

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 29 November 2025 22:06
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0801 FS-Case-769634381

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0801

Address of Development: Salesbury View Wilpshire

Comments: I object to this proposed development. This has been previously turned down and it needs to stay that way.

The A666 cannot cope with the volume of traffic at peak times now. Regular accidents occur and when the running water freezes expect more .

The access to the proposed site is very steep, hardly a road to encourage cycling to work .

Most importantly, the destruction of a green space and the wildlife that live there .

Developers have run a mock in the Ribble Valley, you only need to drive down the A 59 to experience this.

Please stand up to the developers for the sake of what's left of our Ribble Valley.

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 30 November 2025 22:39
To: lanc.custcare@persimmonhomes.com; 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.

Good evening,

I've been invited to register any objection I have toward the above development.

There are masses of houses being built all across the UK to accommodate the huge increase in population that the UK has hosted in the last ten to fifteen years. These houses are usually much more expensive than anyone on minimum wage can afford. So without being accused of an "ism" I suggest there should be some clarity about who it is who actually buys them, and how young families can be introduced into the monetary equation that is used to justify the huge rates of pay of tradesmen onsite and construction company managers' salaries.

From my experience of [REDACTED] I know that there is no discussion of why's or where's or what's regarding the "suitability" of the development in hand. The only fuel that drives the engine of the construction industry is money. Health and Safety as in CSCS goes out of the window after a basic onsite induction. This has over the years become so brief as to simply take 30 seconds sign a document saying you understand health and safety issues on a particular site.

My objection to this particular development is for the same reasons as other local residents have raised regarding safety of the junction, drainage, other nearby developments that have no infrastructure built with them eg schools shops health centres police stations etc etc .

I believe this development has now been submitted for consideration by RVBC for the third time, the last time about a year ago. When will Persimmon Homes take no for an answer ? Is there a loophole in the planning law that allows series upon series of applications for a particular site until someone at the council finally "gives in" ?

Persimmon should start to engage with the spirit of the law instead of the letter of the law, have more regard for what existing locals think, give up submitting multiple applications for the same site, and when they do build houses ... build them to last longer than 60 years eh ?

Regards

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 01 December 2025 07:00
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 Planning team,
Re: the proposed development of Parsimmon homes in Wilpshire with the above mentioned application number

I wish to register my objections on the following grounds

1. It will spoil the distinct character of our village, the beautiful countryside
2. The only access for in and out will be to the whalley road, which is already a busy one- increasing the traffic issues
3. The background works on earth around this will diminish the environmental integrity
4. The facilities in Wilpshire are already limited to cope with a significant increase in the number of people living in this area
5. Previous proposals have been denied and the changes made to this proposal are very minimal - like 4 houses fewer and slight changes to the type of houses- as opposed to all the other negative factors unchanged.

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 01 December 2025 08:54
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0801 FS-Case-769869316

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0801

Address of Development: Land to the 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 wish to raise serious concerns on multiple grounds and for these reasons I believe the 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 cul-de-sac with approximately 12% incline.

In winter conditions this road becomes unusable due to icy weather. (There are documented instances of vehicles getting stuck as the incline is too severe.

Adding potentially 150-200 houses to this road would overwhelm its capacity.

Relying on a single, very steep access poses risks to everyday traffic, emergency vehicles and pedestrians. The proposed scheme fails to provide safe and suitable access for all.

The A666 is a busy principle route between Blackburn and Clitheroe. Introducing an additional 80+ houses would significantly increase traffic volumes on this road, worsening peak-time congestion and increasing the danger of accidents on a stretch plagued by speeding issues.

The proposal does not provide a safe, suitable access and would create severe impacts on the road network.

Drainage and Flood risk. The site lies on a steep hillside composed of clay soils.

democracy.ribblevalley.gov.uk There are already known flooding issues in the area damaging property and creating road safety hazards. 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.

Ecological and Environmental impact. Loss of habitats. The proposal would destroy a significant amount of existing natural 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. Roe deer, foxes, hedgehogs (which are on the Red Danger list for vulnerable species), bats and other species that rely on the hedgerows and woodland edges for foraging, movement and survival. The hedgerows 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. This application does not demonstrate a measurable net gain for biodiversity; on the contrary, it presents a net loss of habitat and ecological value.

The large scale removal of these natural habitats will irreversibly harm local biodiversity. The ecological survey provided by the developer "falls short of any meaningful identification and protection of wildlife"

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

Landscape and Visual Impact. This development would have a significant adverse impact on the landscape character of Wil[shire].

I could continue with the list of objections, particularly as there is no advantage of this proposed development, except to the developer.

I will close my objection with the comment that I request to be kept informed of this proposed plan.

Regards [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 01 December 2025 10:14
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0801 FS-Case-769910983

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0801

Address of Development: Salesbury View, Wilpshire

Comments: My concerns relating to this proposed development of 80 new homes are mainly concerned with the additional level of traffic that will be taken by Whalley Road. It seems that the only access to this proposed development will be by a narrow road which will carry traffic down onto Whalley Road which is already very busy especially at peak times. We already suffer long delays on Whalley Road at peak times and this development will only make the situation worse. Whalley Road does not need a further 100 - 150 cars at peak times. My other major concern is that yet again we seem to be willing to push ahead with developments on what is effectively green belt whilst disregarding such sites as the one a Brownhill roundabout which has remained empty waste land for several years. I know this is in Blackburn but can we not have some joined up thinking?

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 01 December 2025 11:10
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0801 FS-Case-769949862

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0801

Address of Development: Land East of Salesbury View, Wilpshire

Comments: Objection to Planning Application 3/2025/0801 – Land East of Salesbury View, Wilpshire
I live in [REDACTED] [REDACTED] where this development is proposed, and I object to the application.

Summary of Objections

- The only access is a steep cul-de-sac that becomes impassable in winter and is hazardous even in normal conditions.
- The junction with the A666 is already dangerous; extra traffic from 80+ homes would make it worse.
- The hillside is clay soil and prone to flooding. More hard surfaces will send water downhill, putting homes and roads at risk.
- Hedgerows and trees would be destroyed, removing habitats for deer, bats, hedgehogs, and birds.
- The site is a prominent green slope. Building here would spoil the landscape and erode the gap between Wilpshire and Blackburn, while also harming the outlook for Ramsgreave residents opposite.
- Wilpshire does not need this scale of housing. Local schools, doctors, and dentists are already stretched, and the wrong type of homes are being proposed.

Supporting Detail

Salesbury View has a 12% gradient and is narrow, often blocked by parked cars. Emergency vehicles would struggle, and pedestrians, wheelchair users, and parents with prams would find it unsafe. The junction with Whalley Road (A666) is on a blind bend known locally as “The Knolle,” already a collision risk. The applicant’s traffic survey was carried out during COVID lockdown, when volumes were abnormally low, so it does not reflect reality.

Flooding is a serious concern. The site’s clay soils and steep slope mean heavy runoff. Past developments have already caused flooding on Whalley Road. Without robust drainage, water could overwhelm local systems and pollute Showley Brook.

The scheme would remove around 165 metres of hedgerow and numerous trees, harming habitats for local wildlife. The ecological survey is superficial and does not demonstrate biodiversity net gain. The hillside is highly visible from Whalley Road and beyond. Housing, retaining walls, and engineered slopes would urbanise the landscape, eroding Wilpshire’s semi rural character and narrowing the green buffer with Blackburn.

Wilpshire’s housing need is modest — around 32 dwellings to 2028. This scheme proposes 84 homes, far exceeding local requirements. The mix of housing does not match local need, focusing on

large family houses rather than starter homes or accommodation for older residents. Local schools, GP surgeries, and dentists are already stretched, with no new facilities proposed.

Conclusion

This application repeats the same fundamental problems identified in the recent appeal decision. The steep, unsafe access, flood risk, ecological damage, landscape harm, and lack of local housing justification all point to refusal. Approving the proposal would conflict with the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

For the safety of residents, the protection of our environment, and the preservation of local character, I urge the Council to refuse application 3/2025/0801.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 01 December 2025 11:42
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0801 FS-Case-769963915

[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: 01 December 2025 11:58
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0801 FS-Case-769977624

[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’ first-hand 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 neighbours 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: 01 December 2025 15:33
To: Planning
Subject: application number 3/2025/0801

 External Email

This email originated from outside Ribbles 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.

Hi, I wish to submit an objection to the above application on behalf of [REDACTED] and myself, [REDACTED]

Salesbury View development application 3/2025/0801 Objection.

Traffic. With likely additional road traffic being created by the 84 new dwellings, providing approximately 120 vehicles, assuming a realistic estimate that two, possibly more, vehicles are associated with many of the homes.

The poor, quite narrow, steeply sloped and only access road for the estate, connects with a very busy main road (A666), particularly during 'rush hours'. This will create the potential for accidents, for example: uncontrolled entry onto the busy road due to poor conditions and with frustrated drivers taking risks to join in, or cross, the main traffic flow.

The estate's access road in poor weather, particularly with winter rain, ice and snow, is known to be very difficult for existing nearby residents and their supporting vehicular services. This has been experienced personally by a visiting essential professional, serving local residents.

Public transport is very poor. Access to, and from, the Wilpshire railway station is not readily gained from the development site at the top of the steep access road and its distance from the station. The train service is very sparse and often irregular, sometimes with none running at all. The bus service is not particularly useful in this case, again due to the walking access of the estate, it not being easy for all potential residents. Walking potential school children to the local schools is not a realistic option and the 'school run' will add further congestion on the roads and at drop-off points adjacent to the schools, already a current problem. Evidently walking will not be a first choice for a majority of estate residents, young children, busy people and more senior citizens.

Local amenities. The local amenities are currently over stretched, medical surgeries and schools for example.

Additional local housing. There are several other large developments proposed and approved within a close distance to Salesbury View's proposal. There is a danger that development 'creep' will significantly affect the rural aspect of Wilpshire and its surroundings. Currently, there is a stable natural habitat for the local observed wildlife, and its loss would be very regrettable as it will change the 'feel' of the surrounding area.

Site plan. Artist's impressions of the development do not impress; the estate looks very unimaginative and crowded. The plan shows two rather dangerous sharp bends with restricted lines

of sight due to the tight curve and imposed buildings. Unsited drivers run the risk of collision accidents with other vehicles and pedestrians, particularly young unsupervised children crossing roads.

Reflection. These observations have been made by residents who have the experience of living on the Durham Road estate with its similar steep road access points, and the lack of viability in using private transport. A bus service through Durham Road estate was tried for one period of time, but failed due to the lack of use, reliability and infrequent timings.

Please give the above due consideration and I hope that after the full review of residents' objections, the proposed development application proves unsuccessful.

Regards, [REDACTED].

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 01 December 2025 15:41
To: Planning
Subject: 3/2025/0801

 External Email

This email originated from outside Ribbles 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 Planning Department,

I am writing to voice my opinion for yet another application from Persimmon Homes for 80 new homes at Salesbury View in Wilpshire.

The only access and exit to the proposed development is Salesbury View, a short narrow and steep road that will be expected to carry at least 150 cars and multiple times journeys from 80 houses onto Whalley Rd. LCC Highways in the last application stated that they 'are unable to accept the spine road/site road area gradients as they are steeper than 1 in 12. What I am really struggling to understand is that on the last planning rejection there was no mention of the steep site and how in winter, this road will not be accessible. I live [REDACTED] to the site and a comparable site is that of Beaver Close in Wilpshire where all cars from that avenue cannot move from their driveways due to snow and ice and the steep gradient. It is my understanding that when a Minister visited the site from London last winter the proposed access to Salesbury view would not have been able to be driven up due to the ice on that particular day. I remember thinking how good it is that they would be seeing the access road on a typically icy winter day. I cannot imagine walking up the slope was an option either. This wasn't mentioned within the rejection, and I am very confused as to why it wasn't.

Cars from Salesbury View that would leave their homes and down the steep gradient would:

1. Struggle to join the traffic turning left towards Brownhill due to the speed of the traffic coming from the Wilpshire direction
2. Find it very difficult to turn right due to busy traffic from both directions.

And pedestrians walking down from Salesbury View would be faced with no pavement to turn left towards the amenities but would have to risk the chance of an accident trying to cross the busy A666 with busy traffic from both directions. I presume that there would be parents with prams and young children too who would be trying to cross this road.

There is a significant flood risk due to the steep nature of the site with drainage likely being overwhelmed in times of high rainfall, creating an ice rink in winter. Furthermore the drainage on the A666 is very poor and would not be capable of taking the extra water run off from the application. The water that runs off close to Wilpshire Banks now is free flowing and freezes in Winter. Not great for a main road.

The house building alongside the RVBC boundary with Blackburn with Darwen along Yew Tree (Drive A6119) and the proposed 1500 houses on the site bounded by Parsonage Rd, Brownhill Drive (A6119) and Sunnybower is creating a conurbation that should be delineated and separated by Green belt/fields which this application, if successful, will only add to that pressure. Within this is the stunning wildlife that

currently frequents the field at the proposed site. RVBC Planning department will have seen multiple photos of deer sent in by local residents.

Kind regards

[REDACTED]

Sent from [Outlook](#)

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 01 December 2025 17:57
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 planning officer,

I wish to lodge my objections to the proposed housing development, application number 3/2025/0801 on land east of Salesbury View, Wilpshire.

My main objections are as follows:

- This is a fill-in development blurring the distinction between different communities in the area, and spoiling the character of our village, with a significant detrimental impact on the local residents.
- The traffic on Whalley Rd has already increased significantly due to housing developments in Whalley and Clitheroe. With potentially up to 200 more cars from the Salesbury View development, traffic will build up to a dangerous level. The main road is in an extremely poor state, with pot holes and uneven manhole covers creating dangerous driving conditions.
- There does not appear to be any consideration for new safety measures for pedestrians and cyclists using the surrounding roads.
- I have concerns on the environmental impact on an area where wildlife, including bats, otters, owls, and deer are seen.

Yours faithfully,

[REDACTED]

1st December 2025

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 01 December 2025 19:03
To: Planning; [REDACTED]
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.

Formal Protest Letter Regarding Salesbury View Housing Application number 3/2025/0801

Addressed to Ribble Valley Council

1st December 2025

Ribble Valley Borough Council

Council Offices

Church Walk

Clitheroe

Lancashire

BB7 2RA

Dear Sir or Madam,

Objection to Proposed Housing Development at Salesbury View, Wilpshire

I am writing to formally express my concerns regarding the recent housing application for development at Salesbury View, Wilpshire. As a resident of Wilpshire [REDACTED], I have witnessed first-hand the unique character and charm of our village, and I feel compelled to raise several points of objection to this proposal.

Traffic Congestion on the A59

The A59 is already a notably congested route, particularly during peak hours. The addition of a new housing development is likely to result in an estimated 200 extra cars using this main thoroughfare daily. This increase will inevitably exacerbate existing traffic issues, raise safety concerns for both drivers and pedestrians, and could lead to further delays and inconvenience for local residents.

Environmental Impact

The proposed site is adjacent to areas of mature woodland, established hedgerows, and valuable grazing land. These habitats are not only integral to the rural landscape but also support a diverse range of wildlife, including otters, wild deer, and bats. The development threatens to disrupt these sensitive environments, leading to the potential loss of biodiversity and irreversible ecological damage.

Pressure on Local Services

Wilpshire and the surrounding area already face limitations in the availability of essential services. School places are in short supply, and there is significant pressure on local doctors' surgeries and dental practices. An increase in population from the proposed development would place further strain on these services, potentially impacting the wellbeing of both existing and new residents.

Proximity to Green Belt and Village Character

The site's proximity to designated green belt land is particularly concerning. The green belt plays a vital role in preserving the open, rural nature of Wilpshire, providing a clear boundary that helps maintain the village's distinct identity. The proposed development risks blurring this boundary and undermining the very character that makes Wilpshire a unique and desirable place to live.

Conclusion and Request

In summary, I respectfully urge the Council to reconsider this application in light of the significant concerns outlined above regarding increased traffic, environmental impact, insufficient local services, and the threat to Wilpshire's character and green belt. I trust that you will give full consideration to the views of long-standing residents who value and wish to protect the integrity of our village.

Yours faithfully,

[Redacted Signature]

[Redacted Address]

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 01 December 2025 19:08
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0801 FS-Case-770153478

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0801

Address of Development: Salesbury View in Wilpshire

Comments:

Objection to Proposed Housing Development at Salesbury View, Wilpshire

I am writing to formally express my concerns regarding the recent housing application for development at Salesbury View, Wilpshire. As a resident of [REDACTED], I have witnessed first-hand the unique character and charm of our village, and I feel compelled to raise several points of objection to this proposal.

Traffic Congestion on the A59

The A59 is already a notably congested route, particularly during peak hours. The addition of a new housing development is likely to result in an estimated 200 extra cars using this main thoroughfare daily. This increase will inevitably exacerbate existing traffic issues, raise safety concerns for both drivers and pedestrians, and could lead to further delays and inconvenience for local residents.

Environmental Impact

The proposed site is adjacent to areas of mature woodland, established hedgerows, and valuable grazing land. These habitats are not only integral to the rural landscape but also support a diverse range of wildlife, including otters, wild deer, and bats. The development threatens to disrupt these sensitive environments, leading to the potential loss of biodiversity and irreversible ecological damage.

Pressure on Local Services

Wilpshire and the surrounding area already face limitations in the availability of essential services. School places are in short supply, and there is significant pressure on local doctors' surgeries and dental practices. An increase in population from the proposed development would place further strain on these services, potentially impacting the wellbeing of both existing and new residents.

Proximity to Green Belt and Village Character

The site's proximity to designated green belt land is particularly concerning. The green belt plays a vital role in preserving the open, rural nature of Wilpshire, providing a clear boundary that helps maintain the village's distinct identity. The proposed development risks blurring this boundary and undermining the very character that makes Wilpshire a unique and desirable place to live.

Conclusion and Request

In summary, I respectfully urge the Council to reconsider this application in light of the significant concerns outlined above regarding increased traffic, environmental impact, insufficient local services, and the threat to Wilpshire's character and green belt. I trust that you will give full consideration to the views of long-standing residents who value and wish to protect the integrity of our village.

Yours faithfully,

[Redacted signature block]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 01 December 2025 19:46
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.

To Whom it may concern,

I have recently become aware of the proposed erecting of new homes on Salesbury view. I am emailing to strongly object to the proposed plans.

The infrastructure is already struggling to cope with the sometimes overwhelming amounts of traffic not to mention the poor condition of the roads at the moment. At the moment Knowsley road is already used as a cut through (despite it being for access only) and is getting worse at a constant rate and this will surly exacerbate the issue. Here in Wilpshire we have fairly limited facilities, and whilst we are able to get by quite happily more strain on the shops, dentists and doctors surgeries are not welcome.

At what point will this madness of building houses on green fields stop? And what happens when there are no fields left?

The Ribble valley was always a beautiful place to be but sadly its aesthetic is being blighted by housing firms being allowed to put up cheaply built, poor quality and unpleasing to the eye housing whilst charging eye watering sums of money. And who wants to pay those prices when 30% is for affordable/social housing on their doorstep. And what does Wilpshire get out of this? .If there is to be more housing why are Persimmon homes not made responsible for improving the local area as well instead of just their profit margins. If planning is given you could insist on building an extension on the local school or provide some amenities for the community. As it stand when the housing is complete they up and leave and move on the next area leaving the local services and amenities struggling to cope.

Once again i must protest against this proposed development.

Thanks for your consideration,
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 02 December 2025 10:07
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0801 FS-Case-770269536

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0801

Address of Development: Land to the east of Salesbury view

Comments: I am writing to object to the above planning application; I have looked at the details and have the following objections.

1, Traffic safety to the main road via car and pedestrian. This road is already heavily overloaded with traffic and there have been a large number of accidents recently. When the planning that I objected to at the knoll was granted the reports said that there would be no issues to the main rd., if you look there are constant streams of water now crossing this area making it deadly in winter, the same will happen again further up the road even though they say it won't, but it will.

Traffic pulling out onto this road from another eighty dwellings will mean 160 cars more, hundreds of deliveries etc all pulling onto that main road. pedestrians would leave that site and there are no pavements so would need to cross this road, children's safety etc. Residents on the access road already complain that it is difficult to pull onto the main road.

To lose this lovely habitat to further housing is disgraceful as there are more than enough other options within the village to build the recommended amount of housing we need, the local infrastructure cannot support it as the schools are full, you cannot get a local doctor or dentist appointment, parking for the local shops is terrible, and this will add to an already frustrating situation.

[REDACTED] where we once had lovely views and fields all around us you have recently given permission for 4 houses [REDACTED], up a slope the equivalent to 6 story high houses that all completely [REDACTED], then you gave permission for houses [REDACTED] that blatantly broke all planning regulations (The Knoll), I am [REDACTED] and watched them being built, the building standards were a blatant breach of planning regulations, one still has not been signed off. When this house was built, I raised objections that were ignored by planning and I was told to get a surveyor's report before proceeding, this was impossible as I could not access the site so feel RVBC planning just fobbed me off. The houses are not according to the plans, the levels were too high, the whole structures were completely different from plans, I pointed this out on several occasions but was ignored. Once the inappropriate construction was completed, they applied for retrospective planning that you willingly signed off on, so we are now left with an eyesore [REDACTED]. I am not convinced that you have the willingness to be able to control this national building contractor

and they will simply do as they please as usual. If this happens, I will be watching every small thing they do incorrectly and will bring you to task with the support of a whole village this time.

The landscaping scheme is inadequate and nowhere near large enough in my opinion.

The native scrub planting does not extend to the northern and eastern boundary enough neither do the woodland mix, the plants they have suggested on Landscaping plan 2 are not high growing but many species are low growing and will lose leaf in winter giving us 6 months of the year with no screening whatsoever and 6 months with low growing planting, the area of planting needs to be much larger to give any impact and the species need to be addresses by a competent horticulturalist. After having the last 10 years of my life ruined by having building projects miss managed and miss built [REDACTED] lovely property I cannot imagine a further 4 years of building in this location, there is no support for this from anyone within the village, no support from the parish council, it will be an eyesore for all to see and I wholeheartedly object to this ridiculous building project on such a lovely piece of woodland and meadow.

Please acknowledge receipt of this objection.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 02 December 2025 10:29
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0801 FS-Case-770291034

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0801

Address of Development: Salesbury View Wilpshire

Comments: The following are my concerns over this development:

It seems to blur the boundary of Ribble Valley and Blackburn with Darwen and this is an issue in terms of infrastructure and services given Blackburn with Darwen Councils plans for 15000 houses on Brownhill Drive for which work has already begun. In addition to the estates on Ramsgrave Drive which is making Whalley Road congested as well. It is in a poor state of repair and has inefficient drainage, yet is the main route to the A59.

The current proposal for 80 houses is only 4 short of the last application. They also not visually attractive and will appear out of character with the area and will spoil this historic hillside view.

The proposed development is at the edge of Wilpshire ([REDACTED]), on a steep hillside and adjacent to Green Belt, all of which can be seen from miles around and will spoil the distinct character of the area.

The sole access and exist to the proposed development is Salesbury View a short, narrow, sloping road which will carry traffic onto the already busy Whalley road. Potentially 200 extra cars from those houses travelling on the roads, without adequate infrastructure will exacerbate traffic issues and accidents, especially in Winter when water runs down the hill. across the A666 and freezes and has never been addressed in the [REDACTED] in this area.

Significant issues exist with the topography of the land and major earthworks will be needed which will damage its historic and environmental integrity.

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

There are environmental concerns around the development local residents have seen bats and otters on the site.

Thank you for considering my major concerns