

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 02 December 2025 15:09
To: Planning
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: PROPOSED HOUSING DEVELOPMENT - SALESBURY VIEW, WILPSHIRE - APPLICATION No 3/2025/0801

 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.

Dear Sir/Madam

We wish to object to the above application on the following grounds.

- The development would blur the separation between Wilpshire parish and Blackburn with Darwen borough.
- Whalley New Road A666, which is the sole access to and from Salesbury View, already suffers from traffic congestion coming from both Langho and Brownhill. This is compounded by the traffic light crossroads at the Co-op, which is near Salesbury View, with traffic arriving from Ramsgreave and Parsonage Road.
- There is likely to be more rainwater running down the hillside onto the A666 because the development is bound to make the ground less porous. In the winter, freezing conditions may cause ice on the road.
- The increased traffic may have an adverse effect on local businesses on the A666 at Wilpshire and Brownhill due to increased difficulties in customers parking at the roadside.

Yours faithfully

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 02 December 2025 14:55
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0801 FS-Case-770419830

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0801

Address of Development: Salesbury View, Wilpshire

Comments: We wish to register its strong objection to this application for residential development on the hillside east of Salesbury View, Wilpshire. This is the third application submitted for this sensitive site. The previous two applications were refused, with the most recent dismissed at appeal. The current proposal, despite minor amendments, does not address the core reasons for refusal identified by either the Local Planning Authority or the Planning Inspectorate. The development remains fundamentally unacceptable due to its impact on the landscape, highways and access constraints, drainage/flood risks and ecological harm.

1. Planning History and Principle

Persimmon Homes has already been refused permission twice on this site. The Planning Inspectorate dismissed the most recent appeal because the development would create an incongruous and visually intrusive form of development on a steep and highly visible hillside. The Inspector found that extensive earthworks, overbearing retaining structures and ineffective landscape buffers would cause significant harm to the landscape and visual amenity. These concerns arise from the nature of the site itself. The current scheme contains only five fewer houses than the previously refused application and does not overcome the fundamental constraints identified by both the Council and the Inspector.

2. Landscape, Visual Impact and Light

The site occupies a prominent and exposed hillside forming part of the rural setting of Wilpshire. Development here would be visible from miles around and would significantly erode the character of the area, including the important stretch of open land that prevents urban sprawl along the settlement edge. The developer's Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment is selective in its viewpoints and does not present an accurate picture of the visibility of the scheme from surrounding areas. The revised landscape buffers do not mitigate the harm and cannot disguise a suburban estate on a steep open hillside. The Inspector previously concluded such buffers would be ineffective, and nothing in the current proposal contradicts this conclusion.

As the site sits [REDACTED], the proposed development would severely compromise our natural light. Our property is positioned on a steep hill, and the proposed build would tower dramatically above us, casting significant shadows over the rear of our house and garden. This would result in a substantial and lasting loss of daylight, fundamentally altering the character and enjoyment of our home.

3. Housing Need and Scale

Wilpshire requires only 24 new homes before 2028, focused on first-time buyers and older residents. The proposal for 80 dwellings significantly exceeds this requirement and does not reflect the type or mix of housing that local needs assessments indicate is required. The scale and density remain out of keeping with the character of the area.

4. Highways, Access and Road Safety

Access is solely via Salesbury View, a narrow, steep road that becomes hazardous in winter conditions and already suffers from parking pressures. Lancashire County Council Highways previously raised concerns about gradients steeper than 1:12; these remain unaddressed. When the weather is particularly icy/snowy many residents need to park on Whalley Road (A666) due to being unable to drive up or down Salesbury View, Wilpshire Banks and Station Close. The increased volume of cars, due to the proposed site, that will evidently exacerbate this ongoing issue.

The A666 is one of the busiest routes in the borough, connecting Blackburn and Clitheroe. It already experiences significant congestion, frequent accidents, dangerous bends, no pavement, speeding, and rat-running via Knowsley Road and Ramsgreave Road. A recent police survey recorded vehicles travelling above 30mph three times per hour. An additional 80 homes would significantly increase traffic volumes and collision risks. The developer's suggestion that the location is "highly sustainable" does not reflect local conditions or the realities of pedestrian and vehicle movement in this area.

We have lived on [REDACTED] and witnessed a high volume of road traffic accidents.

5. Drainage and Flood Risk

The site consists of clay and peat on a steep slope. These conditions promote surface water run-off and nearby development has already contributed to long-term flooding problems in nearby areas, including perpetual flooding across Whalley Road. The drainage assessment does not address the known behaviour of saturated clay slopes, the potential for winter ice formation, or the risk to Knotts Brook from polluted runoff. The site is also crossed by a United Utilities strategic water main which restricts where construction can safely occur. Claims that the development will not increase flood risk are therefore not credible.

Our garden becomes very waterlogged and we have had to dig a trench to enable water to flow away. This is not a complete fix. Our garage suffers from rain water run-off. The build of this site could result in damage to the foundations of our property and increased flood risk.

6. Ecology and Failure to Deliver Biodiversity Net Gain

The ecological value of this site has been significantly understated. The fields, hedgerows, tree belts and peat pockets provide habitat for a range of wildlife, including legally protected species.

The development requires the removal of approximately 165 metres of hedgerow, along with several trees and areas of semi-natural habitat. These cannot be replaced by new planting in any meaningful ecological timeframe. Newly planted hedgerows and trees typically take at least 15 years to reach functional value, whereas the habitat loss would be immediate and permanent.

The ecological assessment also fails to acknowledge the presence of otters in Knotts Brook, despite clear local evidence. For publicly available video please see: https://youtube.com/shorts/Yp_cjQ1Jtso?si=1Rgo5GQRxyvGK294 Otters are protected species, and this omission undermines the credibility of the ecological report.

We have a witnessed badgers in our back garden, video attached as evidence. Badgers are protected species.

The Lancashire County Council Guidance note on policy M2 report shows that the site contains “safeguarding minerals” which prohibits the land to be built upon. To expand – Minerals Safeguarding Areas (MSAs) provide for the safeguarding of proven mineral resources which are, or may become, of economic importance from unnecessary sterilisation by non-mineral development – such as being covered by building.

7. Construction Impacts

Three years of construction would expose residents to significant noise, dust, road damage and traffic disruption. Previous Persimmon developments in the area have caused long-term deterioration to local roads. Given the constraints of the hillside and limited road network, the impacts would be severe.

8. Pressure on Local Facilities

Wilshire already faces limited access to GP and dental services, and local schools have restricted capacity. Adding 80 new homes would place further pressure on already overstretched services.

9. Rebuttal of Developer Claims

The Planning Statement asserts that the revised design is “entirely acceptable,” that landscape buffers mitigate impacts, and that drainage, highways and ecology concerns have been addressed. These claims are not supported by evidence. The fundamental issues identified previously remain unchanged, and the amendments are superficial rather than substantive.

Conclusion

The proposed development fails to overcome the longstanding concerns identified by the Local Planning Authority and the Planning Inspectorate. It causes unacceptable and irreversible harm to the landscape, ecology, highways safety, drainage, and character of the area, and is inconsistent with key local planning policies.

[REDACTED] therefore urges Ribble Valley Borough Council to refuse this application once again.

We request that this objection is fully considered by the Planning Committee and that the previously identified harms continue to be given the weight they are due.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 02 December 2025 17:18
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0801 FS-Case-770478929

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0801

Address of Development: land to the east of Salesbury View, Wilpshire

Comments: 2 Wilpshire Banks – Formal Objection to Planning Application by Persimmon Homes (Land at Salesbury View, Wilpshire)

We wish to register its strong objection to this application for residential development on the hillside east of Salesbury View, Wilpshire. This is the third application submitted for this sensitive site. The previous two applications were refused, with the most recent dismissed at appeal. The current proposal, despite minor amendments, does not address the core reasons for refusal identified by either the Local Planning Authority or the Planning Inspectorate. The development remains fundamentally unacceptable due to its impact on the landscape, highways and access constraints, drainage/flood risks and ecological harm.

1. Planning History and Principle

Persimmon Homes has already been refused permission twice on this site. The Planning Inspectorate dismissed the most recent appeal because the development would create an incongruous and visually intrusive form of development on a steep and highly visible hillside. The Inspector found that extensive earthworks, overbearing retaining structures and ineffective landscape buffers would cause significant harm to the landscape and visual amenity. These concerns arise from the nature of the site itself. The current scheme contains only five fewer houses than the previously refused application and does not overcome the fundamental constraints identified by both the Council and the Inspector.

2. Landscape, Visual Impact and Light

The site occupies a prominent and exposed hillside forming part of the rural setting of Wilpshire. Development here would be visible from miles around and would significantly erode the character of the area, including the important stretch of open land that prevents urban sprawl along the settlement edge. The developer's Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment is selective in its viewpoints and does not present an accurate picture of the visibility of the scheme from surrounding areas. The revised landscape buffers do not mitigate the harm and cannot disguise

a suburban estate on a steep open hillside. The Inspector previously concluded such buffers would be ineffective, and nothing in the current proposal contradicts this conclusion.

As the site sits [REDACTED], the proposed development would severely compromise our natural light. Our property is positioned on a steep hill, and the proposed build would tower dramatically above us, casting significant shadows over the rear of our house and garden. This would result in a substantial and lasting loss of daylight, fundamentally altering the character and enjoyment of our home.

3. Housing Need and Scale

Wilpshire requires only 24 new homes before 2028, focused on first-time buyers and older residents. The proposal for 80 dwellings significantly exceeds this requirement and does not reflect the type or mix of housing that local needs assessments indicate is required. The scale and density remain out of keeping with the character of the area.

4. Highways, Access and Road Safety

Access is solely via Salesbury View, a narrow, steep road that becomes hazardous in winter conditions and already suffers from parking pressures. Lancashire County Council Highways previously raised concerns about gradients steeper than 1:12; these remain unaddressed. When the weather is particularly icy/snowy many residents need to park on Whalley Road (A666) due to being unable to drive up or down Salesbury View, Wilpshire Banks and Station Close. The increased volume of cars, due to the proposed site, that will evidently exacerbate this ongoing issue.

The A666 is one of the busiest routes in the borough, connecting Blackburn and Clitheroe. It already experiences significant congestion, frequent accidents, dangerous bends, no pavement, speeding, and rat-running via Knowsley Road and Ramsgreave Road. A recent police survey recorded vehicles travelling above 30mph three times per hour. An additional 80 homes would significantly increase traffic volumes and collision risks. The developer's suggestion that the location is "highly sustainable" does not reflect local conditions or the realities of pedestrian and vehicle movement in this area.

We have lived on [REDACTED] and witnessed a high volume of road traffic accidents.

5. Drainage and Flood Risk

The site consists of clay and peat on a steep slope. These conditions promote surface water run-off and nearby development has already contributed to long-term flooding problems in nearby areas, including perpetual flooding across Whalley Road. The drainage assessment does not address the known behaviour of saturated clay slopes, the potential for winter ice formation, or the risk to Knotts Brook from polluted runoff. The site is also crossed by a United Utilities strategic water main which restricts where construction can safely occur. Claims that the development will not increase flood risk are therefore not credible.

Our garden becomes very waterlogged and we have had to dig a trench to enable water to flow away. This is not a complete fix. Our garage suffers from rain water run-off. The build of this site could result in damage to the foundations of our property and increased flood risk.

6. Ecology and Failure to Deliver Biodiversity Net Gain

The ecological value of this site has been significantly understated. The fields, hedgerows, tree belts

and peat pockets provide habitat for a range of wildlife, including legally protected species.

The development requires the removal of approximately 165 metres of hedgerow, along with several trees and areas of semi-natural habitat. These cannot be replaced by new planting in any meaningful ecological timeframe. Newly planted hedgerows and trees typically take at least 15 years to reach functional value, whereas the habitat loss would be immediate and permanent.

The ecological assessment also fails to acknowledge the presence of otters in Knotts Brook, despite clear local evidence. For publicly available video please see: https://youtube.com/shorts/Yp_cjQ1Jtso?si=1Rgo5GQRxyvGK294 Otters are protected species, and this omission undermines the credibility of the ecological report.

We have a witnessed badgers in our back garden, video attached as evidence. Badgers are protected species.

The Lancashire County Council Guidance note on policy M2 report shows that the site contains “safeguarding minerals” which prohibits the land to be built upon. To expand – Minerals Safeguarding Areas (MSAs) provide for the safeguarding of proven mineral resources which are, or may become, of economic importance from unnecessary sterilisation by non-mineral development – such as being covered by building.

7. Construction Impacts

Three years of construction would expose residents to significant noise, dust, road damage and traffic disruption. Previous Persimmon developments in the area have caused long-term deterioration to local roads. Given the constraints of the hillside and limited road network, the impacts would be severe.

8. Pressure on Local Facilities

Wilpshire already faces limited access to GP and dental services, and local schools have restricted capacity. Adding 80 new homes would place further pressure on already overstretched services.

9. Rebuttal of Developer Claims

The Planning Statement asserts that the revised design is “entirely acceptable,” that landscape buffers mitigate impacts, and that drainage, highways and ecology concerns have been addressed. These claims are not supported by evidence. The fundamental issues identified previously remain unchanged, and the amendments are superficial rather than substantive.

Conclusion

The proposed development fails to overcome the longstanding concerns identified by the Local Planning Authority and the Planning Inspectorate. It causes unacceptable and irreversible harm to the landscape, ecology, highways safety, drainage, and character of the area, and is inconsistent with key local planning policies.

██ therefore urges Ribble Valley Borough Council to refuse this application once again.

We request that this objection is fully considered by the Planning Committee and that the previously identified harms continue to be given the weight they are due.

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 02 December 2025 19:47
To: Planning
Subject: 3/2025/0801

 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 to the East of Salesbury View

I wish to object to the above plan for development on the hill overlooking Wilpshire and Ramsgreave.

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] 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 Whalley Road I would be very concerned about the safety of myself and my children 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: 02 December 2025 20:18
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0801 FS-Case-770516026

[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: 02 December 2025 22:00
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 37889 FS-Case-770534041

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 37889

Address of Development: 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 Wiltshire 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 Wiltshire 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, Wiltshire’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: [REDACTED]
Sent: 02 December 2025 22:43
To: Planning
Subject: OBJECTION - Application number 3/2025/0801

⚠ 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.

Objection Letter - Application number 3/2025/0801



United Kingdom

Date: 02/12/2025

To: Planning Department Local Council

Objection to Proposed Development of 80 Houses with Single Road Access

Dear [Planning Officer]

I am writing to formally object to the proposed development of 80 houses that would rely solely on a single road access for entrance and exist. While I understand the need for new housing, I believe this particular plan presents serious risks and disadvantages for both current and future residents.

Key Concerns

1. Traffic Congestion and Safety

A single access road would be unable to safely accommodate the volume of vehicles generated by 80 households. This raises concerns about congestion, increased accident risk, and difficulties for pedestrians and cyclists.

2. Emergency Access

In the event of an emergency, such as a fire or medical crisis, reliance on one road could delay response times. Especially since the current residents use the road for parking as there is nowhere else to park making it already a tight squeeze. Blockages or accidents on that road would leave residents vulnerable without alternative routes.

3. Infrastructure Strain

The existing road network and local facilities are not designed to absorb such a significant increase in demand. This would place undue pressure on schools, healthcare services, and utilities.

4. Community Impact

The scale of the development, combined with restricted access, would negatively affect the quality of life for existing residents. Increased traffic, noise, and pollution would diminish the character and safety of the area.

Conclusion

I respectfully urge the Council to reject this application in its current form. Housing growth must be balanced with safe, sustainable infrastructure, and this proposal does not meet those standards.

Thank you for taking my concerns into account.

Yours sincerely,

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the signature of the author.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 03 December 2025 02:55
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0801 FS-Case-770556633

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0801

Address of Development: Salesbury view in Wilpshire

Comments: My privacy will be impacted, the proposed development w [REDACTED]
[REDACTED], which is unacceptable invasion of my personal space, flooding issues my house has been
[REDACTED] to water runoff from the land in question which drains through [REDACTED]
causes severe flooding on my property. this recurring issue has not been adequately addressed in the
planning application, I am worried that further development will exacerbate the problem. Whalley
road is already a very busy road and any additional housing will only worsen traffic congestion in the
area. this will not only inconvenience local residents but could also pose serious safety risks, and
will likely make it harder for pedestrians, cyclists and motorists to navigate the road safely. potential
for increased criminality

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 03 December 2025 07:29
To: Planning
Subject: Planning application no. 3/2025/0801

⚠ 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.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

03/12/2025

Planning Department
Ribble Valley Council

Application number 3/2025/0801

Re: Objection to Proposed Development “Salesbury View” near Knowsley Road, Wilpshire

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to lodge a formal objection to the proposed housing development known as Salesbury View, located near Knowsley Road, Wilpshire.

My primary concern relates to the significant increase in traffic that this development will generate. Knowsley Road is already used extensively as a cut-through route for drivers seeking quick access to the A59. Adding a new housing estate in this location will almost certainly worsen congestion, raise safety risks for pedestrians, cyclists and children playing, and degrade the overall environment for existing residents.

At present, the road infrastructure is not capable of accommodating the additional vehicle movements that a development of this scale will create. Increased traffic flow will likely lead to:

- Heavier use of Knowsley Road as a “rat run,” especially during peak travel times.
- More congestion and longer queues at junctions feeding onto the A59.
- Greater noise, air pollution, and general disturbance for local residents.
- Higher risks of road accidents due to increased through-traffic and limited sightlines in certain sections of the road.

Before any development is approved, I believe a thorough and transparent traffic impact assessment must be carried out, including peak-hour modelling and realistic projections of vehicle use from the proposed properties. Without this, the full impact on local infrastructure and residents cannot be properly understood or mitigated.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that the council reconsider this proposal or require substantial changes and safeguards to ensure that the development does not intensify traffic problems in the area.

Thank you for considering my objection. I look forward to being kept informed of any further steps in the planning process.

Yours faithfully,

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the signature of the sender.

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 03 December 2025 09:18
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application 3/2025/0801

⚠ 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.

Dear Ms Hughes
Planning Application 3/2025/0801 Land to the east of Salesbury View

We wish to register our objections to the above planning application.

Although the number of houses has been slightly reduced the issues are still the same as on previous applications by this applicant. The proposed 80 dwellings significantly exceeds the requirement for Wilpshire.

The steep gradient at Salesbury View causes many problems particularly in Winter with cars having to park on the A666 road. A gradient steeper than 1:12 on the access road discriminates against the elderly, disabled and families with children. There is also a danger with the existing footpaths on the main road.

The proposed development will only have one entry/exit road therefore the road could easily become blocked causing severe congestion. This has already been a problem with large vehicles becoming stuck on the road, this could become a problem emergency vehicles. Due to the extra traffic, Knowsley Rd (access only) will become more of a rat run with motorists cutting through to avoid delays on Whalley Rd.

Drainage is also a problem on this waterlogged site. Surface water already causes flooding on the A666 and with so much hard surfacing on the proposed development the problem will be exacerbated.

Due to the topography of the site and the size of the development it will be seen from many view points, changing the character of the whole area.

The ecology report hardly refers to any wildlife even though the site has an abundance of birds, deer, foxes, newts plus many more.

It is difficult to assess the damage done to the environment with the large number of hedgerows and trees being removed. Even with new planting it will take at least 15 years to have any significant impact on the site.

Wilpshire residents currently have difficulties in accessing NHS services and local school places, a further 80 homes will make the situation more problematic.

New residential developments have to be in a suitable location, good for the local community, and of a good quality. This Application does not meet these criteria.

I hope our comments will be taken into consideration and the Application be refused.

Thank you.
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 03 December 2025 10:19
To: Planning
Subject: Objection to app 3/2025/0801 Salisbury 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.

Hello, I would like to strongly object (again) to the building of 80 houses at Salisbury View, Wiltshire. The last attempt at planning permission was thrown out, and I see no reason at all why they've been allowed to re-apply as the permanent issues have not and can not be changed.

1, Absolutely dangerous road - I lived on [REDACTED] needed access to Whalley Road. There was a lot less traffic then, but it was incredibly dangerous in Winter. Cars barrel down an ice rink and can't stop, they swing onto Whalley Road and just hope to God no one is there to hit.... Now, that so many other houses have been built in the area, there is always a huge stopped queue of traffic. There are constant little accidents, serious near misses even in Summer from cars trying to get out of Salisbury view.

You are proposing adding 80 houses traffic to this - that could reasonably be 160 extra cars barreling down an ice rink in Winter, unable to stop, unable to turn out into an already clogged, traffic stopped road. Whalley Road is the ONLY access to the A59 for anyone from the Brownhill area. The road is already a mad flood zone because of all the trees cut down for new houses. To use this as an access road is monumentally dangerous.

2, Too many new houses already - This is a clear money grab by builders because Wiltshire is expensive. The reason Wiltshire is expensive is because it's pretty, and has ancient woodlands/views etc. Of course, it won't when you destroy them all to build these hideous houses that are not at all in keeping with the area.

We don't need more £600,000 houses. Your idea of affordable housing is not at all affordable. These houses are not going to help the local people whose kids can't afford to live here, in fact they will be supremely bad for the local people.

There are already new houses built (and hundreds more planned) very nearby. Parsonage road to Brownhill Roundabout may be technically Blackburn so not your jurisdiction, but it is right next to where you want to build. There is zero need for these houses. The builders asking for planning permission want to cash in on the Ribble Valley prices - they can charge more for these houses than Blackburn one because of Ribble Valley schools, services. However, where are these services????

Infrastructure- There are zero NHS dentists. It is ridiculously difficult to get a doctor's appointment - there aren't any of these services for Wiltshire people already. We have to use Brownhill surgery/Roe Lee in Blackburn, or Whalley who have started to turn people away as they are so totally overwhelmed by the influx of new people from the hundreds of new houses already built in Whalley, in Brownhill (hundreds more already green-lit to be built), and Roe Lee/Pleckgate.

Where are the doctors? The dentists? The schools for these family houses? The secondary schools are absolutely full to bursting. I [REDACTED]. You force us every year to take more and more, we force them in but what quality of education are these kids already getting? You are going to make it worse if you allow 80 more unnecessary houses just out of greed. The wait time at the ONLY Accident and Emergency department was 18 hours yesterday.

There are no services for the people who are already here. There is one local shop. Unless you drive a car, which there is no place to park, this is a terrible place to try and commute from.

Where is the transport? The buses you need to catch to get to Clitheroe - Blackburn on a 9-5 schedule are so packed they routinely drive past the bus stops without stopping. This is the only bus. The only way i can make sure i get to [REDACTED] is to catch 3 buses early. The correctly timed bus, and the one before can not be trusted to stop, certainly don't have seats for [REDACTED]

The train service at Ramsgreave is incredibly unreliable. There aren't even any trains on a Sunday, ever, The replacement bus does not pick up here. The once an hour train is often cancelled after its due to 'signalling errors' or 'not enough staff'. So people moving in will need to drive - There are too many cars on the road already!

Whalley Road is the main access for the A59. There is constant traffic on a badly maintained road that is already a hazard in Winter due to poorly maintained drains, the trees that were a natural barrier being removed (you'll make this even worse) This road was not built for the traffic already on it - don't add more. It would be incredibly reckless.

Local character - You will lose everything that attracts people to the Ribble Valley if you keep building all the villages into one place. If you build these new houses Wilpshire and Blackburn will be one place. There will be zero divide.

They will also be an absolute eyesore. This is ancient woodland you want to destroy. There are otters in the streams, Bats. Hedgehogs. Badgers. Foxes. Birds - even a mile away in Ramsgreave you don't get the types of endangered birds we do in Wilpshire. They will all die.

The deer all live here now because the land they used to live on has been destroyed by building. I saw an hare last week - do you know how rare that is?

This is why people pay a premium to live in Wilpshire. If you take away the green, destroy ancient hedgerows that have been part of the land for 500 years, you can't grow that back when these houses are derelict in 50 years. Everything good will be gone. The animals will all be running in the roads because they have nowhere left to go - the only place they could go is the land next to all this that Blackburn are already going to build on. It is no exaggeration to say everything will die. We will just be looking at hideous cheaply built yellow houses all pressed too close together - all anyone will see is the builders greed. No one will understand that this is Wilpshire and not Blackburn.

This planning permission was thrown out a few years ago. They have changed very little with this new application. There is no reason for this application to be passed besides greed. These builders do not care what happens once they've thrown up their houses, and run away with the money. 80 new houses in a tiny village? On an incredibly dangerous access road? Built on our last bit of ancient woodland? No.

[REDACTED]