

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 29 November 2025 09:47
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0801 FS-Case-769540616

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0801

Address of Development: Salesbury View

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

. 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: 29 November 2025 11:42
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0801 FS-Case-769561527

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0801

Address of Development: Salisbury View Wilpshire

Comments: The traffic issues are already terrible around the Wilpshire hotel & surrounding areas, particularly with any temporary traffic lights, mornings, evenings, bad weather. These proposed houses will exacerbate the already stretched traffic issues around this area & make for potentially more treacherous & dangerous problems for school children/walkers/local residents as well as road problems.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 29 November 2025 13:09
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0801 FS-Case-769575987

[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: [REDACTED]
Sent: 29 November 2025 14:29
To: Planning
Subject: Salisbury View 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.

Hello,

I'm writing to object to the proposed erection of new residential development comprising of 80 new homes by Persimmon on Salisbury View. I must as I appreciate their persistence in trying to build on this area, I am equally persistent in objecting to it.

Apologies if my objections cover the same areas as previous ones when they have attempted to build here, however as this new proposal of 80 is only 4 short of the last application, it shows how little care has been given to the previous objections.

We have hundreds of new homes recently built in the area which rely on the same roads, such as Whalley New Road, which is already congested, in a poor state of repair and has inefficient draining, yet it is the main route to the A59.

The proposed building site is on a steep hillside, next to a green belt and a village, it's site is one that can be seen from miles around. Building so many houses here will spoil the distinct character of the village and surrounding areas, creating an eye sore.

The sole access and exit to the proposed development is Salisbury view, this is a short, narrow, sloping road which will carry traffic to the already mentioned busy Whalley Road. This will only exacerbate traffic issues and accidents, especially in Winter when water runs down the hill and across A666 and freezes.

There are significant issues that exist with the topography of the land and major earthworks will be needed, this will damage its historic and environmental integrity.

There are very limited facilities available for a significant increase in the number of people living in Wilpshire for example, school places, doctors, dentists and other health services and shops etc.

Plus, there are environmental concerns around the development, with local residents seeing bats and otters on the site.

I hope this is helpful. Please let me know if you need any other objections.

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 29 November 2025 15:10
To: Planning
Subject: Objection: Salesbury view housing development

⚠ 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,

I am writing for the third time to object to this third attempt by Persimmon to build on this site.

Persimmon Homes are a very large corporate entity with significant resources that enable them to persist vexatiously against the very clear wishes of a wide range of local residents who have consistently raised a host of objections.

I repeat my previous concerns that (1) this very visible site will destroy the character of a greater part of an entire hillside and spoil the view from my house (one reason I bought it) [REDACTED] (2) produce a very significant amount of additional residential traffic merging a very steep estate exit with a main road that is already clogged at rush hour, (3) place significant further pressure on local services given the large amount of recent building on Brownhill Drive and many other sites on the Blackburn with Darwen/Ribble Valley border.

The character of the area that we moved to [REDACTED] has already changed greatly for the worse; I can no longer walk or run to Mellor or to local reservoirs due to significantly increased traffic at all times of the day, and there are frequent queues backed up Ramsgreave Rd from the rail bridge that obstruct access to [REDACTED]. The proposed build would feel like a tipping point in terms of viability of living and driving locally.

Each time Persimmon has been denied permission to build, it has come back with only a very slightly amended plan that I take to be a cynical attempt to out-wait and out-resource local residents while waiting for favourable change in the political complexion of local government. The current application is only four units short of the last application, does not and cannot address the access, traffic and resource pressure points above.

I urge you to reject this application: we must put local residents and quality of life above the profits of this careless company.

Yours,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 29 November 2025 17:06
To: Planning
Subject: Objection to Planning Application by Persimmon Homes (Land East of Salesbury View, Wilpshire) 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.

Objection to Planning Application by Persimmon Homes (Land East of Salesbury View, Wilpshire) Application 3/2025/0801

I am, once again, submitting my objection to this proposal based on my direct knowledge of the site. [REDACTED] and have done so for several years. Because of this, I have a clear understanding of its topography, ecological features, drainage behaviour, and wider landscape context.

1. Landscape and Visual Impact

The hillside forms part of the open approach to Wilpshire and contributes significantly to the rural character of this section of the A666 corridor. The landscape is exposed, with long-distance visibility both from the valley and from the opposite side in Ramsgreave. I do not believe the proposed housing layout, earthworks, or retaining structures could be successfully absorbed into the landform. This aligns with the Planning Inspector's conclusions in the previous appeal, which highlighted the prominence of the site, the scale of engineering required, and the inability of landscape buffers to mitigate the visual effects. The views presented in the developer's documents do not reflect the full range of perspectives available when walking around the site, particularly those from footpaths and informal viewing points used by local residents.

2. Ecological Value

Through regular walking, I have observed consistent wildlife activity along the hedgerows and field edges, including roe deer, foxes, bats, and a variety of bird species. These observations demonstrate that the existing hedgerows and tree belts function as active ecological corridors. The developer's proposal includes the removal of around 165 metres of hedgerow and several established trees. This would have a substantial impact on local habitat connectivity. Knotts Brook, which runs adjacent to the site, supports otters. This is a protected species and their presence is evidenced locally. Their omission from the ecological assessment is a significant oversight. Given the steep slope and direct runoff pathways, any pollution incident or increased sediment load during construction could affect this watercourse. The claim that ecological impacts can be mitigated through new planting does not reflect the functional value of the existing mature hedgerows and tree networks. Newly planted features do not replace these in either the short or medium term.

3. Drainage and Ground Conditions

Walking the edge of the site during and after periods of rainfall provides clear evidence that the ground sheds water quickly down the slope. The soil structure, which is predominantly clay and peat, becomes waterlogged and produces surface runoff. This creates natural flow paths towards the A666 and Knotts Brook.

Nearby developments on similar ground conditions cause constant flooding on Whalley Road. From my own observations of the site after rainfall, significant earthworks and increased impermeable surfaces would likely accelerate runoff further. Support protected species

- clay and peat soils that shed water rapidly

Based on that direct evidence, and in line with the findings of previous refusals, I do not believe this hillside can accommodate a development of this scale without significant and irreversible impacts.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that the application is refused.

Yours sincerely

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted name]

[Redacted title]

[Redacted contact information]

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 29 November 2025 15:15
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0801 FS-Case-769591894

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0801

Address of Development: SALESBURY VIEW WILPSHIRE

Comments: 1 I am concerned about the development and its impact on wild life Deer, bats and Otters have been seen in this area.
2 Limited facilities available in the area a significant increase for doctor's, schools and dentists.
3 The increase in traffic in the village the road is in poor condition and the development will further exasperate this.
4 Major earth works will be needed the run off of water from this area in wet weather is well known in the area.
5 Access to the site is by one small road .
6 Other major developments 1500 houses at Sunnybower /Ramsgreave and at the Rugby club area are further adding to the strain on infrastructure.
7 This Major development will spoil the distinctive character of Wilpshire

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 29 November 2025 17:37
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2022/0115 FS-Case-769609975

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2022/0115

Address of Development: Salesbury View, Wilpshire, Blackburn

Comments: The highways around the development are already too busy, in particular Hollowhead lane where it joins Whalley New Road. The crossroads into Ribchester road is already dangerous and more traffic will cause accidents, which may involve children who use this route to access Salesbury School. During winter this road is impassable when it freezes.

The land is a natural soak for rainwater coming from the hill, Further roads, houses and hard land , will cause a flooding risk on Whalley New Road, as the water will run straight across the development and pour onto the main road below, this is already the case but the development will multiply the problem.

The social infrastructure in the area is already stretched, schools, Doctors and Dentists, so further houses Will exasperate the problem.

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 29 November 2025 17:57
To: Planning
Subject: Ref:3/2025/0801 Land to the east of Salesbury View, Wiltshire

⚠ 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.

I wish to submit an objection to the planning appeal above.

I live [REDACTED], and trying to [REDACTED] Whalley Road is already troublesome - and almost impossible at rush hour, unless someone takes pity and lets you join the road. Extra cars joining from Salesbury View will exacerbate this issue. In addition, access to the proposed new housing via such a steep access road is not ideal. I have seen cars slithering down that hill in icy conditions, and people who live on Salesbury View tend to park on the main road when there is frost. Imagine all the other residents of the proposed development doing the same. This is a hazard in waiting. I understand the traffic report that was done as part of the application is out of date - I think an up to date report should be necessary. I understand there have been three accidents on the relevant stretch of Whalley Road in the past couple of weeks.

I am also concerned for the wildlife in this green field site, which will be displaced by this development - deer, foxes, etc.

The character and appearance of the area is also in jeopardy. The proposed development is not attractive visually and I would question its quality and whether it is sympathetic to those houses surrounding it.

I hope that the appeal will be dismissed - there is much strength of feeling on the part of local residents who are against this development.

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 30 November 2025 08:25
To: Planning
Subject: Planning 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.

Re- Land at Salesbury View, Wilpshire

Dear Sir / Madam,

I am writing to register my **STRONG OBJECTION** to the above planning application for residential development on the hillside east of Salesbury View, Wilpshire. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED], which is within the local area, and I believe this proposal remains wholly unsuitable for the site for the following reasons:

1. Landscape and Visual Impact

- The site occupies a prominent, exposed hillside forming part of the rural setting of Wilpshire, visible from miles around. Development here would significantly erode the rural / open-land character and result in unacceptable suburbanisation of a key green buffer.
- The revised landscape buffers and planting are inadequate to mitigate this harm, especially given the steep slope and visibility; they do not address the concerns previously raised by the Local Authority and the Planning Inspectorate.

2. Housing Need, Scale and Density

- Local need assessments identify a requirement for a modest number of new homes (approx. 24 by 2028), focused on first-time buyers and older residents — not an 80-house development. The scale and density of the proposal do not match the identified local need, and the proposed mix appears out-of-keeping with the character and requirements of the area.

3. Highway Safety, Access and Parking

- Access would be solely via Salesbury View, a narrow and steep road which already experiences parking pressure and can become hazardous in winter conditions. Concerns previously flagged by the highways authority remain unaddressed.
- The nearby main road (A666) is already congested and prone to accidents; adding 80 households would significantly increase traffic volume, risking further congestion, hazards, rat-running, and undermining pedestrian safety given limited pavement provision.

4. Drainage, Flood Risk and Ground Stability

- The site lies on steep slopes of clay and peat, prone to surface-water run-off.

Surrounding areas have a history of flooding. The submitted drainage assessment does not sufficiently address the risks posed by saturated clay slopes, winter ice, or potential pollution of watercourses.

- A strategic water main crosses the site, further constraining safe development and raising risks of damage or disruption.

5. Ecology and Biodiversity Loss

- The site supports hedgerows, trees, semi-natural habitat and peat patches that provide habitat for wildlife, including protected species such as otters. The proposal would result in removal of around 165 metres of hedgerow and loss of mature trees — damage that cannot be offset realistically.

- The ecological assessment understates habitat value and fails to acknowledge local evidence. The proposal does not deliver genuine biodiversity net gain.

6. Pressure on Local Infrastructure and Community Services

- Wiltshire already has limited school and healthcare capacity. An additional 80 homes would place unsustainable pressure on local services.

Conclusion:

The application does not overcome fundamental constraints identified previously. Its approval would cause irreversible harm to the landscape, ecology, drainage, highway safety, and local character, while failing to meet genuine housing needs.

For these reasons, I urge you to refuse this application.

Yours faithfully,



[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 30 November 2025 11:52
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0801 FS-Case-769707299

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0801

Address of Development: Salesbury view in wilpshire

Comments: After hearing about the proposed application of 80 new houses in Wilpshire I feel that it would only be right to comment on what I feel is an already over developed area. There are already plans submitted for 1500 houses on Brownhills drive for which work has already begun in addition to that we have had house built and still being built on ramsgreave drive by the Rugby club. We had house built not too long back up Parsonage road. All this building of properties on beautiful green fields has to stop at some point. I feel that an extra 80 properties which would of course relate to around 180/200 minimum extra people who majority will use cars on the A666. Which is already a nightmare at peak times. We also have a lot of water which runs down off these hills already onto the A666 which in the last week alone has seen 3 crashes when it's frosted over. This is mainly down to the fact that there is nowhere for this rain to soak into as the ground is full of foundations from existing properties. On top of this we already have oversubscribed schools, doctors, dentists in the area and more people would only put more strain on these businesses and less appointments for those in need. Then there is the environment aspect. Wild animals losing there habitat, at night when I've been walking along Whalley new road I've seen bats flying in that area. I can't say for sure where they live but they definately are in the area. So on these pointers alone I feel that these properties should NOT be built.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 30 November 2025 12:49
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0801 FS-Case-769715898

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0801

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

Comments: I wish to register my objections to the proposed development application by Persimmon Homes . As far as I am aware this has been rejected twice already including at appeal stage . The revised application does not appear to be significantly different to the others submitted previously. I believe that the proposed development would be not be in keeping with the character of the local area and because of the location ie on an exposed hillside it would be visible for miles around , making it visually unacceptable to residents in the area . The proposed access is off A666 via Salisbury View . This is a steep gradient short access road to existing properties directly onto an already very busy main road (the only main road linking Brownhill to Langho) and one which is fraught with traffic queues at busy times particularly at the traffic lights at the Co-op . This is already a dangerous junction with many drivers jumping the lights and risking the lives of pedestrians . 80 more houses would increase the traffic significantly and cause more frustration for drivers , and increasing the likelihood of unsafe driving . Apart from that Salisbury View is steep and in the winter it ices up due to water from the surrounding land , leading to dangerous road conditions , again this would impact users of the main road . The land of proposed development is home to much wildlife which would suffer as a result ie deer roam that open land , they would have to find alternative land . I also believe that there would be a significant negative impact on local amenities which would struggle to accommodate the increased number of residents .

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 30 November 2025 16:09
To: Planning
Subject: 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.

Dear Sir/Madam,

Re: Planning application number 3/2025/0801

I am writing to lodge my objection to the proposed housing development - Salesbury View, Wiltshire by Persimmon Homes.

My main objection to this development is the proposal to make the sole access to Salesbury View a narrow, sloping road which will feed onto Whalley Road. Whalley Road (A666) is already a busy road. With this new housing development there is the potential for a further 200 cars to be using Whalley road which was not designed for the amount of potential traffic. When it rains, water pours down off the hillside forming a mini-ford across Whalley road, in winter this can freeze. I do not believe the service road will be safe. I believe it will be a further hazard. I speak from the experience of [REDACTED] and have had to learn to drive whilst sliding downhill. I believe the situation of potentially slipping straight down onto a busy road with little means of stopping is dangerous. This is an accident waiting to happen.

I also object from the environmental prospective, houses should ideally be built on 'brown land' not adjacent to Greenbelt. We are losing more of the local countryside which supports a diversity of wildlife. Furthermore, I believe homes should be built with easy access to amenities, schools, shops, doctors surgeries and medical centres and public transport, clearly these houses are not going to be provisioned adequately. I assume it is being built mainly for young families? Where are the extra schools, nurseries, creches and play areas? Older people will struggle with the steep hill, it is not suitable for anyone with more than mild mobility issues.

This is the third time Persimmon Homes have applied for permission to build on this site. I note they are now asking to build 80 homes, only 4 less than in the previous application. This is still a large development. Permission for 1500 new homes has already been given so there are many new homes already being built, already putting pressure on local roads and services.

I urge the planning department to reject this application on the grounds, it is an unsuitable site with rainwater draining off the hillside and a lack of facilities to cater to the possible 200 extra residents. There is very little different about this application from its predecessors and I urge the Planning committee to decline this application.

Yours Faithfully

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 30 November 2025 19:22
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 37889 FS-Case-769788907

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 37889

Address of Development: Salesbury View

Comments: As someone who [REDACTED] from this proposed site I have concerns on the following grounds

1) Traffic and access,

At peak times the traffic on Whalley/Whalley New Road is very heavy and adding another major turn onto Salesbury View will add to this especially traffic going towards the A59. There is also the impact of the site traffic whilst the site is being developed

Access to the development via Salesbury View a very steep road is also a major concern.

2) Drainage

There is running water already down the slope on to Whalley Road and this causes accidents in winter.

Thanks

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 30 November 2025 20:01
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0801 FS-Case-769795863

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0801

Address of Development: Salesbury view

Comments: I object to this development as there have already been significant house building in the local area near Blackburn Rugby club, between Whalley New Road and the Knowles Arms, and permission also given for a further development NE Blackburn. Add to the this the excessive house building from Langho, Whalley and Clitheroe. Local roads are clogged at peak times. There has been no increase in amenities such as doctors, dentists, local parking at the railway station, and Ramsgreave road is used by speeding motorists as a dangerous rat run at peak times. Royal Blackburn hospital is overwhelmed by the growing population it supports. There is no benefit to existing residents, only a further squeeze on space and resources. Continuous building is also pushing wildlife out such deer, owls, bats and birds. I think there is sufficient building done in the area, and it's time to stop.