

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 28 November 2025 14:30
To: Planning
Subject: 3/2025/0801 Salesbury View

⚠ 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.

Appeal Ref: 3/2025/0801

Land to the east of Salesbury View, Wilpshire Lancashire

I wish to object in the strongest terms to the proposed development. It is unbelievable that this land remains as a possible site for the construction of houses. On February 5th 2025 A Veevers, BA(Hons) PGDip(BCon) MRTPI an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State refused the appeal to build on the above land made by Persimmon Homes.

I can only endorse her findings and, following a study of the new application made by Persimmon Homes, conclude that slightly changing the layout of the development and reducing the number of houses by just 4, will not address the issues [REDACTED]. The plans simply tinker around the edges. There is scant regard for the devastating effect 80 modern houses will have on a semi-rural area.

This green hill, currently used to graze cattle, gives Wilpshire a rural character. Any development would sadly reduce this. The prominent position of the houses, which cannot be obscured by trees due to the upward slope, will forever change the character of Ramsgreave and Wilpshire.

I understand the report on behalf of the secretary of state will be available, but I would specifically direct those who will make a decision on this development to the comments on the visual nature of the development to the residents of and visitors to the area.

Her detailed and thoroughly researched report, including visits to local homes, walking the footpaths and viewing from various aspects, concludes on a number of points that:

7. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

57. I find the layout and resultant visual effects on the landscape would not be acceptable. The proposal would fail to deliver a high-quality, visually attractive development.

58. It would therefore cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area and be contrary to Policy DMG1 of the CS. This policy requires, amongst other things, that developments are of a high standard of building design, sympathetic to existing and proposed land uses and consider the density, layout and relationship to surroundings, including impact on landscape character. This policy also requires that regard is had to the landscape or townscape of an area and the importance the open space has on this.

59. The proposal would also be contrary to paragraphs 129 and 135 of the Framework which outlines, amongst other things, the importance of securing well-designed, attractive places. It is also outlined that decisions should ensure that developments add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but

over the lifetime of the development, are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping.

72. Taking all of these considerations together in the overall planning balance, the harm that I have found to the character and appearance of the area would not be outweighed by the benefits when taken individually or cumulatively.

Conclusion

73. The proposal is in conflict with the development plan, when read as a whole. Material considerations have not been shown to indicate that a decision should be taken otherwise than in accordance with it.

74. Therefore, for the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

In addition to the findings above, I am gravely concerned regarding the following points, all of which have been expressed by local residents and acknowledged by A Veevers in her report.

1. The steepness of the only access road, which is impassable in icy or very wet weather.
2. An increase in traffic on Whalley Road, which would also result in higher levels of pollution.
3. The impact on local services such as doctors, schools, transport.
4. A reduction of green spaces for wildlife such as deer, (seen every day in the field) rabbits, birds and smaller animals.
5. The issue of wet land on clay. The disturbance of the field could have serious consequences for properties below the development regarding flooding. In heavy rain, rivers flow across Whalley Road as water drains from the land.
6. The loss of local footpaths, which are well-used at all times of the year.

I would ask the members of the planning committee to consider the above and permanently take this area of land off the list for development.

██████████

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 28 November 2025 14:53
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0801 FS-Case-769405528

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0801

Address of Development: Land to the East of Salesbury View

Comments: i wish to object to the above plan for development on the hill overlooking Wilpshire and Ramsgreave.

I

Before a decision is made, please visit the site:

- 1 On an icy day to see the obvious danger of the access road,
- 2 On a wet day to see the water which runs from the land across Whalley Road - this would be made worse by building works,
- 3 On a sunny day from [REDACTED] Ramsgreave to imagine the impact a housing estate on the top of a hill would have on the area,
4. At rush hour when the traffic backs up between the traffic lights at Wilpshire and at the Co op,
- 5 In the early morning or evening to see the deer grazing on this hillside.

I believe that the scale and design of this development will have a serious impact on the semi-rural character of this area. Local residents would be subjected to higher levels of noise, pollution and inconvenience. Highway safety would be seriously compromised. As a resident on [REDACTED] I would be very concerned about the safety of [REDACTED] if 160 more car users were to be introduced to the neighbourhood.

This land is currently a green space, inhabited by wildlife and pleasing to the eye. It needs to be preserved for future generations and I would ask RVBC to ensure that this is the case and to look for housing development in more suitable places.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 28 November 2025 15:15
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0801 FS-Case-769416758

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0801

Address of Development: Land to the East of Salesbury View

Comments: I wish to object to the above plan for development on the hillside overlooking Wilpshire and Ramsgreave.

The development will ruin the green hillside, which dominates Wilpshire.

The access road is too steep and dangerous for over 100 cars which will require access to the houses.

Whalley Road is already choked with vehicles at rush hour and there have been a number of accidents along this stretch in recent months. Crossing the road from Wilpshire Banks is almost impossible at busy times of the day.

Flooding will be made much worse.

Noise and pollution will have a detrimental effect on local residents, particularly children.

Wildlife will lose their habitat, particularly the deer who can be seen every day on this field.

The most recent proposal, as put together by Persimmon Homes, does nothing to address the comments made by [REDACTED], the expert who rejected the previous appeal earlier this year.

I ask the planning committee to take this piece of land off the list for proposed development as it is totally unsuitable for a housing estate of 80 dwellings.

[REDACTED]
Local resident

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 28 November 2025 19:48
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0801 FS-Case-769475355

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0801

Address of Development: Salesbury view

Comments: I want to strongly object to this. [REDACTED] on whalley road a while back and has [REDACTED] 70+ more houses will not help the traffics situation.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 28 November 2025 20:03
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0801 FS-Case-769476500

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0801

Address of Development: Salesbury View

Comments: This is a beautiful green area with an abundance of wildlife. I can't believe that this is even being considered. Deer, foxes and other animals are regularly seen there.

Wilpshire is already too busy. The traffic is a nightmare. No new houses should be allowed to be built destroying wildlife and clogging up the roads even further. Road conditions are dreadful in the winter and this is a steep access road. Flood risk must be considered.

The environmental and ecological impact of this proposal is too great to be ignored.

No building in our village please.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 28 November 2025 20:06
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0801 FS-Case-769477231

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0801

Address of Development: Land to east of Salesbury View, Wilpshire

Comments:

I am writing to formally object to planning application 3/2025/0801 regarding the proposed development at Land East of Salesbury View, Wilpshire. I have reviewed the submitted plans and documentation, including the recent appeal decision for a similar proposal on this site. I wish to raise serious concerns on multiple grounds, with particular emphasis on traffic and access issues. For the reasons detailed below, I believe this application is unacceptable and should be refused.

Traffic, Access, and Highway Safety Concerns

Steep and Unsafe Access Road: The sole access to the site is via Salesbury View – a steep residential cul-de-sac with approximately a 12% incline

. In winter conditions this road becomes effectively impassable; it has been noted that the access road is “steep and unusable if there is ice,” with existing residents forced to abandon vehicles on the main road during icy weather

. There are documented instances of vehicles “getting stuck as the incline is too severe” at the junction, even in normal conditions

. Relying on a single, very steep access is inherently unsafe – posing risks to everyday traffic, emergency vehicles (which could be obstructed in snow/ice), and pedestrians. The gradient is also

problematic for those on foot, pram and wheelchair users would struggle greatly on a 12% slope

meaning the scheme fails to provide safe and suitable access for all. This falls short of the requirements of Ribble Valley Core Strategy Policy DMG3, which attaches weight to provision of access for pedestrians and those with reduced mobility and of national guidance that developments ensure “safe and suitable access for all users”.

Single Access and Capacity Constraints: Serving an entire new estate of around 80+ homes via this one cul-de-sac is not only impractical but dangerous. Salesbury View’s carriageway is only about 5.5m wide with cars often parked on-street, effectively narrowing it

. It currently serves just a handful of houses; adding potentially 150-200 additional vehicles would overwhelm its capacity. There is no secondary emergency access. Any blockage (a stalled vehicle on the hill, an accident, or roadworks) could trap residents. During construction, heavy lorries would have to negotiate this steep, narrow route, exacerbating congestion and safety issues for existing residents. The visibility at the junction with Whalley Road (A666) is also substandard – Salesbury View joins near a blind double bend known locally as “The Knolle,” which makes pulling in and out hazardous.

. Residents already report having to “dodge speeding cars to get onto Whalley Road” from Salesbury View

. Adding the traffic from this development will greatly increase collision risk at this difficult junction.

Impact on A666 Traffic and Inadequate Survey Data: The A666 through Wilpshire is a busy principal route between Blackburn and Clitheroe. Introducing the traffic from an additional ~84 houses (initial proposals were for up to 109) would significantly increase traffic volumes on this road

democracy.ribblevalley.gov.uk

. This not only worsens peak-time congestion (including at the nearby traffic lights such as Wilpshire Hotel and Bulls Head junctions) but also heightens the danger of accidents on a stretch already plagued by speeding issues

. Importantly, the submitted Traffic Assessment is based on a traffic survey conducted during the COVID lockdown, which is acknowledged to be unrepresentative and “not accurate”

. Basing conclusions on artificially low traffic data fails to reflect normal conditions – a flaw which undermines the credibility of the transport analysis. Local knowledge suggests the actual traffic load and speeds on the A666 are much higher; a police speed survey found vehicles exceeding 30mph routinely, multiple times per hour

. Highway safety for both drivers and pedestrians would be unacceptably compromised by this development, contrary to national policy which states development should only be permitted if there is no unacceptable impact on road safety. In summary, the proposal does not provide a safe, suitable access and would create severe residual cumulative impacts on the road network.

(It is noted that Lancashire County Council as Highway Authority raised no objection in the previous application, after the applicant offered various off-site works and conditions

. However, I urge the Council to reconsider whether these mitigations truly overcome the fundamental issues. Local residents' firsthand experience of the road conditions – steep gradient, poor winter usability, limited visibility, and existing congestion – indicates that significant dangers remain. The absence of an objection from highways does not guarantee that the access is actually safe in practice, especially in extreme weather or peak traffic. The duty of care to future residents and neighbors demands a cautious approach where genuine safety concerns exist.)

Drainage and Flood Risk

The site lies on a steep hillside composed of clay soils

democracy.ribblevalley.gov.uk

. This combination raises serious drainage concerns. There are already known flooding issues in the area: a recent nearby development uphill caused months of flooding across Whalley Road, damaging property and creating road safety hazards

. Introducing a large expanse of hard surfaces (roofs, roads, paving) on this slope will greatly increase surface runoff. The application's drainage strategy appears inadequate to manage the volume and velocity of water that will be generated on such a gradient. During heavy rain, water could overwhelm

local drains and exacerbate flooding downstream (including at Station Close/Whalley Road which has a history of problems). The site is adjacent to a stream (Showley Brook), raising the risk of polluted runoff entering the watercourse

. Without robust evidence that flood risk will not be increased elsewhere (a requirement of NPPF para 167) and that sustainable drainage systems will truly mitigate the worst-case storm events, this application should not be allowed to proceed. In its current form, the development could transfer an untenable flood risk to existing residents and infrastructure. It thus conflicts with Core Strategy policies that seek to ensure new development does not result in unacceptable flood or drainage impacts.

Ecological and Environmental Impact

Loss of Habitats: The proposal would destroy a significant amount of existing habitat, including the removal of approximately 165 metres of mature hedgerow and numerous trees

. The site is immediately adjacent to ancient woodland and currently comprises fields with boundary hedges that support a variety of wildlife. Local residents frequently observe roe deer, foxes, hedgehogs, bats, and a wide range of birds in and around the site

. These species rely on the hedgerows and woodland edges for foraging and movement. The large-scale removal of greenery and the disturbance from 84 houses will undoubtedly harm local biodiversity.

Inadequate Ecological Assessment: The ecological survey provided by the developer is notably cursory – it “falls short of any meaningful identification and protection of wildlife”

. Important features (like the hedgerows which may qualify as “important hedgerows” under the Hedgerow Regulations, or potential bat roost trees) have not been given proper consideration. There is no robust plan for protecting or compensating for the loss of these habitats. This is contrary to Policy DME3 (Site and Species Protection) and the NPPF’s requirement to conserve and enhance biodiversity. The application does not demonstrate a measurable net gain for biodiversity; on the contrary, it presents a net loss of habitat and ecological value.

Green Space and Mental Wellbeing: Beyond protected species, the green field and its trees/hedges provide visual relief and amenity value for the community. As one representation noted, “Green spaces are crucial for local wildlife and our own mental wellbeing.”

Replacing this natural green slope with a housing estate would diminish the environmental quality of the area for both wildlife and residents.

Landscape and Visual Impact

This development would have a significant adverse impact on the landscape character of Wilpshire. The site occupies an elevated, steeply sloping hillside (falling about 38m from north to south across the site

) that is currently open grassland. It is highly visible from various public viewpoints, including Whalley Road and farther afield. In fact, the proposed estate would be visible from miles around – a fact that the applicant’s own viewpoints gloss over (the submitted visual montages are selective and do not include key viewpoints, such as those directly opposite the site in Ramsgreave)

democracy.ribblevalley.gov.uk

. Introducing dozens of houses, roads, and in particular the large retaining walls and engineered slopes likely needed for this gradient, would fundamentally alter the scenic hillside. The urbanizing effect would harm the semi-rural character of the area and erode the attractive landscape setting of the village.

It should be noted that Wilpshire’s settlement boundary was only recently extended to include this site as an allocated housing site (Policy HAL2) – however, part of the eastern site area remains in the Green Belt

. The Parish Council and local community strongly wish to see the “green wedge” between Wilpshire and Blackburn maintained to prevent urban sprawl

democracy.ribblevalley.gov.uk

. This development would substantially reduce that crucial separation, effectively merging the edge of Wilpshire toward the built-up areas of Blackburn

. The proposal therefore conflicts with the core planning principle of safeguarding the countryside and avoiding coalescence of settlements. It would also be at odds with Core Strategy Policy DME2 (Landscape Protection), which seeks to ensure new development does not have an unacceptable impact on the appearance or character of the landscape. The recent Appeal Inspector likewise raised concerns about the landscape harm, noting that the scheme's benefits did not outweigh its adverse effects on the character and appearance of the area

Housing Need and Local Infrastructure

Excessive Scale Relative to Local Need: Wilpshire is identified as a Tier 1 village, but the housing requirements for this community are limited. According to the Council's housing figures, only 32 new dwellings were needed in Wilpshire for the plan period up to 2028

. This proposal (84 homes, following a prior scheme of 109) wildly exceeds that number – in fact, 109 units would be five times the identified need

. Even acknowledging that housing targets are not caps, this scale of development is clearly far beyond what is necessary for local growth. The Core Strategy's vision was for gradual, sustainable development; this project represents an overdevelopment of the site and the village. Furthermore, the mix of housing proposed does not align with local needs – Wilpshire has an identified need for starter homes and housing for older people (such as bungalows), whereas the development is largely 2, 3, 4, and 5-bedroom two-storey houses

. Building the “wrong type of properties” that do not meet local need undermines the justification for using this sensitive site.

Strain on Services and Amenities: Local infrastructure in Wilpshire and the surrounding area is limited. There are very few amenities in walking distance (essentially only a butcher, a pub, and a golf

club in the immediate vicinity

– residents must travel to nearby towns for most needs). Crucially, public services are already at capacity: there is limited access to NHS doctors and dentists for current residents, and local schools have very limited places available

. Yet the application does not convincingly show how an influx of potentially 200+ new residents would be accommodated. No new schools or medical facilities are planned as part of this development, and we have no evidence of substantive contribution agreements to expand such services. The Parish Council has questioned whether there is any need (or capacity) for these additional homes at all in Wilpshire under the adopted Core Strategy

. Without adequate planning for new infrastructure, this proposal would exacerbate pressures on doctors, dental practices, and schools – to the detriment of both new and existing residents. This is not sustainable development. The Core Strategy Policy DMG3 requires that “considerable weight” be given to the availability of public transport and other infrastructure when determining applications

. At present, apart from a bus route and nearby train station, Wilpshire’s facilities are scant. Future occupants would be highly car-dependent for work, education, shopping and healthcare, further undermining the sustainability claims of this proposal. The increase in private car usage also raises air quality concerns, as noted in the application documents (more traffic means higher emissions and a negative impact on local air quality).

Quality and Safety of Construction:

As a final note, the community is also concerned about the developer’s track record. Persimmon Homes (the applicant) has, in other contexts, gained a poor reputation for build quality and safety standards – for example, noted issues with fire safety in their constructions

. While this is not a direct planning policy issue, it does raise apprehension that the promised benefits of the scheme (quality new homes) may not materialise to the standard expected. It reinforces the need for caution and rigorous oversight if any development were to proceed.

Conclusion

In conclusion, this planning application presents numerous serious conflicts with planning policy and material considerations that collectively render the proposal wholly inappropriate for approval. The traffic and access problems alone – a dangerously steep single access road with poor winter usability and substandard junction safety – are enough to justify refusal on grounds of highway safety and unsustainable access. When combined with the additional harms identified – increased flood risk, loss of important habitats, damage to landscape character, excessive scale beyond local need, and strain on infrastructure – the case against the development is overwhelming.

Crucially, these issues are not new. A virtually identical scheme for this site was recently examined at appeal, and it was dismissed by the Planning Inspector on 5 February 2025

(Appeal Ref APP/T2350/W/24/3352614, relating to previous application 3/2023/0614). In that decision, the Inspector concluded that the proposal was “in conflict with the development plan, when read as a whole,” and that there were no material considerations sufficient to outweigh that conflict

. The fundamental problems with developing this site – especially the unsafe access and the landscape/character impact remain unresolved in the current application. Approving this new application would fly in the face of the clear findings of the appeal and the Council’s own prior decision.

I respectfully urge the Council to refuse this planning application. In doing so, you would be upholding the Ribble Valley Core Strategy policies (notably DMG1, DMG3, DME2, DME3 and others) and the National Planning Policy Framework guidance which together seek to ensure development is safe, sustainable, and suitable for its context. This proposal fails on all those counts. For the safety of residents, the preservation of our local environment, and the integrity of the planning process, please reject the application 3/2025/0801.

Thank you for considering these objections. I trust the Council will make the right decision in line with both local and national planning policies.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 28 November 2025 20:07
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0801 FS-Case-769477312

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0801

Address of Development: Steep field east of salesbury view wilpshire

Comments:

I am writing to formally object to planning application 3/2025/0801 regarding the proposed development at Land East of Salesbury View, Wilpshire. I have reviewed the submitted plans and documentation, including the recent appeal decision for a similar proposal on this site. I wish to raise serious concerns on multiple grounds, with particular emphasis on traffic and access issues. For the reasons detailed below, I believe this application is unacceptable and should be refused.

Traffic, Access, and Highway Safety Concerns

Steep and Unsafe Access Road: The sole access to the site is via Salesbury View – a steep residential cul-de-sac with approximately a 12% incline

. In winter conditions this road becomes effectively impassable; it has been noted that the access road is “steep and unusable if there is ice,” with existing residents forced to abandon vehicles on the main road during icy weather

. There are documented instances of vehicles “getting stuck as the incline is too severe” at the junction, even in normal conditions

. Relying on a single, very steep access is inherently unsafe – posing risks to everyday traffic, emergency vehicles (which could be obstructed in snow/ice), and pedestrians. The gradient is also

problematic for those on foot, pram and wheelchair users would struggle greatly on a 12% slope

meaning the scheme fails to provide safe and suitable access for all. This falls short of the requirements of Ribble Valley Core Strategy Policy DMG3, which attaches weight to provision of access for pedestrians and those with reduced mobility and of national guidance that developments ensure “safe and suitable access for all users”.

Single Access and Capacity Constraints: Serving an entire new estate of around 80+ homes via this one cul-de-sac is not only impractical but dangerous. Salesbury View’s carriageway is only about 5.5m wide with cars often parked on-street, effectively narrowing it

. It currently serves just a handful of houses; adding potentially 150-200 additional vehicles would overwhelm its capacity. There is no secondary emergency access. Any blockage (a stalled vehicle on the hill, an accident, or roadworks) could trap residents. During construction, heavy lorries would have to negotiate this steep, narrow route, exacerbating congestion and safety issues for existing residents. The visibility at the junction with Whalley Road (A666) is also substandard – Salesbury View joins near a blind double bend known locally as “The Knolle,” which makes pulling in and out hazardous.

. Residents already report having to “dodge speeding cars to get onto Whalley Road” from Salesbury View

. Adding the traffic from this development will greatly increase collision risk at this difficult junction.

Impact on A666 Traffic and Inadequate Survey Data: The A666 through Wilpshire is a busy principal route between Blackburn and Clitheroe. Introducing the traffic from an additional ~84 houses (initial proposals were for up to 109) would significantly increase traffic volumes on this road

democracy.ribblevalley.gov.uk

. This not only worsens peak-time congestion (including at the nearby traffic lights such as Wilpshire Hotel and Bulls Head junctions) but also heightens the danger of accidents on a stretch already plagued by speeding issues

. Importantly, the submitted Traffic Assessment is based on a traffic survey conducted during the COVID lockdown, which is acknowledged to be unrepresentative and “not accurate”

. Basing conclusions on artificially low traffic data fails to reflect normal conditions – a flaw which undermines the credibility of the transport analysis. Local knowledge suggests the actual traffic load and speeds on the A666 are much higher; a police speed survey found vehicles exceeding 30mph routinely, multiple times per hour

. Highway safety for both drivers and pedestrians would be unacceptably compromised by this development, contrary to national policy which states development should only be permitted if there is no unacceptable impact on road safety. In summary, the proposal does not provide a safe, suitable access and would create severe residual cumulative impacts on the road network.

(It is noted that Lancashire County Council as Highway Authority raised no objection in the previous application, after the applicant offered various off-site works and conditions

. However, I urge the Council to reconsider whether these mitigations truly overcome the fundamental issues. Local residents' firsthand experience of the road conditions – steep gradient, poor winter usability, limited visibility, and existing congestion – indicates that significant dangers remain. The absence of an objection from highways does not guarantee that the access is actually safe in practice, especially in extreme weather or peak traffic. The duty of care to future residents and neighbors demands a cautious approach where genuine safety concerns exist.)

Drainage and Flood Risk

The site lies on a steep hillside composed of clay soils

democracy.ribblevalley.gov.uk

. This combination raises serious drainage concerns. There are already known flooding issues in the area: a recent nearby development uphill caused months of flooding across Whalley Road, damaging property and creating road safety hazards

. Introducing a large expanse of hard surfaces (roofs, roads, paving) on this slope will greatly increase surface runoff. The application's drainage strategy appears inadequate to manage the volume and velocity of water that will be generated on such a gradient. During heavy rain, water could overwhelm

local drains and exacerbate flooding downstream (including at Station Close/Whalley Road which has a history of problems). The site is adjacent to a stream (Showley Brook), raising the risk of polluted runoff entering the watercourse

. Without robust evidence that flood risk will not be increased elsewhere (a requirement of NPPF para 167) and that sustainable drainage systems will truly mitigate the worst-case storm events, this application should not be allowed to proceed. In its current form, the development could transfer an untenable flood risk to existing residents and infrastructure. It thus conflicts with Core Strategy policies that seek to ensure new development does not result in unacceptable flood or drainage impacts.

Ecological and Environmental Impact

Loss of Habitats: The proposal would destroy a significant amount of existing habitat, including the removal of approximately 165 metres of mature hedgerow and numerous trees

. The site is immediately adjacent to ancient woodland and currently comprises fields with boundary hedges that support a variety of wildlife. Local residents frequently observe roe deer, foxes, hedgehogs, bats, and a wide range of birds in and around the site

. These species rely on the hedgerows and woodland edges for foraging and movement. The large-scale removal of greenery and the disturbance from 84 houses will undoubtedly harm local biodiversity.

Inadequate Ecological Assessment: The ecological survey provided by the developer is notably cursory – it “falls short of any meaningful identification and protection of wildlife”

. Important features (like the hedgerows which may qualify as “important hedgerows” under the Hedgerow Regulations, or potential bat roost trees) have not been given proper consideration. There is no robust plan for protecting or compensating for the loss of these habitats. This is contrary to Policy DME3 (Site and Species Protection) and the NPPF’s requirement to conserve and enhance biodiversity. The application does not demonstrate a measurable net gain for biodiversity; on the contrary, it presents a net loss of habitat and ecological value.

Green Space and Mental Wellbeing: Beyond protected species, the green field and its trees/hedges provide visual relief and amenity value for the community. As one representation noted, “Green spaces are crucial for local wildlife and our own mental wellbeing.”

Replacing this natural green slope with a housing estate would diminish the environmental quality of the area for both wildlife and residents.

Landscape and Visual Impact

This development would have a significant adverse impact on the landscape character of Wilpshire. The site occupies an elevated, steeply sloping hillside (falling about 38m from north to south across the site

) that is currently open grassland. It is highly visible from various public viewpoints, including Whalley Road and farther afield. In fact, the proposed estate would be visible from miles around – a fact that the applicant’s own viewpoints gloss over (the submitted visual montages are selective and do not include key viewpoints, such as those directly opposite the site in Ramsgreave)

democracy.ribblevalley.gov.uk

. Introducing dozens of houses, roads, and in particular the large retaining walls and engineered slopes likely needed for this gradient, would fundamentally alter the scenic hillside. The urbanizing effect would harm the semi-rural character of the area and erode the attractive landscape setting of the village.

It should be noted that Wilpshire’s settlement boundary was only recently extended to include this site as an allocated housing site (Policy HAL2) – however, part of the eastern site area remains in the Green Belt

. The Parish Council and local community strongly wish to see the “green wedge” between Wilpshire and Blackburn maintained to prevent urban sprawl

democracy.ribblevalley.gov.uk

. This development would substantially reduce that crucial separation, effectively merging the edge of Wilpshire toward the built-up areas of Blackburn

. The proposal therefore conflicts with the core planning principle of safeguarding the countryside and avoiding coalescence of settlements. It would also be at odds with Core Strategy Policy DME2 (Landscape Protection), which seeks to ensure new development does not have an unacceptable impact on the appearance or character of the landscape. The recent Appeal Inspector likewise raised concerns about the landscape harm, noting that the scheme's benefits did not outweigh its adverse effects on the character and appearance of the area

Housing Need and Local Infrastructure

Excessive Scale Relative to Local Need: Wilpshire is identified as a Tier 1 village, but the housing requirements for this community are limited. According to the Council's housing figures, only 32 new dwellings were needed in Wilpshire for the plan period up to 2028

. This proposal (84 homes, following a prior scheme of 109) wildly exceeds that number – in fact, 109 units would be five times the identified need

. Even acknowledging that housing targets are not caps, this scale of development is clearly far beyond what is necessary for local growth. The Core Strategy's vision was for gradual, sustainable development; this project represents an overdevelopment of the site and the village. Furthermore, the mix of housing proposed does not align with local needs – Wilpshire has an identified need for starter homes and housing for older people (such as bungalows), whereas the development is largely 2, 3, 4, and 5-bedroom two-storey houses

. Building the “wrong type of properties” that do not meet local need undermines the justification for using this sensitive site.

Strain on Services and Amenities: Local infrastructure in Wilpshire and the surrounding area is limited. There are very few amenities in walking distance (essentially only a butcher, a pub, and a golf

club in the immediate vicinity

– residents must travel to nearby towns for most needs). Crucially, public services are already at capacity: there is limited access to NHS doctors and dentists for current residents, and local schools have very limited places available

. Yet the application does not convincingly show how an influx of potentially 200+ new residents would be accommodated. No new schools or medical facilities are planned as part of this development, and we have no evidence of substantive contribution agreements to expand such services. The Parish Council has questioned whether there is any need (or capacity) for these additional homes at all in Wilpshire under the adopted Core Strategy

. Without adequate planning for new infrastructure, this proposal would exacerbate pressures on doctors, dental practices, and schools – to the detriment of both new and existing residents. This is not sustainable development. The Core Strategy Policy DMG3 requires that “considerable weight” be given to the availability of public transport and other infrastructure when determining applications

. At present, apart from a bus route and nearby train station, Wilpshire’s facilities are scant. Future occupants would be highly car-dependent for work, education, shopping and healthcare, further undermining the sustainability claims of this proposal. The increase in private car usage also raises air quality concerns, as noted in the application documents (more traffic means higher emissions and a negative impact on local air quality).

Quality and Safety of Construction:

As a final note, the community is also concerned about the developer’s track record. Persimmon Homes (the applicant) has, in other contexts, gained a poor reputation for build quality and safety standards – for example, noted issues with fire safety in their constructions

. While this is not a direct planning policy issue, it does raise apprehension that the promised benefits of the scheme (quality new homes) may not materialise to the standard expected. It reinforces the need for caution and rigorous oversight if any development were to proceed.

Conclusion

In conclusion, this planning application presents numerous serious conflicts with planning policy and material considerations that collectively render the proposal wholly inappropriate for approval. The traffic and access problems alone – a dangerously steep single access road with poor winter usability and substandard junction safety – are enough to justify refusal on grounds of highway safety and unsustainable access. When combined with the additional harms identified – increased flood risk, loss of important habitats, damage to landscape character, excessive scale beyond local need, and strain on infrastructure – the case against the development is overwhelming.

Crucially, these issues are not new. A virtually identical scheme for this site was recently examined at appeal, and it was dismissed by the Planning Inspector on 5 February 2025

(Appeal Ref APP/T2350/W/24/3352614, relating to previous application 3/2023/0614). In that decision, the Inspector concluded that the proposal was “in conflict with the development plan, when read as a whole,” and that there were no material considerations sufficient to outweigh that conflict

. The fundamental problems with developing this site – especially the unsafe access and the landscape/character impact remain unresolved in the current application. Approving this new application would fly in the face of the clear findings of the appeal and the Council’s own prior decision.

I respectfully urge the Council to refuse this planning application. In doing so, you would be upholding the Ribble Valley Core Strategy policies (notably DMG1, DMG3, DME2, DME3 and others) and the National Planning Policy Framework guidance which together seek to ensure development is safe, sustainable, and suitable for its context. This proposal fails on all those counts. For the safety of residents, the preservation of our local environment, and the integrity of the planning process, please reject the application 3/2025/0801.

Thank you for considering these objections. I trust the Council will make the right decision in line with both local and national planning policies.

Feel free to tweak this to add your own personal experiences. For example:

- How hard you already find it to get out onto Whalley Road
- Any times you have slipped or struggled on Salesbury View in winter
- How often you see speeding traffic or near misses at the junction
- Why you value the open hillside and green space

STEP 5: Submit your objection

1. Click Submit at the bottom of the form.
2. Share a quick comment on this Facebook post to say “Done” so others can see people are taking action.

KEY DETAILS TO INCLUDE

- Application number: 3/2025/0801
- Site: Land to east of Salesbury View, Wiltshire
- Description: 80 new homes with open space and infrastructure
- Decision type: Full planning
- Consultation currently ends: 4 December 2025

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 28 November 2025 20:08
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0801 FS-Case-769476346

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0801

Address of Development: Land to east of Salesbury view, Wilpshire

Comments: I wish to object to planning application 3/2025/0801 for 80 new homes on the land east of Salesbury View, Wilpshire.

1. Traffic and Highway Safety

The surrounding roads are already extremely busy, and it is often very difficult and unsafe to join the A666 from Salesbury View. Cars come quickly around the bends, and I regularly experience near misses or have to pull out faster than I would like just to join the road. Adding the traffic from 80 new homes will significantly increase the danger at this already problematic junction.

Salesbury View itself is a steep hill that becomes slippery and hazardous in winter. I have personally seen vehicles struggling or sliding on the incline. Even in normal weather the gradient makes driving and walking difficult. Relying on this single, steep access for all vehicles to an entire estate is unsafe and not suitable for a development of this scale.

2. Loss of Wildlife and Green Space

I regularly see wildlife in this field, including birds, deer and hedgehogs. This is one of the last remaining green spaces in the area, and once it is built on those habitats will be lost permanently. The hedgerows and open hillside are important for local nature, and losing them would reduce biodiversity in Wilpshire.

3. Flooding and Surface Water Run-Off

The site is a steep hillside and rainwater already runs quickly down towards Whalley Road. I am concerned that covering the slope with houses, roads and driveways will greatly increase run-off and the risk of local flooding. The drains in the area already struggle during heavy rainfall, and this development would make the situation worse.

4. Pressure on Local Services

Local services such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools are already stretched. It is difficult to get appointments as it is. Wilpshire does not have the capacity to support the number of additional residents an 80-home estate would create. This would add further pressure to services that are already at or beyond their limits.

5. Noise, Pollution and Light Impact

More vehicles entering and leaving the site will increase noise and air pollution around Salesbury View and the A666. The development will also introduce significant light pollution on a currently dark hillside, which will affect residents and disrupt local wildlife.

6. Construction Impacts

Construction traffic using a narrow, steep road will cause years of disturbance, including noise, vibration, dust and restricted access. Salesbury View is not designed for heavy construction vehicles, especially in winter when the incline is dangerous.

7. Harm to the Landscape and Green Gap

This slope is part of the important green gap between Wilpshire and Blackburn. Building on it would permanently change the character of the area and reduce the separation between the two settlements. The visual impact on the hillside would be very significant.

8. A Similar Application Was Recently Refused

A nearly identical proposal for this same site was refused and dismissed at appeal earlier this year. None of the major issues identified then, such as unsafe access, landscape harm and drainage concerns, have been resolved. The same fundamental problems still apply.

For all these reasons, I strongly object to planning application 3/2025/0801 and urge the Council to refuse it.

Thank you for considering my comments

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 28 November 2025 20:17
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0801 FS-Case-769478098

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0801

Address of Development: Land to east of salesbury view wilpshire

Comments: I am writing to formally object to planning application 3/2025/0801 regarding the proposed development at Land East of Salesbury View, Wilpshire. I have reviewed the submitted plans and documentation, including the recent appeal decision for a similar proposal on this site. I wish to raise serious concerns on multiple grounds, with particular emphasis on traffic and access issues. For the reasons detailed below, I believe this application is unacceptable and should be refused.

Traffic, Access, and Highway Safety Concerns

Steep and Unsafe Access Road: The sole access to the site is via Salesbury View – a steep residential cul-de-sac with approximately a 12% incline

. In winter conditions this road becomes effectively impassable; it has been noted that the access road is “steep and unusable if there is ice,” with existing residents forced to abandon vehicles on the main road during icy weather

. There are documented instances of vehicles “getting stuck as the incline is too severe” at the junction, even in normal conditions

. Relying on a single, very steep access is inherently unsafe – posing risks to everyday traffic, emergency vehicles (which could be obstructed in snow/ice), and pedestrians. The gradient is also

problematic for those on foot, pram and wheelchair users would struggle greatly on a 12% slope

meaning the scheme fails to provide safe and suitable access for all. This falls short of the requirements of Ribble Valley Core Strategy Policy DMG3, which attaches weight to provision of access for pedestrians and those with reduced mobility and of national guidance that developments ensure “safe and suitable access for all users”.

Single Access and Capacity Constraints: Serving an entire new estate of around 80+ homes via this one cul-de-sac is not only impractical but dangerous. Salesbury View’s carriageway is only about 5.5m wide with cars often parked on-street, effectively narrowing it

. It currently serves just a handful of houses; adding potentially 150-200 additional vehicles would overwhelm its capacity. There is no secondary emergency access. Any blockage (a stalled vehicle on the hill, an accident, or roadworks) could trap residents. During construction, heavy lorries would have to negotiate this steep, narrow route, exacerbating congestion and safety issues for existing residents. The visibility at the junction with Whalley Road (A666) is also substandard – Salesbury View joins near a blind double bend known locally as “The Knolle,” which makes pulling in and out hazardous.

. Residents already report having to “dodge speeding cars to get onto Whalley Road” from Salesbury View

. Adding the traffic from this development will greatly increase collision risk at this difficult junction.

Impact on A666 Traffic and Inadequate Survey Data: The A666 through Wilpshire is a busy principal route between Blackburn and Clitheroe. Introducing the traffic from an additional ~84 houses (initial proposals were for up to 109) would significantly increase traffic volumes on this road

democracy.ribblevalley.gov.uk

. This not only worsens peak-time congestion (including at the nearby traffic lights such as Wilpshire Hotel and Bulls Head junctions) but also heightens the danger of accidents on a stretch already plagued by speeding issues

. Importantly, the submitted Traffic Assessment is based on a traffic survey conducted during the COVID lockdown, which is acknowledged to be unrepresentative and “not accurate”

. Basing conclusions on artificially low traffic data fails to reflect normal conditions – a flaw which undermines the credibility of the transport analysis. Local knowledge suggests the actual traffic load and speeds on the A666 are much higher; a police speed survey found vehicles exceeding 30mph routinely, multiple times per hour

. Highway safety for both drivers and pedestrians would be unacceptably compromised by this development, contrary to national policy which states development should only be permitted if there is no unacceptable impact on road safety. In summary, the proposal does not provide a safe, suitable access and would create severe residual cumulative impacts on the road network.

(It is noted that Lancashire County Council as Highway Authority raised no objection in the previous application, after the applicant offered various off-site works and conditions

. However, I urge the Council to reconsider whether these mitigations truly overcome the fundamental issues. Local residents' firsthand experience of the road conditions – steep gradient, poor winter usability, limited visibility, and existing congestion – indicates that significant dangers remain. The absence of an objection from highways does not guarantee that the access is actually safe in practice, especially in extreme weather or peak traffic. The duty of care to future residents and neighbors demands a cautious approach where genuine safety concerns exist.)

Drainage and Flood Risk

The site lies on a steep hillside composed of clay soils

democracy.ribblevalley.gov.uk

. This combination raises serious drainage concerns. There are already known flooding issues in the area: a recent nearby development uphill caused months of flooding across Whalley Road, damaging property and creating road safety hazards

. Introducing a large expanse of hard surfaces (roofs, roads, paving) on this slope will greatly increase surface runoff. The application's drainage strategy appears inadequate to manage the volume and velocity of water that will be generated on such a gradient. During heavy rain, water could overwhelm

local drains and exacerbate flooding downstream (including at Station Close/Whalley Road which has a history of problems). The site is adjacent to a stream (Showley Brook), raising the risk of polluted runoff entering the watercourse

. Without robust evidence that flood risk will not be increased elsewhere (a requirement of NPPF para 167) and that sustainable drainage systems will truly mitigate the worst-case storm events, this application should not be allowed to proceed. In its current form, the development could transfer an untenable flood risk to existing residents and infrastructure. It thus conflicts with Core Strategy policies that seek to ensure new development does not result in unacceptable flood or drainage impacts.

Ecological and Environmental Impact

Loss of Habitats: The proposal would destroy a significant amount of existing habitat, including the removal of approximately 165 metres of mature hedgerow and numerous trees

. The site is immediately adjacent to ancient woodland and currently comprises fields with boundary hedges that support a variety of wildlife. Local residents frequently observe roe deer, foxes, hedgehogs, bats, and a wide range of birds in and around the site

. These species rely on the hedgerows and woodland edges for foraging and movement. The large-scale removal of greenery and the disturbance from 84 houses will undoubtedly harm local biodiversity.

Inadequate Ecological Assessment: The ecological survey provided by the developer is notably cursory – it “falls short of any meaningful identification and protection of wildlife”

. Important features (like the hedgerows which may qualify as “important hedgerows” under the Hedgerow Regulations, or potential bat roost trees) have not been given proper consideration. There is no robust plan for protecting or compensating for the loss of these habitats. This is contrary to Policy DME3 (Site and Species Protection) and the NPPF’s requirement to conserve and enhance biodiversity. The application does not demonstrate a measurable net gain for biodiversity; on the contrary, it presents a net loss of habitat and ecological value.

Green Space and Mental Wellbeing: Beyond protected species, the green field and its trees/hedges provide visual relief and amenity value for the community. As one representation noted, “Green spaces are crucial for local wildlife and our own mental wellbeing.”

Replacing this natural green slope with a housing estate would diminish the environmental quality of the area for both wildlife and residents.

Landscape and Visual Impact

This development would have a significant adverse impact on the landscape character of Wilpshire. The site occupies an elevated, steeply sloping hillside (falling about 38m from north to south across the site

) that is currently open grassland. It is highly visible from various public viewpoints, including Whalley Road and farther afield. In fact, the proposed estate would be visible from miles around – a fact that the applicant’s own viewpoints gloss over (the submitted visual montages are selective and do not include key viewpoints, such as those directly opposite the site in Ramsgreave)

democracy.ribblevalley.gov.uk

. Introducing dozens of houses, roads, and in particular the large retaining walls and engineered slopes likely needed for this gradient, would fundamentally alter the scenic hillside. The urbanizing effect would harm the semi-rural character of the area and erode the attractive landscape setting of the village.

It should be noted that Wilpshire’s settlement boundary was only recently extended to include this site as an allocated housing site (Policy HAL2) – however, part of the eastern site area remains in the Green Belt

. The Parish Council and local community strongly wish to see the “green wedge” between Wilpshire and Blackburn maintained to prevent urban sprawl

democracy.ribblevalley.gov.uk

. This development would substantially reduce that crucial separation, effectively merging the edge of Wilpshire toward the built-up areas of Blackburn

. The proposal therefore conflicts with the core planning principle of safeguarding the countryside and avoiding coalescence of settlements. It would also be at odds with Core Strategy Policy DME2 (Landscape Protection), which seeks to ensure new development does not have an unacceptable impact on the appearance or character of the landscape. The recent Appeal Inspector likewise raised concerns about the landscape harm, noting that the scheme's benefits did not outweigh its adverse effects on the character and appearance of the area

Housing Need and Local Infrastructure

Excessive Scale Relative to Local Need: Wilpshire is identified as a Tier 1 village, but the housing requirements for this community are limited. According to the Council's housing figures, only 32 new dwellings were needed in Wilpshire for the plan period up to 2028

. This proposal (84 homes, following a prior scheme of 109) wildly exceeds that number – in fact, 109 units would be five times the identified need

. Even acknowledging that housing targets are not caps, this scale of development is clearly far beyond what is necessary for local growth. The Core Strategy's vision was for gradual, sustainable development; this project represents an overdevelopment of the site and the village. Furthermore, the mix of housing proposed does not align with local needs – Wilpshire has an identified need for starter homes and housing for older people (such as bungalows), whereas the development is largely 2, 3, 4, and 5-bedroom two-storey houses

. Building the “wrong type of properties” that do not meet local need undermines the justification for using this sensitive site.

Strain on Services and Amenities: Local infrastructure in Wilpshire and the surrounding area is limited. There are very few amenities in walking distance (essentially only a butcher, a pub, and a golf

club in the immediate vicinity

– residents must travel to nearby towns for most needs). Crucially, public services are already at capacity: there is limited access to NHS doctors and dentists for current residents, and local schools have very limited places available

. Yet the application does not convincingly show how an influx of potentially 200+ new residents would be accommodated. No new schools or medical facilities are planned as part of this development, and we have no evidence of substantive contribution agreements to expand such services. The Parish Council has questioned whether there is any need (or capacity) for these additional homes at all in Wilpshire under the adopted Core Strategy

. Without adequate planning for new infrastructure, this proposal would exacerbate pressures on doctors, dental practices, and schools – to the detriment of both new and existing residents. This is not sustainable development. The Core Strategy Policy DMG3 requires that “considerable weight” be given to the availability of public transport and other infrastructure when determining applications

. At present, apart from a bus route and nearby train station, Wilpshire’s facilities are scant. Future occupants would be highly car-dependent for work, education, shopping and healthcare, further undermining the sustainability claims of this proposal. The increase in private car usage also raises air quality concerns, as noted in the application documents (more traffic means higher emissions and a negative impact on local air quality).

Quality and Safety of Construction:

As a final note, the community is also concerned about the developer’s track record. Persimmon Homes (the applicant) has, in other contexts, gained a poor reputation for build quality and safety standards – for example, noted issues with fire safety in their constructions

. While this is not a direct planning policy issue, it does raise apprehension that the promised benefits of the scheme (quality new homes) may not materialise to the standard expected. It reinforces the need for caution and rigorous oversight if any development were to proceed.

Conclusion

In conclusion, this planning application presents numerous serious conflicts with planning policy and material considerations that collectively render the proposal wholly inappropriate for approval. The traffic and access problems alone – a dangerously steep single access road with poor winter usability and substandard junction safety – are enough to justify refusal on grounds of highway safety and unsustainable access. When combined with the additional harms identified – increased flood risk, loss of important habitats, damage to landscape character, excessive scale beyond local need, and strain on infrastructure – the case against the development is overwhelming.

Crucially, these issues are not new. A virtually identical scheme for this site was recently examined at appeal, and it was dismissed by the Planning Inspector on 5 February 2025

(Appeal Ref APP/T2350/W/24/3352614, relating to previous application 3/2023/0614). In that decision, the Inspector concluded that the proposal was “in conflict with the development plan, when read as a whole,” and that there were no material considerations sufficient to outweigh that conflict

. The fundamental problems with developing this site – especially the unsafe access and the landscape/character impact remain unresolved in the current application. Approving this new application would fly in the face of the clear findings of the appeal and the Council’s own prior decision.

I respectfully urge the Council to refuse this planning application. In doing so, you would be upholding the Ribble Valley Core Strategy policies (notably DMG1, DMG3, DME2, DME3 and others) and the National Planning Policy Framework guidance which together seek to ensure development is safe, sustainable, and suitable for its context. This proposal fails on all those counts. For the safety of residents, the preservation of our local environment, and the integrity of the planning process, please reject the application 3/2025/0801.

Thank you for considering these objections. I trust the Council will make the right decision in line with both local and national planning policies.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 28 November 2025 20:17
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 378889 FS-Case-769479039

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 378889

Address of Development: Salesbury view

Comments: I fully object to this development due to traffic congestion and protection of wildlife