LCC or NHS might have actually to build them).

Noise disturbance

16. As we said in paragraph 3 above, we have not previously objected to planning applications. However the 2021 and 2022 grants led to unexpectedly prolonged noise disturbance. The work seemed to take forever, perhaps because of the amendment and/or fresh application, but overall it continued through the summers of 2021 and 2022, with drilling, hammering and the like every weekday, making it impossible on many fine days to enjoy the front garden and seating areas of our house. We dread the prospect of what seems,

on the applicant's own timescale to be at least two years of 77-times that noise – and much closer.

Other Matters

17. We confess that we are not sure whether the following are or are not material planning considerations, but:
- (a) the field may not be a public green space but it is a green space;
 - (b) it is also not a case of the field being unused because it is used at different times in the year, for grazing sheep and hay baling and, as such, performs a vital agricultural purpose; and
 - (c) it is not uncommon to see wild deer in the field. We do not know whether they live in the wooded area near the bypass or come across the by pass from the Barrow side, but any development will obviously damage their habitat.

Conclusion

18. We hope and trust that the planning committee (and the planning officers) will give careful consideration to our objection and either:
- (a) reject the application in its entirety; or
 - (b) reject it in part by limiting it to 57 houses or fewer; or
 - (c) otherwise imposing such conditions as will prevent any loss of [REDACTED], whether this be by requiring only bungalows along the boundary with the Bramley Meade Hall driveway or some other modification.
19. One final point. The applicant is (as it boasts in the SCI, para 1.7) a well-established builder of luxury homes, having in particular built “a number of 3 – 6 bed luxury residences” although of course it has “recently” moved into “affordable” housing, but with only one such development identified. Its original desire was to construct 18 such ‘self-build’ homes. Perforce, it has cut its cloth following the indication by RVBC that such an application would be rejected, by shifting focus, no doubt reluctantly, to the “affordability”. Without a doubt, it would still rather build those 18 homes (see SCI para 3.2). All the reasons for not permitting that development would still apply but for the word “affordable” although one wonders what that really means in the context of house prices in the Whalley area even for new small two- and three- bed (again, e.g., the Hawthorn Road development). Nowhere in the supporting documentation can we find any indication of the proposed prices of the proposed “affordable” homes. Can the committee enforcibly ensure that there will be no amendments in due course to increase the size and reduce the number of houses? No doubt, the committee will apply its own experience of other recent developments, large and small, in this area to that question.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 18 August 2025 15:11
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0588 FS-Case-741671695

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Lancashire

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0588

Address of Development: Land east of Clitheroe Road, Whalley

Comments: Please do not grant permission to PRINGLE HOMES to build one bedroom housing. Whalley as been ruined by all the new builds. The Doctors are overwhelmed by extra patients. The schools are bursting at the seams too. Not to mention the traffic. I moved back to the Ribble Valley after being in Northumberland for many years. I cannot get over the amount of new builds in Whalley...Its a mess. I oppose the building of these homes. Its not as if they want to build for families. I am sorry to say that it will be undesirables in this accomodation. No one wants these Homes.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 18 August 2025 14:53
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0588 FS-Case-741661680

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Lancashire

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0588

Address of Development: Land East of Clitheroe Road Whalley

Comments: I strongly object to the building of even more RENTED. The area is changing and there isn't the infrastructure to accommodate even more houses.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 18 August 2025 14:40
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0588 FS-Case-741652023

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Lancashire

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0588

Address of Development: Land east of Clitheroe Road, Whalley.

Comments: If the sewerage from this proposed development joins the system used by Grasscroft Way ,I object strongly. After very heavy rain we regularly have raw sewage, etc running down the road and into the newt corridor (storm drain). The sewerage system just cannot cope.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 18 August 2025 14:14
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0588 FS-Case-741641196

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Lancashire

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0588

Address of Development: Land east of clitheroe road.

Comments: Re Pringle Homes application.

I strongly object to the application for 77 affordable rentals flats and houses being built between Whalley and Barrow. I do this on the basis of potential damage to wildlife, increased traffic and congestion in Whalley the negative impact on local services, doctors and schools.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 18 August 2025 13:51
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0588 FS-Case-741616381

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Lancashire

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0588

Address of Development: Land east of Clitheroe Road, Whalley

Comments: I strongly oppose this development. There has been so much development in Whalley, Barrow and Billington in recent years and I feel that additional housing in this area is not required. The traffic congestion in Whalley has increased over recent years and parking in Whalley village is now virtually impossible at peak times, 77 more houses will make this worse. The local schools, GPs, dentists are already under pressure. houses are still being built in Whalley and this development could be the straw that breaks the camels back.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 18 August 2025 13:47
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0588 FS-Case-741629300

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Lancashire

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0588

Address of Development: Pringle

Comments: This area is now so overdeveloped, we moved here 8years ago to get away from busy areas. Had we known all these housing estates who be so huge, we would have looked elsewhere. Whalley is getting choked with cars, and people. Leave at least one greenfield alone here!!!

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 18 August 2025 13:46
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0588 FS-Case-741624814

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Lancashire

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0588

Address of Development: Land east of Clitheroe Road Whalley

Comments: Un-necessary, unneeded and of no benefit whatsoever to locals. Additional strain on existing overstretched amenities (for example try getting a doctors appointment quickly). Spoiling what little local countryside we have left. The only people to benefit are the rapacious developers, the land owner and the council in extra community charges. When will over-development ever stop?

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 18 August 2025 13:46
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0588 FS-Case-741621754

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Lancashire

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0588

Address of Development: Land east of Clitheroe road Whalley

Comments: I strongly object to these proposed plans. Please Please do not take more green fields away. I always see so much wildlife there; curlews, hawks, kites, all manner of birds, deer (in April i saw a young family of 3), There are bats, rabbits, squirrels butterflies ans so much more. I moved here 10 years ago and in this time the area has become unrecognisable. The traffic is busy and Whalley and Barrow is losing it charm of a peaceful village life.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 18 August 2025 13:10
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0588 FS-Case-741609271

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Lancashire

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0588

Address of Development: Land East of Clitheroe Road, Whalley

Comments: I firmly believe that the application to build 77 affordable rented properties is not in the best interests of the Whalley area and community. There have been a number of new builds properties over the last 10 years, bringing in an increased population without any increase in infrastructure. Doctors surgeries, schools, supermarkets and shops are already at capacity before even current house builds have been completed, not to mention the increased traffic across all roads in and out of the area. The addition of another 77 new homes would only compound these issues.