

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 22 January 2026 17:33  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0997 FS-Case-789382584

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

**Planning Application Reference No.:** 3/2025/0997

**Address of Development:** Land off Henthorn Road Clitheroe BB7 3BY

**Comments:** Proposed Gladman Development off Henthorn Road BB7 3BY

Houseowners within Montague Place have been raising a number of issues over the proposed Gladman development covering both sides of Henthorn Road, beyond where Montague Place and Pendleton Grange are situated. A primary concern being the proposed entrance to the to the more northerly element of the development, via Waterfall Gardens and Ingleton Crescent.

Gladman's latest proposal (as they have already had a previous planning request rejected) would have all traffic from this part of the development (not absolutely sure but say in the region of 40 houses entering and exiting via Ingleton Crescent and Waterfall Gardens. Waterfall Gardens already takes all of the traffic in and out of Montague Place and Ingleton Crescent is currently a narrow road leading to a cul-de-sac which services a small number of houses and as such is used as a play area for the children within the estate and an area where the wildlife from the pond in front of it (ducks, geese, herons and occasionally deer families and the odd rouge sheep) roam freely. This crescent will all be heavily affected by this proposal and the risk of children being hit by the significantly increased traffic flow heightened.

This road is not fit for the purpose of an access road. It is already quite challenging for the refuse vehicles to navigate when collecting the waste and is even more so for emergency vehicles like fire engines. God for bid what it would be like with all the heavy construction vehicles, work vans etc..... parking on it, travelling down it trying to navigate the ducks etc... total chaos.

What we are asking for is that the proposed traffic entrance be changed from entering and exiting via Waterfall Gardens and Ingleton Crescent to that of entering and exiting directly from Henthorn Road, as is being proposed for the more southerly element of the development and that the currently proposed traffic entrance and exit via Waterfall Gardens and Ingleton Crescent be used as a footpath, which is currently being proposed to enter and exit directly onto Henthorn Road (a very dangerous proposal as traffic (cars to and from the Reclamation Centre, trucks collecting and dropping off skips and fluid tankers to and from the Water Treatment Plant) use this road multiple times daily and the footpath is shielded from view for both people and traffic.

[REDACTED] expressed our concerns regarding the proposed access to the proposed development and he agreed that our suggested access made more sense and was safer than that proposed by Gladman development.

Mr Hinder also said that he would liaise with Ribble Valley Cllr Ryan Corney and ask him to champion our concerns going forward. Post Jonathan's contact with Ryan we received the following email:

-----

[REDACTED],

I have also been emailed by other residents impacted by this proposal, so I'll share my response with you.

I'm dropping you a line to respond to your email and acknowledge it. I too was only very recently made aware of these developments and have already been engaging with other Town and Borough Councillors to understand their own views on this.

In my own opinion I'm in agreement that access via Ingleton Crescent does not seem a fair nor credible solution, so I would highly recommend you take up the Developers offer to respond to their initial proposal via their website survey in the first instance. I would also encourage your neighbours to do the same. (<https://clitheroe.gladman.hub.arcgis.com/apps/b6fcc87844be4dfe938b7641bf0e99d6/explore>.) If the Developer truly cares about considering how their development impacts existing residents, then at this point, they may make changes as they state on their website "The proposals have been informed by an analysis of the site and its context. At this stage, the proposals are not final and may change in response to feedback received through this consultation".

If / when the Developer makes a formal planning application residents or indeed anyone that feels they are impacted by the application can make comments on the RVBC planning portal. I'll also be adopting a process

called "Calling In" against any application which means that RVBC Planning Officers alone won't decide on this application. They will make a recommendation to Approve or Refuse based upon their own reports, but ultimately

it will be the Councillor members of the Planning Committee that would scrutinise and decide. Residents can also apply to speak at Planning Committee meetings in order to brief Councillors on information that may affect how a decision is made and how the potential development may impact them. The Developer can also speak at these meetings if they wish to do so.

I'll contact you further once I have more information, but at this early stage I'd encourage you (all) to respond to the website survey on the link you originally sent me as a first step.

Best Regards

[REDACTED]

-----

To emphasise our concern again; we are asking for the main vehicle access to the proposed northerly element of the Gladman development be directly from Henthorn Road and not via Waterfall Gardens and Ingleton Crescent and for the proposed footpath to exit the proposed development via the footpath surrounding the SUDS on Ingleton Crescent.

Best regards

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 22 January 2026 18:55  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0997 FS-Case-789409602

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

**Planning Application Reference No.:** 3/2025/0997

**Address of Development:** 115 dwellings on land off Henthorn Road, Clitheroe

**Comments:** Dear Sir / Madam,

I am writing to formally object to planning application 3/2025/0997, relating to the proposed erection of up to 115 dwellings on land off Henthorn Road, Clitheroe, specifically in relation to the proposed use of our residential estate as an access route.

This objection is made on the grounds of highway safety, unjustified and inappropriate access arrangements, severe impact on residential amenity, and the unsustainable cumulative impact on Clitheroe's already overstretched infrastructure.

---

**1. Unnecessary and Inappropriate Use of Our Residential Estate for Access**

The proposed use of our residential estate as an access route is wholly unnecessary. Direct access to the site can be achieved via Henthorn Road, and there is no compelling justification for routing construction and development traffic through an established residential community.

This approach places an unreasonable and unfair burden on existing residents purely for the convenience of the developer and fails to give due consideration to the purpose, design, and character of the estate.

---

**2. Serious Highway Safety Risks to Children, Pedestrians and Animals**

The use of our estate as an access route would introduce heavy construction vehicles, plant machinery, delivery lorries, and contractor traffic into an area where:

- Young children regularly play, walk, and travel independently
- Residents routinely walk dogs and keep domestic animals

- Roads are residential in nature and wholly unsuitable for large construction vehicles

The risk of serious injury or worse is unacceptably high. Construction traffic inevitably brings dust, mud, noise, debris, and reduced visibility, all of which significantly increase danger within a residential environment.

Furthermore, there is no clear or credible information regarding contractor parking, raising additional concerns regarding obstruction of roads, illegal parking, restricted visibility, and compromised emergency access.

---

### 3. Severe and Prolonged Impact During the Construction Phase

The construction phase alone would cause prolonged and significant disruption to residents' quality of life, including:

- Persistent dust and mud being tracked throughout the estate
- Noise disturbance from heavy machinery and frequent vehicle movements
- Damage to roads, pavements, and verges not designed for such use
- A substantially increased risk of traffic-related incidents

These impacts are not minor or temporary inconveniences. They would persist for a considerable period and disproportionately affect residents who derive no benefit whatsoever from the proposed development.

---

### 4. Henthorn Road Is Already Dangerous and Overburdened

Henthorn Road is already subject to excessive traffic, poor driver behaviour, and significant safety concerns. Vehicle speeds are frequently too high, congestion is common, and there have been numerous accidents, including incidents involving pedestrians being knocked down.

A development of this scale would introduce a minimum of 155 additional vehicles, significantly exacerbating an already dangerous situation. Any assertion that the existing highway network can safely accommodate this increase is unrealistic and directly contradicts the lived experience of local residents.

---

### 5. Clitheroe's Infrastructure Cannot Sustain Further Major Development

Clitheroe is already struggling to cope with existing demand. Schools, GP practices, dental services, and local road infrastructure are at or beyond capacity.

Approving a development of this scale without clear, deliverable, and proportionate infrastructure improvements would place further strain on already overstretched services, to the detriment of both current residents and future occupants.

---

## 6. Conclusion

This proposal constitutes overdevelopment, with wholly unacceptable access arrangements that place highway safety, residential amenity, and local infrastructure at serious risk. The proposed use of our residential estate as an access route is inappropriate, unnecessary, and dangerous.

For the reasons set out above, I strongly urge the Council to refuse this application, or at the very least remove any provision permitting access through our residential estate.

Yours faithfully,

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

23 JAN 2026

Ribble Valley Borough Council  
Planning department  
Council Offices  
Church Walk  
Clitheroe  
BB7 2RA

19th January 2026

Dear Kathryn Hughes

Re Planning Application number 3/2025/0997  
Land off Henthorn Road, Clitheroe BB7 3BY.

I want to object to the above application of 115 dwellings.

This is concerning as it will create more traffic on an already severely congested Henthorn Road especially at the junction with Thorn Street.

There is only 2 ways into and out of town ie through Bawdlands or Eshton terrace due to the railway line. When the barrier is down especially at peak times traffic backs up onto Henthorn Road which causes gridlock as this road is a single track due to parked cars on one side.

More houses will result in more cars, delivery vans etc and make the roads even busier.

Please confirm that you have received this letter.

Kind regards

[Redacted signature]

23<sup>rd</sup> January 2026

Director of Economic Development and Planning  
Council Offices  
Church Walk  
Clitheroe  
BB7 2RA

Dear Sir/Madam

**RE: WATER VOLES 3/2025/0997 Gladman Developments Henthorn Road**

I am writing to say that there are Water Voles in the stream next to this proposed development. I have seen one recently. **Water Voles are a protected species**, yet I cannot see a report on the list for this development. Please can you confirm that one has been done?

It is far too close to a brook which supports a variety of wildlife such as Herons, Kingfishers, Dippers, Otters etc. Housing too close to this will bring even more cats and dogs to these green fields and decimate this wildlife, **including a protected species.**

I have entered a comment on you planning portal and asked for confirmation of receipt but I haven't had one. How do I know that you have even looked at it?

Please can you confirm you have received this letter to [REDACTED] and please confirm that a report will be done and its findings will be acted on so that the Water Voles and all the other wonderful wildlife will NOT be affected.

Yours faithfully

[REDACTED]

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 27 January 2026 12:37  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Formal Objection – Outline Planning Application 3/2025/0997, Land off Henthorn Road, Clitheroe

**⚠ 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: Objection to Outline Planning Application 3/2025/0997  
Land off Henthorn Road, Clitheroe, BB7 3BY**

I write to formally object to the above application.

What residents should reasonably expect from a planning authority is a clear, long-term strategy to protect and enhance Clitheroe as an aspirational town. Development plans should facilitate that ambition, not erode it. Infrastructure should be planned and delivered in advance, with roads and access designed for future demand rather than pushed to the narrowest acceptable standard.

This proposal does the opposite.

---

## **1. Fundamental infrastructure failure**

Henthorn Road is not fit for purpose. Beyond the junction with Kenilworth Drive, the area functions as a large cul-de-sac serving well over 500 existing dwellings, with no alternative route in or out.

Congestion and blockages along the length of Henthorn Road are already common. Introducing traffic associated with up to 115 additional dwellings would materially worsen an existing and well-understood problem.

Without significant prior infrastructure intervention — such as comprehensive road widening or the provision of a genuine relief route towards Whalley Road — this development cannot be considered acceptable.

---

## **2. Emergency access and network resilience**

The reliance on a single access road represents a serious and foreseeable risk. One incident, routine maintenance closure, or obstruction has the potential to delay or deny emergency access to a large residential area.

Planning decisions must consider worst-case and cumulative scenarios, not idealised conditions. A development that increases the likelihood of emergency service delay cannot reasonably be described as safe or sustainable.

---

### **3. Inadequate and unrealistic Traffic Assessment and Travel Plan**

The submitted Traffic Assessment and Travel Plan fail to reflect real conditions on Henthorn Road. They do not adequately address:

- Persistent congestion and queuing
- Parking on both sides of the carriageway with limited restrictions
- Widespread inconsiderate and illegal parking
- Poor compliance with speed limits and minimal enforcement

The omission of any consideration of the Government’s stated intention to address pavement parking further undermines confidence in these documents.

Professional presentation should not be mistaken for accuracy. These assessments do not provide a credible basis on which to approve development of this scale.

---

### **4. Speeding and unsafe conditions for sustainable travel**

Speed limits along Henthorn Road are routinely ignored. Vehicle Activated Signs demonstrate the extent of the problem but have little impact on driver behaviour.

The stretch between the Blakewater Road junction and the single-lane bridge over Pendleton Brook has effectively become a high-speed corridor for HGVs, articulated vehicles, tractors, taxis, couriers, and refuse vehicles. This makes walking, cycling, and horse-riding unsafe and actively discourages sustainable travel, directly contradicting the assumptions made in the Travel Plan.

---

### **5. Policy conflict and unsustainable development**

The site lies outside the defined settlement boundary of Clitheroe and is not allocated for housing in the adopted development plan. The proposal represents speculative development on greenfield land, contrary to Key Statement DS1, Policies DMG1 and DME2, and the National Planning Policy Framework.

With the council’s improving housing land supply position, there is no compelling justification for releasing this unallocated site.

---

### **6. No meaningful public benefit**

This development would degrade the quality of life for existing residents while offering little tangible benefit. Claims regarding public open space, ecological enhancement, or economic gain are unconvincing.

In reality, the proposal would further drain already stretched infrastructure and permanently erode valued green space that contributes to Clitheroe's character and appeal.

---

## **Conclusion**

Clitheroe's long-term success depends on plan-led growth supported by infrastructure that is delivered first, not retrospectively justified. This proposal fails that test. It exacerbates known infrastructure deficiencies, introduces unacceptable safety risks, conflicts with adopted planning policy, and undermines the qualities that make Clitheroe an aspirational place to live.

I urge the council and planning team to pursue a planning strategy that enhances Clitheroe rather than incrementally eroding it, and to refuse this application accordingly.

Please keep me informed of the application's progress, including the dates of any planning committee meetings.

Yours faithfully,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 27 January 2026 14:02  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0997 FS-Case-791265759

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

**Planning Application Reference No.:** 3/2025/0997

**Address of Development:** Henthorn Road bb7 3by

**Comments:** I think it's crazy to even think about building more houses in this area without another access road, henthorn Road area has had three extra estates built in the last decade and was already a busy area to begin with, the road is far too congested and has been the scene of multiple accidents. It would be completely reckless and irresponsible to build more houses here purely for financial gain without giving a thought to the safety of the existing residents - another access road is absolutely essential before further housing should be even considered

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 27 January 2026 16:57  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0997 FS-Case-791364109

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

**Planning Application Reference No.:** 3/2025/0997

**Address of Development:** Land off Henthorn Road, Clitheroe, BB7 3BY

**Comments:** Ref: Objection to Outline Planning Application 3/2025/0997  
Land off Henthorn Road, Clitheroe, BB7 3BY

Thank you for your letter dated 8th January 2026 and delivered by Royal Mail on 14th January. We note any representations we wish to make are to be submitted within 21 days of your letter. In this day and age this is fundamentally unfair and we are disappointed that a more efficient method of communication had not been used to notify us.

We have little further to add to the objections that have already been submitted other than to complement the authors on their submissions and to endorse them fully.

Notwithstanding this point we would like to emphasise that Henthorn Road is not fit for purpose as it is.

It is apparent on closer scrutiny that the authors of the Travel Assessment and the Travel Plan spent little time on site and composed these documents in their offices in Manchester.

After the junction at Henthorn Road/Kenilworth Drive the whole area is locked in. It is a massive cul-de-sac with no other way in or out servicing over 500 houses. Blockages along the full stretch of Henthorn Road are a regular occurrence as any resident will testify.

Emergency vehicles will not be able to fulfil their prime functions.

It will be considerably worse if this development goes ahead.

Restrictions on parking along the whole of Henthorn Road are few and far between compounded by the fact that it is allowed on both sides of the road. Inconsiderate and illegal parking makes travel difficult all the time. This could be an even bigger issue if the Government goes ahead with it's intentions to tackle pavement parking later this year (which we did not find reference to in the Travel Assessment document).

Speed restrictions of 20 mph are ignored, rarely policed and are ineffective. Vehicle Activated Signs give a good indication of speed but make little difference. Having spent some time watching these signs it was disconcerting to see just one in twenty (5%) vehicles keeping within the speed limit. 38 mph was the highest we saw in this time. We have experienced faster speeds but have no way of recording them.

The section between Blakewater Road/Henthorn Road junction and the single lane bridge over Pendleton Brook, which our house backs onto, has become a speed track for HGV's, Articulated Vehicles, Utility Vehicles, Taxi's, Tractors, Couriers, Vans and recycling traffic the majority of whom ignore the speed limit with monotonous regularity. Walking/cycling/horse riding etc on this stretch is not safe and is not advised

Perhaps a more thorough Traffic Assessment Report would have included such detail and would have been more believable than that that is written.

We urge the council to see through the professional production of the Traffic Assessment & Travel Plan and refuse this application on that basis. We would be grateful if you could keep us informed of progress, including the dates of any committee meetings.

Thank you

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area of the letter.

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 27 January 2026 17:07  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Application Comments - Objection to Outline Planning Application 3/2025/0997 FS-Case-791368192

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

**Planning Application Reference No.:** Objection to Outline Planning Application 3/2025/0997

**Address of Development:** Land off Henthorn Road, Clitheroe, BB7 3BY

**Comments:** Ref: Objection to Outline Planning Application 3/2025/0997  
Land off Henthorn Road, Clitheroe, BB7 3BY

Thank you for your letter dated 8th January 2026 and delivered by Royal Mail on 14th January. We note any representations we wish to make are to be submitted within 21 days of your letter. In this day and age this is fundamentally unfair and we are disappointed that a more efficient method of communication had not been used to notify us.

We have little further to add to the objections that have already been submitted other than to complement the authors on their submissions and to endorse them fully.

Notwithstanding this point we would like to emphasise that Henthorn Road is not fit for purpose as it is.

It is apparent on closer scrutiny that the authors of the Travel Assessment and the Travel Plan spent little time on site and composed these documents in their offices in Manchester.

After the junction at Henthorn Road/Kenilworth Drive the whole area is locked in. It is a massive cul-de-sac with no other way in or out servicing over 500 houses. Blockages along the full stretch of Henthorn Road are a regular occurrence as any resident will testify.

Emergency vehicles will not be able to fulfil their prime functions.

It will be considerably worse if this development goes ahead.

Restrictions on parking along the whole of Henthorn Road are few and far between compounded by the fact that it is allowed on both sides of the road. Inconsiderate and illegal parking makes travel difficult all the time. This could be an even bigger issue if the Government goes ahead with it's intentions to tackle pavement parking later this year (which we did not find reference to in the Travel Assessment document).

Speed restrictions of 20 mph are ignored, rarely policed and are ineffective. Vehicle Activated Signs give a good indication of speed but make little difference. Having spent some time watching these signs it was disconcerting to see just one in twenty (5%) vehicles keeping within the speed limit. 38 mph was the highest we saw in this time. We have experienced faster speeds but have no way of recording them.

The section between Blakewater Road/Henthorn Road junction and the single lane bridge over Pendleton Brook, which our house backs onto, has become a speed track for HGV's, Articulated Vehicles, Utility Vehicles, Taxi's, Tractors, Couriers, Vans and recycling traffic the majority of whom ignore the speed limit with monotonous regularity. Walking/cycling/horse riding etc on this stretch is not safe and is not advised

Perhaps a more thorough Traffic Assessment Report would have included such detail and would have been more believable than that that is written.

We urge the council to see through the professional production of the Traffic Assessment & Travel Plan and refuse this application on that basis. We would be grateful if you could keep us informed of progress, including the dates of any committee meetings.

Thank you

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area of the letter.

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 27 January 2026 17:59  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Formal Objection to Outline Planning Application 3/2025/0997 - Land off Henthorn Road, Clitheroe

**Importance:** High

**⚠ 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 or Madam,

I write to formally object to Outline Planning Application 3/2025/0997 for development of land off Henthorn Road, Clitheroe.

This proposal is fundamentally flawed. It fails to address the realities on the ground experienced daily by residents and would result in serious and harmful impacts on highway safety, emergency access, education, health and council services, green space, and the overall character of Clitheroe. The development is unsustainable in this location and should be refused, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.

1. Failure to Properly Notify Affected Residents

Despite living on the Montague Place estate, which the application explicitly relies upon for access to the site, residents were not notified of this planning proposal. Given that Montague Place will experience direct and long-term impacts from construction traffic and permanent site access, this represents a serious failure in meaningful engagement. This is contrary to the principles of transparent decision-making set out in NPPF paragraph 39.

2. Inappropriate and Unacceptable Access via Montague Place

Using the Montague Place estate as an access route is wholly inappropriate and unfair. This is a quiet residential estate that was never designed to accommodate traffic associated with a development of up to 115 dwellings. Residents already experience speeding delivery vehicles, taxis, and service traffic using this route.

Introducing sustained development traffic will permanently alter the character of the estate, reduce safety for residents and children, and represents an unacceptable transfer of harm onto existing households. This conflicts with Core Strategy Policies DMG1 and DMG2, which require development to protect residential amenity and ensure safe access.

3. Severe and Unacceptable Highway Impacts

Henthorn Road is already operating at or beyond capacity. As residents, we experience this daily, particularly during school drop-off and pick-up times, when vehicles are routinely double-parked, buses and double-decker school buses struggle to pass, and traffic regularly backs up from the nearby level crossing.

In practice, congestion spills onto Whalley Road, Edisford Road, and surrounding side roads, increasing rat-running and placing additional pressure on streets that are already struggling. The condition of the roads reflects this strain, with potholes regularly appearing on both Henthorn Road and Whalley Road.

Taken together, these impacts clearly meet the test set out in NPPF paragraph 111, which states that development should be refused where the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.

#### 4. Excessive Vehicle Speeds and Absence of Pedestrian Protection

Drivers already routinely ignore the 20mph speed limit along Henthorn Road, particularly on the stretch between the Montague Place estate and the recycling centre.

Residents regularly witness HGVs, lorries, couriers, taxis, and service vehicles travelling well above 30mph on what is effectively a narrow country road. Critically, there are no pavements along this stretch, leaving pedestrians completely unprotected. This is a daily safety concern and directly conflicts with NPPF paragraphs 104 and 110, which prioritise safe movement for pedestrians and cyclists, and Core Strategy Policy DMG2.

#### 5. Compromised Emergency Vehicle Access

Congestion already makes movement along these roads difficult at peak times. As residents, we regularly see vehicles struggling to pass when traffic is queued or roads are partially obstructed. The proposal provides no credible reassurance that emergency vehicles would be able to access the area quickly and reliably once traffic levels increase, contrary to NPPF paragraph 110(a) and Core Strategy Policy DMG1.

#### 6. Unsafe Environment for Pedestrians and Cyclists

Children currently walk or cycle independently to school along these routes. Increased traffic volumes, excessive speeds, narrow carriageways, lack of pavements, and insufficient safe crossing points already make this challenging. The development would significantly worsen these conditions and undermine efforts to promote active travel, contrary to NPPF paragraphs 92 and 104.

#### 7. Loss of Green Space and Harm to Wildlife

The site currently provides valuable green space that supports wildlife and contributes to the semi-rural character of the area. Its loss will be immediately felt by residents and cannot be meaningfully replaced by landscaping proposals. This conflicts with NPPF paragraph 174 and Core Strategy Policy DME3, which seek to protect biodiversity and landscape character.

#### 8. Unsustainable Pressure on Education Provision

As a teacher in a local school, I can state with confidence that education provision in Clitheroe is already under significant strain. Schools are operating at or near capacity, and the recently opened Ribblesdale Primary School is not sufficient to meet existing demand or accommodate additional pupils generated by this development. This conflicts with NPPF paragraph 8 and Core Strategy Policy DMG1, which require development to be supported by adequate infrastructure.

#### 9. Unsustainable Pressure on Health Services

Health services in Clitheroe are already overstretched. We moved to the area over three years ago and remain on a waiting list for an NHS dentist, an experience shared by many local families. GP surgeries are similarly under pressure. The application fails to demonstrate how additional demand would be accommodated, contrary to NPPF paragraph 98.

10. Increased Pressure on Council Services

Local council services are already under visible strain, including waste and recycling collections, highway maintenance, environmental enforcement, and street cleaning.

Recurring potholes on Henthorn Road and Whalley Road demonstrate limited capacity to maintain the highway network. Enforcement of speeding, parking, and dog fouling is already stretched despite signage and warnings. A development of this scale will inevitably increase pressure on council services without clear evidence of mitigation, contrary to Core Strategy Policy DMG1.

11. Deterioration of Residential Amenity and Environmental Quality

Dog fouling is already a persistent issue in the area despite signage warning of fines. Increased population density without adequate enforcement or facilities will worsen this problem, further degrading environmental quality and residential amenity, contrary to Core Strategy Policy DMG1.

12. Harm to the Character and Aspirational Nature of Clitheroe

Clitheroe's appeal lies in its balance of safety, accessibility, green space, and quality of life. Overdevelopment without the necessary infrastructure will erode this balance. Increased congestion, reduced safety, and pressure on services will make the town less attractive to families and undermine its aspirational character, contrary to Core Strategy Policy DMG3.

In conclusion, this application fails to reflect the lived reality of residents and fails to demonstrate that the proposed development can be delivered safely or sustainably. For the reasons outlined above — particularly unsafe access arrangements, excessive vehicle speeds, lack of pedestrian protection, compromised emergency access, pressure on schools, health and council services, and environmental harm — the proposal results in severe residual cumulative impacts.

In accordance with NPPF paragraph 111 and Ribble Valley Core Strategy policies DMG1, DMG2, DMG3 and DME3, planning permission should be refused.

Yours faithfully,



**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 28 January 2026 08:47  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Objection to Outline Planning Application 3/2025/0997

**⚠ 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: Objection to Outline Planning Application 3/2025/0997  
Land off Henthorn Road, Clitheroe, BB7 3BY

I write to formally object to the above application.

What residents should reasonably expect from a planning authority is a clear, long-term strategy to protect and enhance Clitheroe as an aspirational town. Development plans should facilitate that ambition, not erode it. Infrastructure should be planned and delivered in advance, with roads and access designed for future demand rather than pushed to the narrowest acceptable standard.

This proposal does the opposite.

**1. Fundamental infrastructure failure**

Henthorn Road is not fit for purpose. Beyond the junction with Kenilworth Drive, the area functions as a large cul-de-sac serving well over 500 existing dwellings, with no alternative route in or out.

Congestion and blockages along the length of Henthorn Road are already common. Introducing traffic associated with up to 115 additional dwellings would materially worsen an existing and well-understood problem.

Without significant prior infrastructure intervention — such as comprehensive road widening or the provision of a genuine relief route towards Whalley Road — this development cannot be considered acceptable.

**2. Emergency access and network resilience**

The reliance on a single access road represents a serious and foreseeable risk. One incident, routine maintenance closure, or obstruction has the potential to delay or deny emergency access to a large residential area.

Planning decisions must consider worst-case and cumulative scenarios, not idealised conditions. A development that increases the likelihood of emergency service delay cannot reasonably be described as safe or sustainable.

**3. Inadequate and unrealistic Traffic Assessment and Travel Plan**

The submitted Traffic Assessment and Travel Plan fail to reflect real conditions on Henthorn Road. A relief road to the A59 ideally is needed or to Whalley Road at the very least. The volume of traffic being pushed down Whalley Road/ Greenacre St / Eshton Terr and onto Henthorn Road is unsustainable and it is. Nevermind adding more construction traffic and then hundreds of new residents with multiple cars because as yet there is insufficient public transport that services the bottom of Henthorn. The current travel and highway plans do not adequately address:

Persistent congestion and queuing

Parking on both sides of the carriageway with limited restrictions

Widespread inconsiderate and illegal parking

Poor compliance with speed limits and minimal enforcement

The omission of any consideration of the Government's stated intention to address pavement parking further undermines confidence in these documents.

Professional presentation should not be mistaken for accuracy. These assessments do not provide a credible basis on which to approve development of this scale.

#### 4. Speeding and unsafe conditions for sustainable travel

Speed limits along Henthorn Road are routinely ignored. Vehicle Activated Signs demonstrate the extent of the problem but have little impact on driver behaviour.

The stretch between the Blakewater Road junction and the single-lane bridge over Pendleton Brook has effectively become a high-speed corridor for HGVs, articulated vehicles, tractors, taxis, couriers, and refuse vehicles. This makes walking, cycling, and horse-riding unsafe and actively discourages sustainable travel, directly contradicting the assumptions made in the Travel Plan.

#### 5. Policy conflict and unsustainable development

The site lies outside the defined settlement boundary of Clitheroe and is not allocated for housing in the adopted development plan. The proposal represents speculative development on greenfield land, contrary to Key Statement DS1, Policies DMG1 and DME2, and the National Planning Policy Framework.

With the council's improving housing land supply position, there is no compelling justification for releasing this unallocated site.

#### 6. No meaningful public benefit

This development would degrade the quality of life for existing residents while offering little tangible benefit. Claims regarding public open space, ecological enhancement, or economic gain are unconvincing.

In reality, the proposal would further drain already stretched infrastructure and permanently erode valued green space that contributes to Clitheroe's character and appeal.

#### Conclusion

Clitheroe's long-term success depends on plan-led growth supported by infrastructure that is delivered first, not retrospectively justified. This proposal fails that test. It exacerbates known

infrastructure deficiencies, introduces unacceptable safety risks, conflicts with adopted planning policy, and undermines the qualities that make Clitheroe an aspirational place to live.

I urge the council and planning team to pursue a planning strategy that enhances Clitheroe rather than incrementally eroding it, and to refuse this application accordingly. No residents want this and hate the idea.

Please keep me informed of the application's progress, including the dates of any planning committee meetings.

Yours faithfully,



'''

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 28 January 2026 08:54  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0997 FS-Case-791573650

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

**Planning Application Reference No.:** 3/2025/0997

**Address of Development:** Land off Henthorn Road Clitheroe BB7 3BY

**Comments:** Objection to Outline Planning Application 3/2025/0997  
Land off Henthorn Road, Clitheroe, BB7 3BY

I write to formally object to the above application.

What residents should reasonably expect from a planning authority is a clear, long-term strategy to protect and enhance Clitheroe as an aspirational town. Development plans should facilitate that ambition, not erode it. Infrastructure should be planned and delivered in advance, with roads and access designed for future demand rather than pushed to the narrowest acceptable standard.

This proposal does the opposite.

**1. Fundamental infrastructure failure**

Henthorn Road is not fit for purpose. Beyond the junction with Kenilworth Drive, the area functions as a large cul-de-sac serving well over 500 existing dwellings, with no alternative route in or out.

Congestion and blockages along the length of Henthorn Road are already common. Introducing traffic associated with up to 115 additional dwellings would materially worsen an existing and well-understood problem.

Without significant prior infrastructure intervention — such as comprehensive road widening or the provision of a genuine relief route towards Whalley Road — this development cannot be considered acceptable.

**2. Emergency access and network resilience**

The reliance on a single access road represents a serious and foreseeable risk. One incident, routine maintenance closure, or obstruction has the potential to delay or deny emergency access to a large residential area.

Planning decisions must consider worst-case and cumulative scenarios, not idealised conditions. A development that increases the likelihood of emergency service delay cannot reasonably be

described as safe or sustainable.

### 3. Inadequate and unrealistic Traffic Assessment and Travel Plan

The submitted Traffic Assessment and Travel Plan fail to reflect real conditions on Henthorn Road. They do not adequately address:

Persistent congestion and queuing

Parking on both sides of the carriageway with limited restrictions

Widespread inconsiderate and illegal parking

Poor compliance with speed limits and minimal enforcement

The omission of any consideration of the Government's stated intention to address pavement parking further undermines confidence in these documents.

Professional presentation should not be mistaken for accuracy. These assessments do not provide a credible basis on which to approve development of this scale.

### 4. Speeding and unsafe conditions for sustainable travel

Speed limits along Henthorn Road are routinely ignored. Vehicle Activated Signs demonstrate the extent of the problem but have little impact on driver behaviour.

The stretch between the Blakewater Road junction and the single-lane bridge over Pendleton Brook has effectively become a high-speed corridor for HGVs, articulated vehicles, tractors, taxis, couriers, and refuse vehicles. This makes walking, cycling, and horse-riding unsafe and actively discourages sustainable travel, directly contradicting the assumptions made in the Travel Plan.

### 5. Policy conflict and unsustainable development

The site lies outside the defined settlement boundary of Clitheroe and is not allocated for housing in the adopted development plan. The proposal represents speculative development on greenfield land, contrary to Key Statement DS1, Policies DMG1 and DME2, and the National Planning Policy Framework.

With the council's improving housing land supply position, there is no compelling justification for releasing this unallocated site.

### 6. No meaningful public benefit

This development would degrade the quality of life for existing residents while offering little tangible benefit. Claims regarding public open space, ecological enhancement, or economic gain are unconvincing.

In reality, the proposal would further drain already stretched infrastructure and permanently erode valued green space that contributes to Clitheroe's character and appeal.

Clitheroe's long-term success depends on plan-led growth supported by infrastructure that is delivered first, not retrospectively justified. This proposal fails that test. It exacerbates known infrastructure deficiencies, introduces unacceptable safety risks, conflicts with adopted planning policy, and undermines the qualities that make Clitheroe an aspirational place to live.

I urge the council and planning team to pursue a planning strategy that enhances Clitheroe rather than incrementally eroding it, and to refuse this application accordingly.

