

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 19 August 2025 11:22  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0588 FS-Case-741990484

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Lancashire

[REDACTED]

**Planning Application Reference No.:** 3/2025/0588

**Address of Development:** Land East of Clitheroe Road, Whalley

**Comments:** Access to the proposed development would be extremely dangerous due to traffic travelling from Clitheroe towards Whalley approaching the site round a fast blind bend. The number of properties proposed is excessive for the size of the site and will add more people and vehicles to an already overcrowded village. Access to local services such as Doctors and Dentists is already seriously overstretched and parking is becoming a nightmare in Whalley. The location of the site adjacent to the A59 is one of the few remaining areas of greenery in Whalley and should remain so. The proposed development is not in keeping with existing properties in the area and would attract high numbers of single adults leading to a degradation of standards of maintenance and anti social behaviour, reminiscent to that seen in many of our larger towns and cities.

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 19 August 2025 13:08  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0588 FS-Case-742052368

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Lancashire

[REDACTED]

**Planning Application Reference No.:** 3/2025/0588

**Address of Development:** Land East of Clitheroe Road Whalley

**Comments:** I would like to object to the above application due to the following reasons;

1. The development is outside of the defined settlement boundary and is not an allocated development site which is in direct contradiction to RVBC Core Strategy DS1.
2. The proposal represents development that is out of character with its location and therefore does not meet the RVBC Core Strategy DMG1.
3. Impact on wildlife due to the loss of an important wildlife corridor contradicting RVBC Key statement EN2 (landscape).
4. Loss of green belt land and open countryside in contradiction to RVBC Strategy DMH3.
5. Housing allocation within the Ribble Valley is already beyond Government targets.
6. Additional Traffic utilising and already overwhelmed road network.
7. Additional strain on local services (Doctors, Dentist, car parking, etc.)

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 19 August 2025 13:03  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0588 FS-Case-742048361

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Lancashire

[REDACTED]

**Planning Application Reference No.:** 3/2025/0588

**Address of Development:** Land east of Clitheroe Road Whalley

**Comments:** [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

19 August 2025

To: Steven Kilmartin  
Planning Officer  
Ribble Valley Borough Council  
Council Offices, Church Walk, Clitheroe BB7 2RA  
Planning Application Reference: 3/2025/0588

Subject: Objection to Planning Application 3/2025/0588 – Residential Development East of Whalley

Dear Mr. Kilmartin,

I am writing to formally object to the proposed development of 77 residential dwellings on land east of Whalley, adjacent to Clitheroe Road, as outlined in planning application 3/2025/0588.

**1. Site Allocation and Planning Policy Conflict**

The proposed site is unallocated for development and lies outside the settlement boundary of Whalley. It is not identified in the Ribble Valley Borough Council's Local Plan or Master Plan as suitable for housing. Approving this application would undermine the strategic planning framework and set a precedent for speculative development on greenfield land.

This proposal appears to conflict with several key policies, including:

- Policy DS1 – Development Strategy
- Policy DMG2 – Strategic Considerations
- Policy EN2 – Landscape Protection

## 2. Harm to Landscape and Rural Character

The site is a greenfield area that contributes to the open countryside and rural setting of Whalley.

Development here would result in:

- Loss of visual amenity from Clitheroe Road and surrounding areas
- Erosion of the village's rural character
- Potential harm to biodiversity and natural habitats

## 3. Infrastructure, Traffic and Environmental Concerns

There is insufficient infrastructure to support a development of this scale. Specific concerns include:

- Increased traffic on Clitheroe Road, leading to greater congestion
- Associated rise in air pollution, which may negatively impact public health and the local environment
- Elevated safety risks for pedestrians and cyclists, particularly given the proximity to a busy through-route
- Pressure on local schools, healthcare services, and utilities

## 4. Loss of Habitat for Protected and Red List Species

The proposed development would result in the destruction of valuable habitat that supports a range of protected and red-listed species. These include:

- Bats such as the pipistrelle, noctule, and brown long-eared bat, all of which are protected under UK and EU law
- Barn owls and greenfinches, both of which are on the Red List for Birds of Conservation Concern
- Other protected species such as badgers, great crested newts, and various reptiles known to inhabit the area

The loss of this habitat would be irreversible and contrary to national and local biodiversity objectives.

## 5. Drainage and Flooding Risks

The existing drainage infrastructure is already under strain and frequently unable to cope with heavy rainfall. The proposed development would result in the loss of natural rainwater soakaway, due to the introduction of hard landscaping and impermeable surfaces. This will significantly increase surface water run-off, exacerbating flooding on Clitheroe Road, which has previously rendered the road impassable — as witnessed earlier this year — forcing vehicles to drive onto verges to pass safely. This poses further risks to pedestrians and other road users and undermines the resilience of local infrastructure.

## 6. Non-Compliance with National Planning Policy Framework

The proposal does not comply with Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which requires developments to be well-designed, locally responsive, and environmentally sustainable. The scale, location, and design of this development would undermine the character of Whalley and fail to deliver a safe, inclusive, and high-quality environment.

## 7. Prematurity and Lack of Justification

This application is premature, given that the site is not part of any current or emerging housing allocation. It lacks justification in terms of housing need, especially when other allocated sites remain undeveloped.

## Conclusion

For the reasons outlined above, I respectfully urge the Planning Authority to refuse this application.

The proposal is contrary to established planning policy, unsustainable, and harmful to the local environment and community.

Yours faithfully,

A solid black rectangular box used to redact a signature.

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 19 August 2025 13:00  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0588 FS-Case-742044405

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Lancashire

[REDACTED]

**Planning Application Reference No.:** 3/2025/0588

**Address of Development:** Land east of Clitheroe Rd, Whalley

**Comments:** I oppose the development of the new proposed planning application on several grounds.

1. Impact on wildlife . Previous building companies have already destroyed a pond which housed Great Crested Newts. On this site and within a few hundred yards there is habitat for bats, deer, badgers and more importantly just the other side of the bridge is nesting and breeding for Curlews.
2. Our local infrastructure can not handle more residents as there are no availability at dentist, doctors and schools
3. The area is always flooded following any rain. The reduction of trees will again cause flooding to increase and added having no soakaways due to new roads and pavements.
4. Single room accommodation is not needed but two bedroom starter homes for existing local families at prices no more than £100k

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 19 August 2025 12:55  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0588 FS-Case-742046042

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Lancashire

[REDACTED]

**Planning Application Reference No.:** 3/2025/0588

**Address of Development:** Land east of Clitheroe rd whalley

**Comments:** ecology:%20The%20applicant%20is%20seeking%20to%20suggest%20there%20is%20poor%20habitat%20on%20this%20site%20yet%20we%20regularly%20see%20deer,%20hawks,%20bats%20and%20all%20manner%20of%20butterflies,%20bees,%20dragon%20flies%20and%20othe r%20forms%20of%20invertebrates.%0A%E2%80%A2%20Transport%20and%20Traffic%3A%20The %20planning%20application%20claims%20the%20site%20is%20well%20connected%20to%20the %20village%20but%20there%20are%20no%20public%20footpaths%20on%20that%20side%20of% 20Clitheroe%20Road%20at%20all.%20Whalley%20is%20already%20experiencing%20significant%2 0traffic%20congestion%20and%20regularly%20a%20car%20parking%20space%20cannot%20be% 20found%20in%20the%20village.%20The%20site%20access%20is%20also%20situated%20just%2 0before%20the%20A59%20flyover,%20directly%20where%20heavy%20flooding%20occurs%20in% 20any%20periods%20of%20heavy%20rainfall.%0A%E2%80%A2%20The%20social%20RENT%20ho mes%20that%20are%20proposed%20here%20are%20very%20unlike%20the%20affordable%20ho mes%20that%20Pringle%20have%20provided%20at%20Northcote%20Manor%20in%20terms%20o f%20format%20and%20scale%20but%20in%20their%20application,%20they%20seek%20to%20giv e%20the%20impression%20that%20is%20what%20they%20intend%20to%20build%20here.%0A% E2%80%A2%2077%20new%20homes%20will%20add%20additional%20pressure%20to%20NHS,% 20dentist,%20schools,%20and%20GP%20services.%0A%20Previous%20housebuilding%20in%20the%2 0village%20has%20promised%20to%20deliver%20funding%20to%20improve%20and%20expand% 20all%20of%20these%20services%20but%20from%20our%20day-to-day%20experiences%20we%20know%20this%20has%20not%20happened.%0A%E2%80%A2%20T he%20type%20of%20housing%20proposed%20does%20not%20match%20those%20in%20the%20l ocality,%20nor%20do%20they%20reflect%20a%20local%20vernacular%20in%20terms%20for%20 proposed%20materials.%20To%20add%2077%20highly%20packed%20dwellings%20into%20what %20is%20otherwise%20a%20low-density%20neighbourhood%20is%20unfeasible.%0A%E2%80%A2%20Appeal%20Decision%20APP/ 72350/W/20/3248156%20Planning%20was%20refused%20on%20the%20adjacent%20fields%20to %20this%20site%20in%202020%20having%20exactly%20the%20same%20set%20of%20circumsta nces.

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

19 August 2025

To: Steven Kilmartin  
Planning Officer  
Ribble Valley Borough Council  
Council Offices, Church Walk, Clitheroe BB7 2RA  
Planning Application Reference: 3/2025/0588

Subject: Objection to Planning Application 3/2025/0588 – Residential Development East of Whalley

Dear Mr. Kilmartin,

I am writing to formally object to the proposed development of 77 residential dwellings on land east of Whalley, adjacent to Clitheroe Road, as outlined in planning application 3/2025/0588.

#### 1. Site Allocation and Planning Policy Conflict

The proposed site is unallocated for development and lies outside the settlement boundary of Whalley. It is not identified in the Ribble Valley Borough Council's Local Plan or Master Plan as suitable for housing. Approving this application would undermine the strategic planning framework and set a precedent for speculative development on greenfield land.

This proposal appears to conflict with several key policies, including:

- Policy DS1 – Development Strategy
- Policy DMG2 – Strategic Considerations
- Policy EN2 – Landscape Protection

## 2. Harm to Landscape and Rural Character

The site is a greenfield area that contributes to the open countryside and rural setting of Whalley. Development here would result in:

- Loss of visual amenity from Clitheroe Road and surrounding areas
- Erosion of the village's rural character
- Potential harm to biodiversity and natural habitats

## 3. Infrastructure, Traffic and Environmental Concerns

There is insufficient infrastructure to support a development of this scale. Specific concerns include:

- Increased traffic on Clitheroe Road, leading to greater congestion
- Associated rise in air pollution, which may negatively impact public health and the local environment
- Elevated safety risks for pedestrians and cyclists, particularly given the proximity to a busy through-route
- Pressure on local schools, healthcare services, and utilities

## 4. Loss of Habitat for Protected and Red List Species

The proposed development would result in the destruction of valuable habitat that supports a range of protected and red-listed species. These include:

- Bats such as the pipistrelle, noctule, and brown long-eared bat, all of which are protected under UK and EU law
- Barn owls and greenfinches, both of which are on the Red List for Birds of Conservation Concern
- Other protected species such as badgers, great crested newts, and various reptiles known to inhabit the area

The loss of this habitat would be irreversible and contrary to national and local biodiversity objectives.

## 5. Drainage and Flooding Risks

The existing drainage infrastructure is already under strain and frequently unable to cope with heavy rainfall. The proposed development would result in the loss of natural rainwater soakaway, due to the introduction of hard landscaping and impermeable surfaces. This will significantly increase surface water run-off, exacerbating flooding on Clitheroe Road, which has previously rendered the road impassable — as witnessed earlier this year — forcing vehicles to drive onto verges to pass safely. This poses further risks to pedestrians and other road users and undermines the resilience of local infrastructure.

#### 6. Non-Compliance with National Planning Policy Framework

The proposal does not comply with Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which requires developments to be well-designed, locally responsive, and environmentally sustainable. The scale, location, and design of this development would undermine the character of Whalley and fail to deliver a safe, inclusive, and high-quality environment.

#### 7. Prematurity and Lack of Justification

This application is premature, given that the site is not part of any current or emerging housing allocation. It lacks justification in terms of housing need, especially when other allocated sites remain undeveloped.

#### Conclusion

For the reasons outlined above, I respectfully urge the Planning Authority to refuse this application. The proposal is contrary to established planning policy, unsustainable, and harmful to the local environment and community.

Yours faithfully,

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature and name of the sender.

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 19 August 2025 13:55  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0588 FS-Case-742074928

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Lancashire

[REDACTED]

**Planning Application Reference No.:** 3/2025/0588

**Address of Development:** Land east of Clitheroe

**Comments:** I'm objecting to this development - whalley is already at capacity - what once was a quiet village is now too busy. What benefit is 77 flats going to to bring to the village and the area ? More traffic, more struggles to get appointments at GP or/ and Dentist. Schools are over capacity - [REDACTED] had 47 pupils in her class and that was 5 years ago. We are at capacity this will cause more problems and solve nothing

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 19 August 2025 14:51  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0588 FS-Case-742086661

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Lancashire

[REDACTED]

**Planning Application Reference No.:** 3/2025/0588

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

**Comments:** I feel that the planning consent should be refused. There has already been sufficient housing built in this area, and the type of housing whatever it is, is not required in this area. There aren't job opportunities for additional home dwellers in the area and more housing would not benefit local people. The infrastructure is not geared towards the percentage of properties to local facilities such as doctors surgeries, schools and parking. The roads are ridiculously small for the amount of traffic already using them and Whalley is meant to be classed as a village not a town. Whalley used to be a pretty little village, unfortunately now it seems to be anything but that, filled with wine bars, clubs, takeaways and heaven knows what else. I avoid the place at all costs. When I need something I visit a town more suited to the purpose and with a town centre specifically designed for shopping etc. More housing will only make the village more crowded, and what used to attract more suitable visitors is very quickly disappearing. 50 years ago Whalley was a village with traditional sweet shops and roads that could be crossed safely even though the A671 wasn't in existence then near Wiswell Lane.

What attracts visitors is gradually being eroded away and this is not a case of Not In My Back Garden as Whalley has had more than enough development it can feasibly cope with. Pringle can use the site to build an additional health centre or school, but I very much doubt that this would be funded. People that already reside in the area should be catered for and unless I have missed all the tents, littering the streets of Whalley, housing is definitely not the main priority.

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 19 August 2025 14:46  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0588 FS-Case-742101831

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Lancashire

[REDACTED]

**Planning Application Reference No.:** 3/2025/0588

**Address of Development:** Land east of Clitheroe road whalley Pringle homes

**Comments:** Whalley does not need another housing estate ,enough is enough ,traffic is increasing through the village ,the schools are full ,doctors can't cope with all the new patients ,the drains won't be able to cope with all these houses it's just pure greed ,once Whalley and barrow were once nice villages they have been ruined in the last ten years ,

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 19 August 2025 15:06  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0588 FS-Case-742112122

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Lancashire

[REDACTED]

**Planning Application Reference No.:** 3/2025/0588

**Address of Development:** Land east of clitheroe road whalley

**Comments:** Key Local Policies (Ribble Valley Core Strategy 2008–2028)

- DS1 (Development Strategy) – new housing should be focused on allocated sites in main settlements. This site is not allocated.
- DMG2 (Development in Principal Settlements) – development must “consolidate, expand or round-off” the existing village in a way that is proportionate. This proposal is too large and outside the village boundary.
- DMH3 (Housing in Open Countryside) – housing outside boundaries is only permitted for local needs or agricultural use. Not met here.
- DMG1 (General Design) – requires proposals to protect amenity, character, and environment. A 77-home estate on greenfield land erodes character.
- DMG3 (Transport and Access) – development must ensure safe access and avoid severe traffic impacts. Clitheroe Road/A59 are already under strain.
- Key Statement EN2 (Landscape) – requires protection of the open countryside and settlement separation. The scheme would reduce the green gap between Whalley and Barrow.

#### Evidence & Statistics

- Whalley population (2021 Census): 4,052 (civil parish). A 77-home scheme is disproportionate to this small settlement.
- Ribble Valley housing land supply (May 2025): 6.2 years deliverable supply (1,324 dwellings). The borough has more than enough homes planned.
- NPPF (Dec 2024): presumption in favour of development does not apply because the Council has over 5 years’ supply and passes the Housing Delivery Test.

#### Simple phrases to use

- “The site is unallocated in the Local Plan and conflicts with Policies DS1, DMG2, and DMH3.”
- “The development is disproportionate to Whalley’s small size (2021 Census: 4,052 people) and conflicts with DMG1 and EN2.”
- “Ribble Valley already has a 6.2-year housing supply, so there is no need for speculative

development here (NPPF para 78, Dec 2024).”

- “The access via Clitheroe Road/A59 will create traffic and safety problems, contrary to DMG1 and DMG3.”