

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 21 August 2025 08:48
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0588 FS-Case-742660958

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0588

Address of Development: Land East of Clitheroe Road Whalley

Comments: 1. Highways Safety – Speeding and Dangerous Conditions

Whalley already suffers from serious traffic-related safety issues:

- Speeding is a persistent and well-known problem along Clitheroe Road, Mitton Road, and other routes in and out of the village. There is a lack of effective traffic calming measures and few safe pedestrian crossings.
- Clitheroe Road, the only proposed access point, already sees high volumes of fast-moving traffic, making new turning movements hazardous.
- Introducing over 120+ additional vehicles from this development will significantly increase risk to pedestrians, cyclists, and school children, especially during peak times.

2. Severe Traffic Congestion and Village Gridlock

Whalley's road network is already at capacity:

- Peak-hour traffic sees long queues forming along Clitheroe Road and Mitton Road.
- The village's mini-roundabouts and narrow streets become gridlocked, particularly during school runs, weekends, and public events.
- The addition of 77 dwellings will further overwhelm local roads with no plans to upgrade infrastructure or mitigate traffic flow.

This level of intensification is incompatible with the existing road capacity and will worsen congestion for all residents and visitors.

3. Inadequate Parking in Whalley

Parking is already a critical issue in Whalley:

- The village centre has limited public parking, which is already under pressure from existing residents, shoppers, and commuters.
- Visitors frequently park on pavements, grass verges, and side streets, causing access problems and safety concerns.
- This development does nothing to alleviate that pressure, and will only increase demand on already limited parking capacity.

Without new public parking or serious investment in alternatives, this scheme will have a negative knock-on effect on the village economy and quality of life.

4. Inappropriate Location for Social Rented Housing

While there is a need for affordable and social housing across the borough, this site is not an appropriate location for social rented accommodation:

- The site is detached from key services and public transport, limiting access to employment, education, and healthcare for those who may rely on them most.
- Whalley is not well served by strong public transport, and residents without cars would face isolation.
- The development would place social housing residents in a car-dependent location with limited walkable amenities and no guaranteed access to services.

Social rented housing should be located in town centres, close to transport hubs, schools, and employment, where residents have genuine access to opportunity and support. This proposal fails that test.

5. Unsuitable Scale and Overdevelopment

This is a large development on greenfield land at the edge of the village:

- It is not allocated in the Ribble Valley Local Plan for housing.
- Its suburban-style layout and density are inconsistent with Whalley's character and surrounding landscape.
- Cumulatively, it represents overdevelopment and urban sprawl into open countryside.

6. Pressure on Local Infrastructure and Services

Whalley's infrastructure is already overstretched:

- Schools and GP practices are close to or already at capacity.
- There is no evidence in the application of planned investment in local infrastructure to meet increased demand.
- Public transport options are limited

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 20 August 2025 16:46
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0588 FS-Case-742546216

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0588

Address of Development: Land east of Clitheroe Road Whalley

Comments: With regards to the above proposed development I am writing to formally object to this proposal.

We have lived in [REDACTED] Indeed this development itself itself caused some objections.

During the last ten years there have been numerous other developments in the Whalley area. From memory I can count at least four new developments resulting in additional dwellings of approximately 500+ houses.

Whilst some of these developments have brought vibrancy to the Whalley area and an additional number of affordable houses the continued development has also placed significant pressure on local services.

During this time there has been limited investment/ improvements in the infrastructure in Whalley. The exception to this is a refurbishment and minor expansion of the Barrow school.

No improvements/ expansions have been made to services including GP services, dentists for NHS patients, improved road infrastructure to ease the congestion on Clitheroe Road and in Whalley at peak times. No expansion of school places, the list goes on.

I would assume this new proposed development will not improve the local infrastructure but indeed add more pressure to it.

Why does the continued expansion of housing in this area not come with investment in local infrastructure from the significant profits made by the developers?

I object to this proposal as I have no confidence that any improvements will be made and the current situation will continue to deteriorate.

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 20 August 2025 17:10
To: Planning
Subject: Planning application 3/2025/0588

 **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.

Land east of Clitheroe road Whalley

Dear Sir/Madam

I object to the application above

At the age of [REDACTED] I have seen so many changes to Whalley's disadvantage . It has got to stress levels which causes accidents .The village is already bursting at the seams with a need for school places and NHS services and parking .We don't need more houses .

Kind Regards

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 20 August 2025 20:09
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0588 FS-Case-742593013

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0588

Address of Development: Land east of Clitheroe Road Whalley

Comments: I'd like to object to this proposed development as a concerned resident of nearby Barrow. The development is completely out of character with the existing properties in the area, both nearby and further afield. 77 rented flats and houses, including one bed apartments would be at complete odds to the surrounding properties and existing landscape. I would question why such a development is being proposed right on the fringe of Whalley.

Whalley and Barrow have seen an explosion of new housing in recent years which have had a massive impact on both the character of the area and traffic levels, but also on services such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The area is close to being completely spoilt if this level of unchecked development is allowed to continue. This development would effectively close the gap between Whalley and Barrow and contribute towards an ever growing urban sprawl running from Blackburn through to Clitheroe.

I'm not only against this particular development, I'm against any development on this site. Such a high density development will have a massive detrimental effect on the nature and ecology established on this piece of land, which is both varied and abundant. Development on this site will remove another natural habit from existence, which should be avoided at all costs taking into account the nature crisis that the UK is facing as highlighted by the 2023 "State of Nature" report, which reinforced the view that the UK is one of the most "nature-depleted" countries in the world.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 20 August 2025 20:18
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0588 FS-Case-742597391

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0588

Address of Development: Land east of Clitheroe Road Whalley

Comments: I vehemently object to this planning application. The proposal for more housing is absolutely unacceptable given the overdevelopment already suffered in this area. An area already which has had multiple significant housing developments which have never included funding or action to provide / increase the infrastructure and services to the community to account for the strain an increase in population such developments would put on schools, doctors and GPs, dentists, parking, traffic, etc. This list could go on. Whalley and the surrounding area has already been horrendously impacted by developers being allowed to build on beautiful green-field sites, now lost to the community, and have destroyed the village atmosphere of a once charming area.

I strongly feel a number of local policies are violated by this proposal. Any one of which should be grounds to reject the planning application:

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.

In Summary:

1. The site in question is unallocated in the Local Plan and conflicts with Policies DS1, DMG2, and DMH3.
2. The development is disproportionate to Whalley's small size (2021 Census: 4,052 people) and conflicts with DMG1 and EN2.
3. Ribble Valley already has a 6.2-year housing supply, so there is no need for speculative development here (NPPF para 78, Dec 2024).
4. The access via Clitheroe Road/A59 will create traffic and safety problems, contrary to DMG1 and DMG3.

I implore you to put a stop to this planning application, in order to protect what remains of the local village community in Whalley. Such a development would be the final nail in the coffin of the local infrastructure and services; creates needless traffic and safety concerns; and seeks to build housing for a need that does not exist in the area, given the sufficient housing supply in the Ribble Valley.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 20 August 2025 20:33
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0588 FS-Case-742601441

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0588

Address of Development: Land East of Clitheroe Road, Whalley

Comments: Dear Stephen,

OBJECTION - 3/2025/0588 – Land to East of Clitheroe Road, Whalley

I am writing to formally object to the above mentioned application made by Pringle Homes [REDACTED]. The site lies outside of the Settlement Boundary and is unallocated land used for agricultural purposes it is not as is frequently insinuated by the application vacant land. These two matters should generally be sufficient to protect the site from development.

Policy Objections

1. That the application is founded entirely on the requirement to provide affordable housing.
 2. That the provision of affordable housing provides an escape route from the restriction to develop the open countryside under the planning policy framework.
- Dealing with these points in turn.

Need for affordable housing

The requirement for affordable housing is not itself a local need. This is an important distinction because the requirement for affordable housing is in fact a housing need. The references in policy that refer to exceptions for local need does not immediately translate to an exception for a housing need. In short, the applicant has erroneously conflicted the two terms of local need and housing need.

In order for the exceptions to policy that rely on the terminology “local need “, the applicant would have to demonstrate how a need has risen locally (i.e. in the immediate vicinity of the area) and how the proposal meets that identified need. That exercise has not been undertaken in the supporting documents, given that the applicant has conflated the terms housing need to equal local need. Put bluntly, housing need is not LOCAL housing need so should not override policy prohibitions on the development of this site.

Relevant policy

The applicant's case is founded on policy DMG2 headed "strategic considerations".

They rightly point out that DMG2 split is into broadly two parts, with the first part relating to development proposals within the principal settlements of Clitheroe, Longridge and Whalley and Tier 1 villages. The requirement is that development in these locations should relate to the main built-up areas and ensure it is appropriate to the scale of and in keeping with the existing settlement.

The second part of DMG2 relates to the remaining defined settlement areas known as Tier 2 villages. There, the policy then sets out a number of considerations at least one of which must be met by development outside the defined settlement areas of the Tier 2 villages.

It is here that I think the applicant is making a further error, namely that affordable housing need across the borough can be interpreted as a local need, then the applicant is still wrong by justifying its case that policy DMG2 allows for exceptions for affordable housing.

This is because the definition of terms is contained at policy DS1, which is headed key statement and "development strategy". Policy DS1 states that the majority of new housing development will be concentrated within a defined strategic site in the principal settlements of Clitheroe, Longridge and Whalley.

The policy then says that in addition to the strategic site and the principal settlements as defined above, development will then be focused towards 32 defined settlements. In turn, those 32 defined settlements are split into two categories known as Tier 1 and Tier 2. Tier 1 contains 9 villages, and Tier 2 the remainder 23.

In other words, policy DS1 uses the words "defined settlements" to mean the villages within both categories.

Returning to policy DMG2 it states the following at part 2, being the part heavily relied upon by the applicant:

" Within the Tier 2 villages and outside the defined settlement areas development must meet at least one of the following considerations..."

It follows that the reference in this second part to DMG2 to "the Tier 2 villages" and "outside the defined settlement areas" is either a reference explicitly to the "Tier 2 villages" or to the 32 defined settlement areas to which policy DS1 addresses itself.

If the criteria at policy DMG2 were to apply to all the settlements, namely the principal settlements as well as the 32 villages, then it would say so. It does not say that.

My opinion is that the second part of policy DMG2 relates entirely to the Tier 2 villages otherwise it would not begin with the words "within the Tier 2 villages and outside the defined settlement areas" - as the approach of the local plan is to define where those settlement areas are.

In overall terms, the applicant is placing considerable weight on an interpretation of policy which I

think is erroneous. I also think they have erroneously conflated the terms housing need with local need, and I think local need in this context means highly specific to the villages where a need might be identified. It does not mean a need that is generally required across the wider geographic area of the entire Ribble Valley.

Appeal Decision APP/T2350/W/20/3248156

This appeal was on land contiguous with the application site and shares very many of the same physical and policy considerations. The Council as you know refused this application and the Inspector upheld that decision on Appeal. You will know far better all the circumstance of that appeal so I shall not regurgitate them verbatim but the lack of connection to the settlement, the lack of footpaths, the density of the proposals on what is effectively open greenfield on the rural fringe of the village, all such characteristics are shared with this site. There has been no attempt to reflect the local vernacular despite what the Design and Access statement says, section 5 refers to the site as being surrounded by various house types, which is simply untrue (the site is simply not surrounded by housing, and therefore it follows it cannot be surrounded by housing types).

Section 7 refers to the character of Whalley. There is no reference in the Design and Access statement that the character of Whalley is largely influenced by the setting, namely it being as a whole surrounded by open countryside, of which the site forms a part.

Section 9 shows the proposed layout which is essentially a residential estate with few (if any) linkages to its surroundings, and as such the development would operate as a self-contained enclave.

On this latter point what is proposed by the applicant would be more a ghetto than an enclave, 100% Affordable rent is not policy compliant. The likely inhabitants would more than likely to be more reliant to upon local services, healthcare and education rather than other residents in Whalley but at this site they will be remote from those very services.

The surroundings of the site are characterised by detached homes set in extensive gardens with mature hedging and trees, this very particular character runs pretty much the full length of Clitheroe Road from its junction with Wiswell Lane up to the A59 bridge. There are simply no examples of the form of development proposed on this site and the materials chosen, artificial slate and reconstituted stone-look blocks are equally incongruous. Accrington Red brick, real slate and real stone quarried in Padiham are the actual identifier materials in this location.

The Arboricultural Reports fails to mention protected trees which are identified on RV own available records, the Ecologist fails to reflect the valuable contribution the site plays as a wildlife corridor for foraging the commuting species. There is no sustainable drainage solution proposed for this development at all and the Highways proposition is to undertake massive intervention on Clitheroe Road, road alterations, two new crossings, changing speed limits and adding general highway clutter and detracting from the pleasant rural feel of Clitheroe Road at this point.

I could continue at length to pick at just about every one of the supporting report, as a generally comment it seem like an application that has been rushed in, with the hope that their erroneous Housing need argument will trump every other consideration. You will of course need to wrestle with the planning balance of the benefits against harms but as one of those who will be impacted the most, I cannot see how this can be supported. We set up a Web-forum earlier this week to collate local resident's views and thus far we have had nothing but 100% support of our objection to this proposal.

The largely held view is that Whalley and Barrow have already taken the brunt of new Housing

development over recent years, we can only assume that policy compliant in terms of Affordable provision have also been made so once again the residents of Whalley have done more than their fair share such provision. So, to ask residents to now accept another 77 Affordable homes, to rent is completely unacceptable.

If there is any aspect you wish to discuss in this objection please do contact me at any time.

Kind regards

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 20 August 2025 21:28
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0588 FS-Case-742610549

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0588

Address of Development: Landsat clitheroe road whalley

Comments: I object to this proposal due to the following - • 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.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 20 August 2025 21:46
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0588 FS-Case-742610139

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0588

Address of Development: Land east of Clitheroe Rd, Whalley

Comments: We feel that Whalley, Barrow and Clitheroe has had more than its fair share of new housing already and in a very short time frame.
The countryside, its wildlife and the environment cannot sustain the amount of existing building work, let alone new building work that is proposed.
We appreciate there is a need for affordable housing, but there are plenty of properties for sale within a 3 to 5 mile radius of Whalley, that is affordable and in desperate need of habitation. Why cause more devastation to the environment when clearly there are vacant properties for sale?
Most of these areas have much better access, infrastructure and services (ie schools and doctors). Whalley is a very small town with limited services and would be unable to sustain this level of increase in population and traffic.
Please reconsider this application.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 20 August 2025 21:57
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0588 FS-Case-742606959

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0588

Address of Development: Land East of Clitheroe Road Whalley

Comments: Why do property developers need to develop green land?
Why do property developers choose to develop in rural areas?
Do property developers really consider the impact of their desire to develop the impact on the local residents?

Do all the authorities that look at a planning applications too consider the impact on local communities?

This application I do not consider of any benefit to Whalley or Barrow or Wiswell. The area has significantly increased these past ten years. Yet if passed it will further impact on all 3 villages with doctors appointments, school placements, possibly bin collections, road congestion, increase in traffic and lack of retail facilities plus the impact on our waste water treatment.

It is a concern the council would permit releasing Green land and removing more green from what once was a rural area.

Both Whalley and Barrow have seen excessive growth in building these past 20 years. Yet there has not been any recognised finance to support the Health Care and Education and general Council services in the area. The services are stretched.
As a [REDACTED] discussions 25 years ago were being considered bussing children in Whalley to schools outside their local Ribble Valley schools. The population then was significantly less.

The new dwellings proposal does not seem aimed for supporting the surrounding villages growth.

Why the need to remove a rural area and using green land to make it urban. Without the support in the infrastructure?

This seems application if passed is supporting a property developer who wants to maximise their profit above local area needs and too destroying green areas.

The main objection is it is bringing a greater population to an over stretched Area and further eroding the green areas that are left.

Green spaces matter to a populations well being.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 21 August 2025 07:57
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0588 FS-Case-742651737

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0588

Address of Development: Land east of Clitheroe Road Whalley, (77 no: affordable dwellings by Pringle Homes).

Comments: Objection to Planning Application 3/2025/0588

Dear Sir/Madam,

I strongly object to the above application for the following reasons:

- **Conflict with the Local Plan:** The site is not allocated for housing in the Ribble Valley Core Strategy. Building here is contrary to Policies DS1, DMG2 and DMH3, which direct new housing to allocated sites within settlement boundaries.
- **Disproportionate Scale:** Whalley is a small parish of just 4,000 residents (2021 Census). A single 77-home estate is disproportionate in size, failing to “round off” the village as required by Policy DMG2, and eroding its character and rural setting, contrary to DMG1 and EN2.
- **No Housing Need:** Ribble Valley currently has a 6.2-year housing land supply (1,324 dwellings, May 2025), well above the required 5 years. The borough is delivering on housing targets, so there is no justification for speculative development here. The NPPF (Dec 2024) confirms that the presumption in favour of development does not apply where housing supply is above 5 years.
- **Transport and Safety Issues:** The proposed access onto Clitheroe Road is immediately before the A59 underpass, an area already known for congestion, speeding, and flooding. Adding a new junction and the traffic from 77 dwellings is unsafe and conflicts with Policy DMG3 and the NPPF requirement for safe and suitable access.
- **Loss of Countryside and Green Gap:** The site lies in open countryside, which should be protected under Policy EN2. Development here would reduce the important green separation between Whalley and Barrow.
- **Infrastructure Strain:** Local GPs, schools, and parking are already stretched to capacity. More housing will place further pressure on services and harm community sustainability, contrary to the objectives of Policy DS1.

Conclusion

This proposal is unnecessary, disproportionate, and contrary to multiple policies of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy (DS1, DMG1, DMG2, DMG3, DMH3, EN2) as well as the NPPF. Whalley has already taken significant growth, and with a housing land supply well above 5 years, there is no justification for approving speculative development in the open countryside.

For these reasons, I respectfully ask the Council to refuse this application.

Regards

■

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 20 August 2025 16:23
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0588 FS-Case-742544599

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0588

Address of Development: Land East of Clitheroe Road Whalley

Comments: I am struggling to understand the approach being taken. Self-build homes—which are in keeping with the existing houses on this road—are not being supported, yet affordable rented houses and flats are being considered. This feels inconsistent with the character of the area and raises concerns about the suitability of the proposals.