

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 15 January 2026 10:37  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0997 FS-Case-786176042

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

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

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

**Comments:** We also understand that there is a need for more housing and that new build homes are a good thing - if we didn't, we wouldn't be living in one.

Our issue, for the most part, is that the proposal includes the use of our estate as the access point for the site. I'm sure I don't have to explain to you how this is going to impact the residents of Waterfall Gardens and Ingleton Crescent - both during the build and once the properties are occupied. A once quiet, dead-end street will become a thru road, no longer safe for children and wildlife.

We would also like to flag the lack of forethought in the plan to make Henthorn Road itself fit for purpose. This is a narrow country road with no markings and inadequate provision for pedestrians. Given this is a popular dog-walking route, a further increase in traffic will make a road that already feels unsafe incredibly dangerous. Surely this should be the responsibility of the developer.

Our final concern is access to the site through the centre of Clitheroe. Thorn Street is already a major pinch point in the town given the number of cars and lorries coming from the south of Clitheroe and the Household Waste Recycling Centre as there is no other option but to take this route to access the A59. Adding more traffic, not just from the developers but the eventual residents, will mean this will inevitably become a wider issue for Clitheroe as a whole.

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 15 January 2026 14:03  
**To:** Planning  
**Cc:** Cllr Michael Graveston; Cllr Mark Sutcliffe  
**Subject:** Fwd: Henthorn development 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 Ms Hopkins,

Regarding the application for 115 houses on Henthorn road, planning application  
3/2025/0997

I have read the supporting documents to the planning application.

I echo the Clitheroe residents concerns regarding the increase in traffic caused by the development, but feel that potential mitigation has been missed.

The supporting planning documents refer to the use of bicycles, however they overlook the opportunity to create a cycle link from Primrose mill/ Woone Lane to the development by upgrading the upgrading of Footpath 17 to a surface suitable for walkers and wheelers.

I've marked the route in yellow on this screenshot



Search Google Earth

Scarloom Rd

Waterfall Gdns

Compass North Digital



ridge



Pendleton Brooc

This would be a considerable traffic free Active Travel route for all of the southern Henthorn road developments, providing a traffic free direct route to the south of the town, and the Aldi supermarket. A distance of around 500m compared to 2.5 km which includes 4 junctions that would require cyclists crossing the traffic flow. The shorter travel time would be an incentive to use an alternative to driving, especially at peak hours.

The creation of a cycle path here would link into the wider creation of the Clitheroe Orbital route, which has been mentioned elsewhere.

Additionally on the plans submitted I cannot see any connections from the southern end of the development to footpath 17 nor to the Ludlow Road and Porchester Road developments.

There should be direct access to FP17 from the southern end of the development.

It is frustrating when walking through the recent developments around the town when no consideration has been given to allow communities to quickly visit neighbours. In this example someone from the new development wishing to visit a neighbour they back to on Portchester Road, to retrieve a football perhaps, it would require a walk of 0.75km

If walking and cycling is to be priority then direct links allowing access should be made. I have drawn black circles on the design plan below.



image from the design access statement 25\_0997\_7

Reference has been made in the travel assessment to the funds provided previously to upgrade the FP 017 section at Edisford Bridge. As previously noted what was delivered by LCC was not to cycle path standard, and does not provide a continuous wheelable surface from Edisford Bridge to Henthorn Road.

Regards

[Redacted signature]

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 15 January 2026 16:58  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0997 FS-Case-786382540

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

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

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

**Comments:** I am writing to formally object to planning application 3/2025/0997 on the grounds of highway safety, unsuitable access arrangements and the lack of realistic sustainable transport infrastructure serving the site.

The proposed development relies on vehicular access via Waterfall Gardens with onward impact on Henthorn Road, both of which are already constrained and unsuitable for additional development-related traffic. Waterfall Gardens is a narrow residential road, not designed to accommodate increased vehicle movements, delivery vehicles or service access. The restricted width, limited visibility and existing on-street parking create an environment where additional traffic would pose a clear risk to highway and pedestrian safety.

Henthorn Road is a busy and heavily used route that already experiences congestion, queuing and conflict between moving vehicles and parked cars, particularly at peak times. Visibility is restricted in places and safe turning movements are already compromised. Additional traffic generated by this development would materially worsen existing problems, increasing the likelihood of accidents and further reducing highway safety for residents, pedestrians and cyclists.

The application suggests that the development is acceptable due to its alignment with sustainable travel objectives. However, this assumption is not supported by the reality of local infrastructure. Public transport options in the area are limited, with slow and infrequent rail services and poor connectivity to major city hubs within reasonable journey times. Bus services are limited in frequency and coverage and do not provide a practical alternative to private car use for commuting or daily needs.

There is also a lack of safe, continuous and well connected walking and cycling infrastructure that would realistically enable residents to travel sustainably. As a result, future occupants would be heavily reliant on private vehicles, directly contradicting the policy justification put forward by the applicant.

In the absence of adequate transport infrastructure to genuinely support sustainable travel, the proposal would lead to an increase in private car use, placing further strain on Waterfall Gardens,

Henthorn Road and the wider local road network. This is contrary to local and national planning policies which require developments to provide safe and suitable access and to be located where sustainable travel choices are genuinely available, not merely theoretical.

The proposal represents an unsustainable form of development with unacceptable highway and traffic impacts and I respectfully request that Ribble Valley Borough Council refuse planning permission for application 3/2025/0997.

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 15 January 2026 17:36  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Fw: Objection of 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.

RE: My objections for the planning application 3/2025/0997 Gladman Development Ltd, land off Henthorn Road, Clitheroe, BB7 3BY.  
Proposal: Up to 115 dwellings (outline, access only)

Dear Sir/Madam, I am writing as a neighbour to strongly object to the above application for outline permission to build up to 115 dwellings on land off Henthorn Road. While I recognise the need for housing, this proposal is inappropriate and should be refused for the following material planning reasons:

1. The site lies outside the settlement boundary of Clitheroe and is not an allocated housing site in the adopted Core Strategy or Housing and Economic Development DPD. It represents unjustified encroachment into the open countryside, contrary to Key Statement DS1, Policy DMG1, and the NPPF's emphasis on sustainable development patterns.
2. The location is poorly accessible to essential services, facilities, and public transport in Clitheroe town centre. Residents would be heavily dependent on private cars, failing to promote sustainable transport choices and conflicting with NPPF paragraphs 104-109 and local Policy DME2.
3. The additional traffic generated (potentially hundreds of daily movements) would exacerbate congestion and highway safety issues on Henthorn Road, which is already narrow and busy. The proposed access does not sufficiently address these cumulative impacts.
4. The development would cause significant harm to the rural character, landscape quality, and visual amenity of the area, urbanising an important open gateway to Clitheroe and potentially affecting views toward the Forest of Bowland AONB setting, contrary to Policy DME2 and NPPF protections.
5. There are concerns over drainage/flood risk, infrastructure capacity (schools, healthcare), and the precedent this would set for further unplanned development in unsustainable locations. The council's recent housing land supply assessments indicate a more robust position, reducing the need to release this unallocated greenfield site.

I respectfully urge the council to refuse this application.

Please could you send me a receipt so I know that you have received my email.

Thank you for considering my objection.

Yours faithfully,

[REDACTED]

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 15 January 2026 20:06  
**To:** jonathan.hinder.mp@parliament.uk; Planning; your-views@your-views.co.uk  
**Subject:** Planning Application : 3/2025/0997 Objection

**⚠ External Email**

This email originated from outside Ribble Valley Borough Council. Do **NOT** click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and are sure the content within this email is safe.

I write to formally object to the proposed development of 115 residential dwellings on land off Henthorn Road. While I acknowledge the national and local need for new housing, this proposal is inappropriate for this location and would result in significant and demonstrable harm to local infrastructure, public services, the environment, and the established character of the town.

#### Highway Safety, Infrastructure and Access

The existing transport infrastructure is wholly inadequate to support a development of this scale. Henthorn Road is already subject to congestion, frequent deterioration, and repeated resurfacing works. It currently struggles to accommodate existing traffic levels, including heavy vehicle movements associated with the nearby recycling centre.

The addition of a development of this size would likely generate in excess of 200 additional vehicles, significantly increasing traffic volume, congestion, and associated safety risks. This would have a direct adverse impact on pedestrians and cyclists, particularly children travelling to and from school. The proposal therefore fails to demonstrate that safe and suitable access can be achieved for all users, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which requires development to ensure that highways impacts are not severe (NPPF, Section 9 – Promoting Sustainable Transport).

#### Pressure on Local Services and Facilities

Local schools, GP practices, and essential community services are already operating at or near capacity. The proposal would introduce a substantial number of new residents without providing sufficient mitigation or clear, deliverable plans for the expansion of education, healthcare, or community infrastructure.

This approach conflicts with the principles of sustainable development set out in the NPPF (Section 8 – Promoting Healthy and Safe Communities), which requires planning decisions to ensure that infrastructure and services are adequate to meet current and future needs.

### Environmental Impact and Loss of Green Space

The proposed site constitutes valuable green space that contributes to local biodiversity, air quality, and the general wellbeing of residents. Development of this land would result in the permanent loss of natural habitats and further reduce already limited open and recreational spaces within the town.

Such impacts are inconsistent with the NPPF (Section 15 – Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment), which requires planning decisions to minimise impacts on biodiversity and protect valued landscapes and green spaces. The proposal does not demonstrate adequate avoidance, mitigation, or compensation for this environmental harm.

### Impact on Community Character and Quality of Life

The scale and density of the proposed development would fundamentally alter the character of the area. The quiet, semi-rural nature of the town would be replaced by increased traffic, noise, and pollution, leading to a decline in residential amenity and overall quality of life.

This form of overdevelopment cannot reasonably be described as sustainable growth. Instead, it represents expansion at the expense of the distinctive character and cohesion of the local community, contrary to the core planning principles of good placemaking and community wellbeing set out in the NPPF (Section 12 – Achieving Well-Designed Places).

### Conclusion

For the reasons outlined above, I strongly object to this proposal and respectfully urge the Council to refuse planning permission. The evidence clearly indicates that the existing infrastructure, public services, and environment cannot accommodate a development of this scale without unacceptable harm.

Thank you for considering my objection and please can you email a response also.

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 16 January 2026 09:49  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Formal objection to proposed access via Ingleton Crescent – Gladman development, 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 members of the Planning Committee,

I am writing to formally object to the proposed access arrangements for the Gladman housing development in Clitheroe, specifically the plan to route development and construction traffic through Ingleton Crescent.

Ingleton Crescent is a quiet residential crescent that was never designed to function as a through-road. It is home to many young families, and the pond and surrounding area directly in front of our homes is regularly used by children for walking, cycling, and playing. Introducing estate traffic and construction vehicles into this space would create a serious and ongoing highway safety risk, particularly to children and pedestrians.

When residents purchased their homes, they did so on the clear understanding that this was a closed crescent, providing a safe and peaceful living environment. The proposed access would fundamentally alter the character of the street, removing its function as a residential crescent and significantly harming the amenity of those who live here.

The proposed access is not only unsafe but unnecessary. There are alternative access points further down that would allow the new development to connect to the wider road network without routing traffic through an established family residential area. A suitable development layout should provide its own dedicated access and should not rely on existing streets that are wholly unsuited to this level and type of traffic.

In addition, increased vehicle movements would negatively impact the pond and surrounding green space, which supports local wildlife and contributes to the environmental value of the area. This harm has not been adequately addressed.

I am also concerned about the lack of effective consultation. A number of households on Ingleton Crescent, who are the most directly affected by this proposal, did not receive consultation leaflets. This raises serious concerns about whether the full impact on existing residents has been properly considered.

I wish to be clear that I am not opposed to new housing in principle. However, I strongly oppose any proposal that routes traffic through Ingleton Crescent. The access arrangements as currently proposed are inappropriate, unsafe, and harmful to residential amenity, and should not be supported.

I respectfully ask the Planning Committee to reject any application that includes access via Ingleton Crescent and to require the developer to provide an alternative access route that protects existing residents, children, and the local environment.

Thank you for taking the time to consider this objection.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 16 January 2026 10:47  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0997 FS-Case-786661850

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

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

**Address of Development:** Gladman Developments  
Henthorn Road  
Clitheroe

**Comments:** I was walking along the bank of the stream adjacent to this potential development a few weeks ago and I saw a Water Vole by the edge of the water.  
I believe Water Voles are a protected species. Their habitat is only a few metres from the proposed boundary of this site. If this goes ahead there will be cats and Water Voles will be decimated.  
I cannot see a Water Vole report on the list of documents published.  
Therefore please can you confirm that this has been done and if not, why not ?  
Please confirm you have received this comment by email.

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 16 January 2026 11:41  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning application No. 3/2025/0997  
**Attachments:** 20260113\_120753.jpg; 20260113\_120824.jpg; 20251209\_084653.jpg; 20251209\_084640.jpg

**⚠ External Email**

This email originated from outside Ribble Valley Borough Council. Do **NOT** click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and are sure the content within this email is safe.

Land of Henthorn Road Clitheroe - Grid reference: 372961 440676

My Details:

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

I object to the above planning application, please find my comments as below:

Application 3/2025/0997 is fundamentally the same as application 3/2019/0999 which was refused planning permission on the 24/9/2021 as it was deemed to be contrary to the Ribble Valley Core Development Strategy. As the core strategy remains unchanged it is difficult to see how the new application, although reduced from 160 to 115 dwellings can now be anything other than still contrary to that Core Strategy?

I would also note that any calculations or data analysis carried out in 2021 (i.e. traffic flows) would no longer be accurate as at that time there were only 6 dwellings occupied on the Miller Montague Place Estate. There are now 106 dwellings occupied.

As the 115 dwellings in application 3/2025/0997 are not required to meet the needs of the 5 year development plan (currently 6.2 years supply) there would not appear to be any supply imperative that would override the Core Development Strategy.

The proposed development sits at the bottom of Henthorn Road which already suffers from significant traffic issues, in particular at the bottleneck at the junctions of Thorn Street and Brown Street. It should also be noted that there is a significant pavement parking issue on Henthorn Road and this will inevitably be made worse by increased traffic (car drivers being considerate to other car drivers at the expense of pedestrians!). Even without any increased traffic there are times currently when it is impossible for pedestrians, especially those with prams/wheelchairs/mobility aids etc, to safely navigate Henthorn Road without having to step out into the road.

I note from the application documentation that the proposal includes widening the lower end of Henthorn Road to 5.5m (I assume to make it suitable for 2 way traffic). Again the inevitable consequence of this will be cars travelling at greater speeds (there is already a problem with excessive speed on that section of road) with increased risk to pedestrians/cyclists/horse riders etc. I would also note that Ingleton Crescent, which is the proposed access for the northern portion of the development, is only 5.3m at its widest (not suitable for 2 way traffic) and suffers from a compromised junction as you turn in from Waterfall Gardens (difficult to turn in if a vehicle is waiting to exit from Ingleton Crescent).

I also note from the application documentation that there is deemed to be no flood risk as part of the proposal. I can only assume that this is a data driven determination as it clearly does not reflect the real world situation especially on what I understand to be the northern (35 dwelling) part of the development. The SUDS installed by Miller homes have never drained properly and the outflow from this runs directly under the northern side of the proposed development. The majority of homeowners on Ingleton Crescent have had to have remedial drainage work carried out in their gardens to combat surface water flooding. The field on the northern side of the development has really poor drainage and is frequently subject to surface water flooding (I have attached photos which show a slightly different, real world, view to those provided by the developers consultants!).

Whilst I am objecting to the application I would propose the following amendments should planning permission ultimately be granted.

1. That access to the Northern part of the development is directly from Henthorn Road, as it is for the southern section, rather than via Ingleton Crescent.
2. That the proposed play area in the Northern part of the development be moved to the far side of the field (nearest to Siddows Farm) so that the noise and anti-social behavior that are inevitable real world consequences have the least impact on existing dwellings.
3. That all site traffic is prohibited from using Ingleton Crescent, including contractors parking.

We all understand the need for housing and we also understand why developers target areas like Clitheroe (Its why we choose to live here) however Clitheroe will not remain a desirable place to live if it is over developed.

Regards

██████████

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 17 January 2026 10:41  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Application Comments - Application 3/2025/0997 FS-Case-787050076

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

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

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

**Comments:** Formal Objection on Highway, Transport and Infrastructure Grounds.

I am writing as a local resident of Clitheroe to object to this planning application on highway, transport and infrastructure grounds.

This objection is based on a detailed review of the submitted Transport Assessment and on my direct experience of traffic conditions and infrastructure pressures within Clitheroe. In my view, the supporting documentation fails to provide a realistic or robust assessment of the cumulative impacts of the proposed development on the local highway network or on essential community infrastructure.

The Transport Assessment repeatedly concludes that the additional traffic generated by the development “does not materially alter the performance” of local junctions. However, this conclusion relies on a baseline assumption that existing traffic conditions are acceptable. This assumption does not reflect reality. Many roads in Clitheroe already experience regular congestion, delays and driver frustration, particularly during peak periods. Adding further traffic to an already constrained network should not be dismissed simply because modelling indicates only marginal change.

Several poorly performing junctions and routes within the town have been identified in previous studies and in connection with earlier, refused planning applications. In my view, there have been no material improvements to address these known deficiencies, nor does the current proposal offer meaningful mitigation to resolve existing issues before introducing additional traffic demand. The traffic surveys underpinning the assessment were undertaken on a single weekday in November 2024. A one-day snapshot cannot reasonably represent the range of traffic conditions experienced locally, including school drop-off and pick-up periods, seasonal variation, frequent temporary road or utility works, or the cumulative effects of recent housing developments. This limited survey base risks under-estimating both existing congestion and the true impact of additional development traffic.

Concerns regarding the reliability of the assessment are reinforced by evidence contained within the report itself. It acknowledges that traffic generation predictions for the Taylor Wimpey Henthorn Road development (270 dwellings) were underestimated by 26% in the AM peak and 16% in the PM peak when compared with observed post-completion traffic flows. This indicates a fundamental weakness

in the forecasting methodology and raises serious doubts that the November 2024 assessment avoids similar or greater under-estimation.

The assessment also relies heavily on generic National Transport Model growth factors to project future traffic levels. While these may be appropriate at a strategic level, they do not adequately reflect local conditions in Clitheroe, where multiple housing developments have already placed sustained pressure on a constrained road network with limited alternative routes. This approach fails to properly account for cumulative impacts and presents a misleading impression of available network capacity.

In addition, the Transport Assessment places significant emphasis on walking, cycling and public transport to limit private car use. In practice, Clitheroe remains highly car-dependent. Bus services require ongoing financial support to remain viable, and walking or cycling is not a realistic alternative for many everyday journeys due to distance, safety concerns and weather conditions. Furthermore, the proposed site is located a considerable distance from the town centre, railway station and bus station, making reliance on public transport highly unlikely. Cycling routes to these transport hubs would, in my view, be unsafe and impractical for the majority of residents.

Paragraph 115 of the National Planning Policy Framework is clear that development should be refused where the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe. The Transport Assessment does not demonstrate that this test has been satisfied. Instead, it relies on optimistic assumptions, limited survey data and modelling that fails to reflect the lived experience of residents, particularly those using Henthorn Road, Edisford Road, Thorn Street, Eshton Terrace, Woone Lane and Bawdlands.

Henthorn Road has effectively become a cul-de-sac, with only two constrained routes providing access into and out of the town centre and towards the A59. These routes struggle under normal conditions, and in the event of an incident or road closure, congestion rapidly escalates and impacts the entire town.

Beyond highways and transport, the proposed development would place further pressure on local infrastructure that is already struggling to meet existing demand. Health services in Clitheroe, including GP and dental provision, are operating at or near capacity, with many residents experiencing difficulty in registering with practices or securing timely appointments. There is no clear evidence within the application that sufficient additional healthcare capacity would be delivered to support the increased population arising from this development.

Local primary and secondary schools are similarly under pressure, with limited surplus capacity and increasing class sizes. The application does not demonstrate how additional demand for school places would be accommodated without placing further strain on existing provision or requiring pupils to travel further afield, thereby compounding transport impacts.

Other local amenities and services, including childcare provision, recreational facilities and town-centre services, have not kept pace with recent growth. The cumulative effect of multiple housing developments without commensurate investment in supporting infrastructure risks eroding quality of life for both existing and future residents. In the absence of clear, secured and deliverable mitigation to address these pressures, the proposal represents an unsustainable form of development.

Taken together, these shortcomings mean that the application fails to demonstrate that the proposed development would not materially worsen existing highway, transport and infrastructure constraints in Clitheroe. I therefore respectfully request that this application be refused, or, at the very least, deferred until a more comprehensive and realistic assessment is undertaken—one that fully

considers cumulative impacts and delivers effective mitigation to existing issues before placing further strain on an already overstretched town.

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 17 January 2026 11:14  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0997 FS-Case-787059673

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

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

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

**Comments:** Formal Objection on Highway, Transport and Infrastructure Grounds.

I am writing as a local resident of Clitheroe to object to this planning application on highway, transport and infrastructure grounds.

This objection is based on a detailed review of the submitted Transport Assessment and on my direct experience of traffic conditions and infrastructure pressures within Clitheroe. In my view, the supporting documentation fails to provide a realistic or robust assessment of the cumulative impacts of the proposed development on the local highway network or on essential community infrastructure.

The Transport Assessment repeatedly concludes that the additional traffic generated by the development “does not materially alter the performance” of local junctions. However, this conclusion relies on a baseline assumption that existing traffic conditions are acceptable. This assumption does not reflect reality. Many roads in Clitheroe already experience regular congestion, delays and driver frustration, particularly during peak periods. Adding further traffic to an already constrained network should not be dismissed simply because modelling indicates only marginal change.

Several poorly performing junctions and routes within the town have been identified in previous studies and in connection with earlier, refused planning applications. In my view, there have been no material improvements to address these known deficiencies, nor does the current proposal offer meaningful mitigation to resolve existing issues before introducing additional traffic demand. The traffic surveys underpinning the assessment were undertaken on a single weekday in November 2024. A one-day snapshot cannot reasonably represent the range of traffic conditions experienced locally, including school drop-off and pick-up periods, seasonal variation, frequent temporary road or utility works, or the cumulative effects of recent housing developments. This limited survey base risks under-estimating both existing congestion and the true impact of additional development traffic.

Concerns regarding the reliability of the assessment are reinforced by evidence contained within the report itself. It acknowledges that traffic generation predictions for the Taylor Wimpey Henthorn Road development (270 dwellings) were underestimated by 26% in the AM peak and 16% in the PM peak when compared with observed post-completion traffic flows. This indicates a fundamental weakness

in the forecasting methodology and raises serious doubts that the November 2024 assessment avoids similar or greater under-estimation.

The assessment also relies heavily on generic National Transport Model growth factors to project future traffic levels. While these may be appropriate at a strategic level, they do not adequately reflect local conditions in Clitheroe, where multiple housing developments have already placed sustained pressure on a constrained road network with limited alternative routes. This approach fails to properly account for cumulative impacts and presents a misleading impression of available network capacity.

In addition, the Transport Assessment places significant emphasis on walking, cycling and public transport to limit private car use. In practice, Clitheroe remains highly car-dependent. Bus services require ongoing financial support to remain viable, and walking or cycling is not a realistic alternative for many everyday journeys due to distance, safety concerns and weather conditions. Furthermore, the proposed site is located a considerable distance from the town centre, railway station and bus station, making reliance on public transport highly unlikely. Cycling routes to these transport hubs would, in my view, be unsafe and impractical for the majority of residents.

Paragraph 115 of the National Planning Policy Framework is clear that development should be refused where the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe. The Transport Assessment does not demonstrate that this test has been satisfied. Instead, it relies on optimistic assumptions, limited survey data and modelling that fails to reflect the lived experience of residents, particularly those using Henthorn Road, Edisford Road, Thorn Street, Eshton Terrace, Woone Lane and Bawdlands.

Henthorn Road has effectively become a cul-de-sac, with only two constrained routes providing access into and out of the town centre and towards the A59. These routes struggle under normal conditions, and in the event of an incident or road closure, congestion rapidly escalates and impacts the entire town.

Beyond highways and transport, the proposed development would place further pressure on local infrastructure that is already struggling to meet existing demand. Health services in Clitheroe, including GP and dental provision, are operating at or near capacity, with many residents experiencing difficulty in registering with practices or securing timely appointments. There is no clear evidence within the application that sufficient additional healthcare capacity would be delivered to support the increased population arising from this development.

Local primary and secondary schools are similarly under pressure, with limited surplus capacity and increasing class sizes. The application does not demonstrate how additional demand for school places would be accommodated without placing further strain on existing provision or requiring pupils to travel further afield, thereby compounding transport impacts.

Other local amenities and services, including childcare provision, recreational facilities and town-centre services, have not kept pace with recent growth. The cumulative effect of multiple housing developments without commensurate investment in supporting infrastructure risks eroding quality of life for both existing and future residents. In the absence of clear, secured and deliverable mitigation to address these pressures, the proposal represents an unsustainable form of development.

Taken together, these shortcomings mean that the application fails to demonstrate that the proposed development would not materially worsen existing highway, transport and infrastructure constraints in Clitheroe. I therefore respectfully request that this application be refused, or, at the very least, deferred until a more comprehensive and realistic assessment is undertaken—one that fully

considers cumulative impacts and delivers effective mitigation to existing issues before placing further strain on an already overstretched town.

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 17 January 2026 11:18  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0997 FS-Case-787060988

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

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

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

**Comments:** Formal Objection on Highway, Transport and Infrastructure Grounds.

I am writing as a local resident of Clitheroe to object to this planning application on highway, transport and infrastructure grounds.

This objection is based on a detailed review of the submitted Transport Assessment and on my direct experience of traffic conditions and infrastructure pressures within Clitheroe. In my view, the supporting documentation fails to provide a realistic or robust assessment of the cumulative impacts of the proposed development on the local highway network or on essential community infrastructure.

The Transport Assessment repeatedly concludes that the additional traffic generated by the development “does not materially alter the performance” of local junctions. However, this conclusion relies on a baseline assumption that existing traffic conditions are acceptable. This assumption does not reflect reality. Many roads in Clitheroe already experience regular congestion, delays and driver frustration, particularly during peak periods. Adding further traffic to an already constrained network should not be dismissed simply because modelling indicates only marginal change.

Several poorly performing junctions and routes within the town have been identified in previous studies and in connection with earlier, refused planning applications. In my view, there have been no material improvements to address these known deficiencies, nor does the current proposal offer meaningful mitigation to resolve existing issues before introducing additional traffic demand. The traffic surveys underpinning the assessment were undertaken on a single weekday in November 2024. A one-day snapshot cannot reasonably represent the range of traffic conditions experienced locally, including school drop-off and pick-up periods, seasonal variation, frequent temporary road or utility works, or the cumulative effects of recent housing developments. This limited survey base risks under-estimating both existing congestion and the true impact of additional development traffic.

Concerns regarding the reliability of the assessment are reinforced by evidence contained within the report itself. It acknowledges that traffic generation predictions for the Taylor Wimpey Henthorn Road development (270 dwellings) were underestimated by 26% in the AM peak and 16% in the PM peak when compared with observed post-completion traffic flows. This indicates a fundamental weakness

in the forecasting methodology and raises serious doubts that the November 2024 assessment avoids similar or greater under-estimation.

The assessment also relies heavily on generic National Transport Model growth factors to project future traffic levels. While these may be appropriate at a strategic level, they do not adequately reflect local conditions in Clitheroe, where multiple housing developments have already placed sustained pressure on a constrained road network with limited alternative routes. This approach fails to properly account for cumulative impacts and presents a misleading impression of available network capacity.

In addition, the Transport Assessment places significant emphasis on walking, cycling and public transport to limit private car use. In practice, Clitheroe remains highly car-dependent. Bus services require ongoing financial support to remain viable, and walking or cycling is not a realistic alternative for many everyday journeys due to distance, safety concerns and weather conditions. Furthermore, the proposed site is located a considerable distance from the town centre, railway station and bus station, making reliance on public transport highly unlikely. Cycling routes to these transport hubs would, in my view, be unsafe and impractical for the majority of residents.

Paragraph 115 of the National Planning Policy Framework is clear that development should be refused where the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe. The Transport Assessment does not demonstrate that this test has been satisfied. Instead, it relies on optimistic assumptions, limited survey data and modelling that fails to reflect the lived experience of residents, particularly those using Henthorn Road, Edisford Road, Thorn Street, Eshton Terrace, Woone Lane and Bawdlands.

Henthorn Road has effectively become a cul-de-sac, with only two constrained routes providing access into and out of the town centre and towards the A59. These routes struggle under normal conditions, and in the event of an incident or road closure, congestion rapidly escalates and impacts the entire town.

Beyond highways and transport, the proposed development would place further pressure on local infrastructure that is already struggling to meet existing demand. Health services in Clitheroe, including GP and dental provision, are operating at or near capacity, with many residents experiencing difficulty in registering with practices or securing timely appointments. There is no clear evidence within the application that sufficient additional healthcare capacity would be delivered to support the increased population arising from this development.

Local primary and secondary schools are similarly under pressure, with limited surplus capacity and increasing class sizes. The application does not demonstrate how additional demand for school places would be accommodated without placing further strain on existing provision or requiring pupils to travel further afield, thereby compounding transport impacts.

Other local amenities and services, including childcare provision, recreational facilities and town-centre services, have not kept pace with recent growth. The cumulative effect of multiple housing developments without commensurate investment in supporting infrastructure risks eroding quality of life for both existing and future residents. In the absence of clear, secured and deliverable mitigation to address these pressures, the proposal represents an unsustainable form of development.

Taken together, these shortcomings mean that the application fails to demonstrate that the proposed development would not materially worsen existing highway, transport and infrastructure constraints in Clitheroe. I therefore respectfully request that this application be refused, or, at the very least, deferred until a more comprehensive and realistic assessment is undertaken—one that fully

considers cumulative impacts and delivers effective mitigation to existing issues before placing further strain on an already overstretched town.

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 17 January 2026 13:43  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0997 FS-Case-787100673

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

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

**Address of Development:** Henthorn road

**Comments:** am writing to formally object to the proposed development of 115 new homes using the land off Henthorn Rd. While I understand the need for housing, this particular proposal is wholly unsuitable for our town and would have a severely negative impact on both the local community and environment.

#### Infrastructure and Access

The existing infrastructure simply cannot support such a large development. The main access road is already in poor condition and has required repeated resurfacing. It cannot safely accommodate the additional traffic, potentially over 200 extra vehicles, that this development would generate. Increased congestion will heighten safety risks for pedestrians, cyclists, and existing residents, particularly children walking to and from the local school and nursery .

Henthorn Road cannot cope with the amount of vehicles going to and from the recycling centre too, why place more stress on this road and those linking to it .

#### Impact on Local Services

Local schools, GP surgeries, and essential services are already operating at or near full capacity. Adding hundreds of new residents would place unsustainable pressure on education, healthcare, and community facilities, with no clear plan for expansion or improvement of these services. Limited services in immediate area at proposed site encourages householders to use cars to travel in and around Clitheroe so increased journeys on these congested rounds throughout days and evenings

#### Environmental Concerns

The proposed site represents valuable green space that contributes to local biodiversity, air quality, and the overall character of the town. Replacing it with concrete and tarmac would destroy more natural habitats and further erode the limited open spaces that residents rely on for recreation and wellbeing.

## Loss of Community Character

This level of development would significantly alter the character of our town. The quiet, semi-rural nature of the area would be lost to overdevelopment, increased noise, and traffic pollution. This is not sustainable growth; it's expansion at the expense of the very qualities that make our community a desirable and cohesive place to live.

In summary, I strongly oppose this development and urge the council to reject the proposal. It is clear that the infrastructure, services, and environment of our town cannot support development of this scale.

Thank you for taking the time to consider my objections.



[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 17 January 2026 15:24  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0997 FS-Case-787118840

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

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

**Address of Development:** Land of Henthorn Road Clitheroe  
Grid ref: 372961 440676

**Comments:** I want to object to the above planning application and ask the Council to refuse permission for the 115 dwellings, my comments are as follows:

My primary concerns are with general access to the new houses due to congestion on Henthorn Road, a situation which can only get worse when the new enforcement powers are introduced to discourage pavement parking. More specifically I have concerns about the northern portion of the development being accessed via Ingleton Crescent which already suffers from inconsiderate driving (speeding, cornering on the wrong side of the road) and this will be made significantly worse if the number of dwelling are increased from the current 12 to the proposed 47.

I don't believe that this development is necessary as I understand that demand for those developments already approved has slowed down (i.e. Half Penny Meadows) and even if there is a need for further new houses in and around Clitheroe there is other land available with direct access to the A59 and that doesn't suffer from the problems caused by being at the end of Henthorn Road.

It also appears that general services (Doctors/Dentists/Schools/Refuse collection/Tip etc) in Clitheroe are stretched (to put it mildly) and I would be interested to know what the developers propose to ensure that the new houses they want to build don't further compromise service delivery for existing residents let alone any new residents.

Kind Regards

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 17 January 2026 15:51  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0997 FS-Case-787133479

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

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

**Address of Development:** Lower Henthorn Road

**Comments:** To Whom ever it may concern,  
Please see the correspondance sent to Gladman homes, who incidently have failed to respond. I feel strongly against any more homes in what is now a very dangerous road with the maount of speeding etc and the high risk to pedestrians and heavy congestion already from the excessive buildings already passed.

Good Afternoon,

As a resident of Henthorn Road, Clitheroe for 18 years I have seen a steady decline in road safety, vandalism, and dirt from increased traffic all down to the 1K plus, new builds already constructed.

I notice you fail to mention any of this in your 'Community Benefits' comments on the leaflet delivered through my door and maybe are blindly un aware that the road as it is, can be termed as the busiest cul-de-sac In England. Allowing another 115 new homes in an already saturated area of green fields will add to the blight on our living standards and our community of neighbours oppose any more building and wish to save the small area of natural habitat.

I cannot stress enough how dangerous the overcrowded road already is due to the existing new builds and luckily for us our children are grown up and moved away so fingers crossed are at less risk when visiting. It is however a big concern for other families when in summer the road is full of them and dogs down a stretch of the road with no pathways and full of large wagons frequenting the refuse tip almost hourly at busy periods.

Network rail also has an issue with traffic congestion at the level crossing when barriers are closed and on many occasions the traffic is backed down Henthorn Road, down what is essentially a single track where cars are parked on one side of the road.

Just one final point I know a few families in the newly built also opposing the development as they realise it is just a matter of time with over crowding of the area and additional traffic until somebody is knocked over and potentially is killed.

I trust my views will be passed onto the planning committee but will forward these on also to the local department at the Ribble Vally Council.

Yours Sincerley