

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 17 January 2026 16:19
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2005/0997 FS-Case-787141669

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2005/0997

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

Comments: Re: Formal Objection to Planning Application – Land off Henthorn Road
I am submitting this letter as a long standing resident of Henthorn Road to formally object to the above planning application on the grounds of highway safety, transport impacts, inadequate infrastructure capacity, and environmental concerns. My objection is based on a detailed review of the Transport Assessment Report provided by Gladman Developments Ltd (2025) and extensive lived experience of the conditions in Clitheroe and the immediate area.

1. Lack of Required Local Community Engagement

The National Planning Policy Framework places clear emphasis on early and meaningful engagement with local communities. Despite claiming alignment with sustainable development goals, Gladman Developments has not made any substantive effort to gather lived experience from residents who regularly use Henthorn Road and other nearby affected areas.
As a homeowner, driver, pedestrian, cyclist, runner and rail commuter, I possess relevant insights which should have formed part of the foundation of the assessment. Their absence is a significant failing.

2. Severe Existing Congestion and Unsafe Traffic Conditions

Clitheroe already suffers from high congestion and frequent gridlock:

- Crossing the road Bawdlands is often unsafe due to high volumes of traffic and poor visibility. This is also the case for exiting the junction in a vehicle.
- Minor roadworks result in gridlock throughout the town centre.
- I have personally observed police officers navigating traffic outside the YMCA because of gridlock.
- Accessing my own driveway on Henthorn Road can take more than 10 minutes.

The Transport Assessment repeatedly states that additional traffic will not “materially alter” junction performance. This conclusion is not credible and ignores the reality that current conditions are already unacceptable.

3. Inadequate and Unrepresentative Traffic Data

The Transport Assessment relies on one weekday of data collection in November 2024, during just two narrow time windows (08:15–09:15 and 16:45–17:45). This methodology fails to capture:

- Early commuting patterns from 5:00am onwards,

- Traffic still heavy past 6:00pm,
- School drop off and pick up periods,
- Weekend tourism and shopping traffic (Saturday congestion often extends from Booths level crossing to Bawdlands),
- Seasonal fluctuations and the impact of road closures,
- The cumulative impact of multiple recent developments.

Such limited data cannot deliver accurate or representative modelling.

4. Road Safety Failures and Speeding Issues

The Assessment records the following speeds in a 20mph zone:

- Peak: 27.1–27.5mph
- Off peak: 32.4–32.5mph

These speeds alone demonstrate significant road safety risks and require immediate action before they are exacerbated with more houses being built. From personal experience:

- Cars continuously speed along Henthorn Road.
- Parked vehicles restrict visibility of pedestrians.
- Chicanes worsen behaviour by encouraging drivers to accelerate for priority.
- My car has been scraped by a speeding car, my neighbour’s van had its wing mirror knocked off, and my daughter witnessed a neighbour’s cat killed by a speeding driver who failed to stop.
- The Seedall Avenue/Henthorn Road chicane bollard is knocked over by cars every time it is reinstated. It has never remained standing for more than a week at a time.

The Transport Assessment notes 5 serious and 12 slight injuries (2020–2025) but fails to give any meaningful context to these pedestrians and the life changing injuries sustained. Nor does it assess trends before and after the Taylor Wimpey estate construction.

5. Evidence That Previous Impact Assessments Were Incorrect

Gladman’s own report acknowledges that the Taylor Wimpey development on Henthorn Road resulted in underestimation of actual traffic by:

- 26% in the AM peak,
- 16% in the PM peak.

This strongly indicates that the current Transport Assessment is similarly flawed and underestimates the true impact of the proposed development.

6. Misuse of Generic Transport Modelling and Failure to Reflect Local Constraints

The report relies heavily on National Transport Model growth factors, which do not account for:

- Local rural commuting patterns,
- Cumulative effects of multiple recent estates,
- Henthorn Road’s effective “cul de sac” nature since earlier phases of development,
- Only two viable routes into the town centre or out to the A59.

This modelling approach masks the actual lack of spare capacity and gives a misleading picture of Clitheroe’s resilience.

7. Unrealistic Assumptions About Walking, Cycling and Public Transport

The assessment’s assumptions about modal shift are fundamentally unrealistic:

- Bus services are limited, infrequent, and financially insecure.
- Clitheroe has no protected cycling infrastructure. Roads are narrow, congested and unsafe.
- The train service is unreliable, frequently cancelled, overcrowded at peak times, and only runs once per hour.
- Train fares are significantly higher than driving, making rail unsustainable for most commuters.
- The proposed site is too far from key transport hubs for walking or cycling to be practical for everyday use.

These assumptions artificially lower predicted car use and invalidate the modelling.

8. NPPF Requirements – Residual Impacts Are Severe

Paragraph 115 of the NPPF states that developments should be refused where residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.

Given the issues outlined above—unsafe speeds, congestion, data inaccuracies, flawed modelling, inadequate infrastructure—the proposed development clearly fails this test.

9. Existing Pressures on Schools, Healthcare and Utilities

Clitheroe’s essential services are already over capacity:

- Ribblesdale High received 698 applications for 285 places for 2025.
- Edisford Primary is already over capacity (212 pupils vs 210 places).
- Only two GP practices serve 27,597 residents, during a period of national GP shortages.
- Water pressure on Henthorn Road has significantly dropped since the Taylor Wimpey estate was built, with no action taken by United Utilities.
- Sewerage infrastructure is outdated and already struggling.

Introducing another large housing estate without committing to infrastructure upgrades is irresponsible and unsustainable.

10. Environmental Concerns – Impact on the River Ribble

Building near the River Ribble raises serious environmental concerns:

- Loss of natural habitat,
- Increased flood risk,
- Higher pollution loads,
- Increased strain on outdated sewer systems.

The river at Edisford Bridge is already officially classified as “Poor” due to elevated E. coli and intestinal enterococci levels. Adding further housing without robust mitigation will worsen conditions.

11. Inadequate Affordable Housing Provision

Despite claims that 30% of the homes will be affordable, experience shows that:

- Affordable plots are usually placed on undesirable parts of the site,
- They often have small footprints and limited facilities,
- Rents can exceed those of private lettings.

This does not justify the wide-ranging negative impacts of the development.

Conclusion and Request

Given the evidence presented, the Transport Assessment and accompanying documentation fail to demonstrate that this development would not cause severe adverse impacts on:

- Transport and road safety,
- Local infrastructure (schools, GPs, utilities),
- Environmental conditions,
- The quality of life of existing residents.

I therefore formally request that this planning application be refused.

If refusal is not immediate, I request a deferral until a comprehensive, multi-day, multi-season, community-informed Transport Assessment is undertaken, including true cumulative impacts and meaningful mitigation measures.

Thank you for considering my objection.

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 17 January 2026 18:22
To: Planning
Subject: Ref Planning Application No: 3/2025/0997 Grid Ref : 372961 440676

⚠ 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.

We would like to raise very strong objection to the above Planning Application for the following reasons:

- Environmental issues - the reduction of green space
- Henthorn Road is already too busy and the road surface is in very poor repair due to the volume of traffic that uses it now another 115 dwellings takes this to a new level and the residential nature of this road makes it unsuitable for this volume of traffic add to that it has needed resurfacing for at least 6 years
- Impact on wildlife - the ditches are home to frogs, toads and newts, the trees are home to tawny owls, barn owls and little owls, curlews have returned to the field and are at a fragile existence already - taking habitats away would be irresponsible; sparrow hawks hunt across this land regularly, woodpecker - common great spotted and rarer lesser spotted woodpecker are visitors
- Connected to the above point there are multiple ancient oak trees that are home to countless species of wildlife - similarly the hedgerows
- Drainage and flooding - when the builders left this site the gardens flooded more or less universally - most people have had to have remedial and more major work done around additional drainage to solve the issue adding more concrete and removing the green space will only serve to add to this issue and is an environmental disaster and irresponsible give the climate emergency that we face
- the infrastructure of local services are already under pressure - GP surgeries and schools or rather the scarcity of them now will be under more pressure
- road access in and out - already it can take 20 mins on occasion to get to the A59 in order to head anywhere, sometimes longer, this will only exacerbate the problem
- Public Footpaths and active travel access - there has been no consideration let alone building in better access via cycling and walking infrastructure around Clitheroe from this end of town
- The health of the rivers around us is poor and no one seems to be addressing the issues - Pendleton Brook is milky in colour often and the run off in many cases is much too close to the river which consequently means they are polluted now and there is clearly sewage running into them in areas around us which need addressing now - adding another 115 houses will make this much worse no doubt
- Safety - people are already speeding down Henthorn Road and people are reluctant to take their children on bikes now

Overall this serves to add to the lack of responsibility in terms of the climate and the environment.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 18 January 2026 12:13
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0997 FS-Case-787357491

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0997

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

Comments: I object to application 3/2025/0997.

A previous planning application on this site was refused by Ribble Valley Borough Council. The refusal was based on fundamental concerns, namely that the proposal represented inappropriate residential development in open countryside outside the defined settlement boundary, failed to demonstrate an identified and evidenced local housing need, and would result in a harmful and discordant pattern, density and form of development that undermined the openness and character of the area. Having reviewed the current submission, I do not consider that these core issues have been satisfactorily addressed. A reduction in the number of dwellings does not amount to a material change in circumstances, as the site location, designation and principle of development remain unchanged.

The submitted Planning and Affordable Housing Statement relies heavily on generic borough wide housing need figures and national policy arguments. It does not provide clear or compelling evidence of an identified and evidenced local housing need specific to this site, as required by Core Strategy Policy DMH3. Nor does it demonstrate any material change in policy or site circumstances that would justify residential development on this greenfield site outside the defined settlement boundary. As such, the principle of development remains contrary to adopted local policy.

The application is again submitted in outline, with all matters reserved except access. While the applicant refers to an indicative density within the Development Framework Plan, this plan is illustrative only and does not form part of the permission being sought. Matters of layout, scale, appearance, landscape impact and visual amenity are deferred to a later stage. Given that the previous refusal explicitly identified harm arising from density, form, pattern and loss of openness, it is not reasonable or appropriate to defer assessment of these issues. The Council cannot be satisfied at this stage that the final development would avoid the same significant harm previously identified.

The illustrative Development Framework Plan confirms that development would extend built form into open countryside, resulting in an urbanising encroachment that erodes the rural edge of Clitheroe. Landscape mitigation and future planting cannot offset the permanent loss of greenfield land or preserve the sense of openness that defines the character of this area. The proposal therefore

remains contrary to Core Strategy Policies DMG1 and DMG2.

Although the proposal is described as being for “up to” 115 dwellings, it is reasonable to assume that the site would be developed to this level. The proposed mix of one to five bedroom homes will largely attract families. In practical terms, this would generate a substantial increase in vehicle ownership. Even using conservative assumptions, 115 family dwellings could reasonably result in around 300 to 400 additional vehicles over time.

The Transport Assessment concludes that impacts would not be severe, but this does not reflect the reality of how the local road network currently operates. Henthorn Road and surrounding streets already experience frequent congestion due to parked vehicles, narrow carriageways, refuse collection vehicles, heavy goods vehicles accessing the recycling centre and peak hour traffic. Parking problems on nearby new estates are already evident, with vehicles regularly parked on roads and pavements due to impractical driveway layouts. Many driveways operate as single car spaces in practice, forcing additional vehicles onto the street. This restricts road width, increases congestion and creates safety risks for pedestrians, including those with prams and young children, while also making access difficult for bin wagons, buses and emergency services.

Traffic routes into Clitheroe via the A671, Whalley Road, Greenacre Street, Eshton Terrace and the railway crossing are already heavily constrained, particularly at school drop off and pick up times. These roads are frequently congested, heavily parked and subject to ongoing maintenance closures. Adding several hundred additional vehicles would significantly worsen congestion, increase pollution and heighten safety risks, particularly for pedestrians and children who use these routes daily.

There are also serious concerns regarding sustainability, waste management and environmental impact. Litter is already a significant problem along Henthorn Road and surrounding estates. In particular, cardboard recycling is collected in paper bags which are often left out overnight and regularly break or blow open in windy conditions. This results in waste being spread across pavements, roads, hedgerows and green spaces, harming wildlife and significantly degrading the appearance of the area.

While the application includes a Waste Management Strategy, this document is largely high level and focuses on principles rather than practical delivery. It confirms that detailed arrangements for bin storage, collection and management will be dealt with at a later stage. This provides little reassurance given the problems already being experienced locally. Introducing up to 115 additional dwellings, potentially adding 350 to 400 residents, will inevitably increase waste volumes. Without clear, secured and enforceable refuse and recycling arrangements, including measures to prevent windblown waste and overflow, these problems are likely to worsen rather than improve. This undermines claims that the development would deliver genuinely sustainable outcomes or protect residential and environmental amenity.

Taken together, the proposal would result in increased traffic, parking congestion, environmental harm, loss of countryside character and reduced residential amenity. These impacts conflict with Core Strategy Policies DMG1, DMG2, DMG3 and DMH3. As the key reasons for the previous refusal remain unresolved and no material change in circumstances has been demonstrated, I strongly believe this application should again be refused.

I would also like to raise serious concerns regarding the consultation period for this application. A 21 day consultation period may be appropriate for a small domestic extension, but it is not sufficient for a large scale development of this nature involving extensive technical documentation and long term impacts on the local community. The applicant has had many years, significant financial resources,

and access to solicitors, planning consultants and technical specialists to prepare this submission, particularly following the refusal of the previous application in 2021. By contrast, local residents have been given just 21 days to review a large volume of highly technical information and prepare meaningful responses.

The timing of the consultation further compounds this issue. The notification letter is dated 8 January, yet did not arrive at my property until around 12 January, effectively reducing the available response period. The consultation also falls immediately after the Christmas and New Year holidays, a time when many residents are away, returning to work, or managing additional commitments. Some residents may be away for extended periods during January and would have little or no opportunity to respond.

In addition, the Ribble Valley has a significant elderly population, many of whom would understandably find it difficult to access, download and navigate large technical planning documents online within such a limited timeframe. For a proposal of this scale and significance, I do not believe the consultation period has been reasonable, proportionate or genuinely inclusive, and this should be given weight when considering the level of public engagement and the representations received.

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 18 January 2026 12:18
To: Planning
Subject: 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.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

18/01/2025

I object to application 3/2025/0997.

A previous planning application on this site was refused by Ribble Valley Borough Council. The refusal was based on fundamental concerns, namely that the proposal represented inappropriate residential development in open countryside outside the defined settlement boundary, failed to demonstrate an identified and evidenced local housing need, and would result in a harmful and discordant pattern, density and form of development that undermined the openness and character of the area. Having reviewed the current submission, I do not consider that these core issues have been satisfactorily addressed. A reduction in the number of dwellings does not amount to a material change in circumstances, as the site location, designation and principle of development remain unchanged.

The submitted Planning and Affordable Housing Statement relies heavily on generic borough wide housing need figures and national policy arguments. It does not provide clear or compelling evidence of an identified and evidenced local housing need specific to this site, as required by Core Strategy Policy DMH3. Nor does it demonstrate any material change in policy or site circumstances that would justify residential development on this greenfield site outside the defined settlement boundary. As such, the principle of development remains contrary to adopted local policy.

The application is again submitted in outline, with all matters reserved except access. While the applicant refers to an indicative density within the Development Framework Plan, this plan is illustrative only and does not form part of the permission being sought. Matters of layout, scale, appearance, landscape impact and visual amenity are deferred to a later stage. Given that the previous refusal explicitly identified harm arising from density, form, pattern and loss of openness, it is not reasonable or appropriate to defer assessment of these issues. The Council cannot be satisfied at this stage that the final development would avoid the same significant harm previously identified.

The illustrative Development Framework Plan confirms that development would extend built form into open countryside, resulting in an urbanising encroachment that erodes the rural edge of Clitheroe. Landscape mitigation and future planting cannot offset the permanent loss of greenfield

land or preserve the sense of openness that defines the character of this area. The proposal therefore remains contrary to Core Strategy Policies DMG1 and DMG2.

Although the proposal is described as being for “up to” 115 dwellings, it is reasonable to assume that the site would be developed to this level. The proposed mix of one to five bedroom homes will largely attract families. In practical terms, this would generate a substantial increase in vehicle ownership. Even using conservative assumptions, 115 family dwellings could reasonably result in around 300 to 400 additional vehicles over time.

The Transport Assessment concludes that impacts would not be severe, but this does not reflect the reality of how the local road network currently operates. Henthorn Road and surrounding streets already experience frequent congestion due to parked vehicles, narrow carriageways, refuse collection vehicles, heavy goods vehicles accessing the recycling centre and peak hour traffic. Parking problems on nearby new estates are already evident, with vehicles regularly parked on roads and pavements due to impractical driveway layouts. Many driveways operate as single car spaces in practice, forcing additional vehicles onto the street. This restricts road width, increases congestion and creates safety risks for pedestrians, including those with prams and young children, while also making access difficult for bin wagons, buses and emergency services.

Traffic routes into Clitheroe via the A671, Whalley Road, Greenacre Street, Eshton Terrace and the railway crossing are already heavily constrained, particularly at school drop off and pick up times. These roads are frequently congested, heavily parked and subject to ongoing maintenance closures. Adding several hundred additional vehicles would significantly worsen congestion, increase pollution and heighten safety risks, particularly for pedestrians and children who use these routes daily.

There are also serious concerns regarding sustainability, waste management and environmental impact. Litter is already a significant problem along Henthorn Road and surrounding estates. In particular, cardboard recycling is collected in paper bags which are often left out overnight and regularly break or blow open in windy conditions. This results in waste being spread across pavements, roads, hedgerows and green spaces, harming wildlife and significantly degrading the appearance of the area.

While the application includes a Waste Management Strategy, this document is largely high level and focuses on principles rather than practical delivery. It confirms that detailed arrangements for bin storage, collection and management will be dealt with at a later stage. This provides little reassurance given the problems already being experienced locally. Introducing up to 115 additional dwellings, potentially adding 350 to 400 residents, will inevitably increase waste volumes. Without clear, secured and enforceable refuse and recycling arrangements, including measures to prevent windblown waste and overflow, these problems are likely to worsen rather than improve. This undermines claims that the development would deliver genuinely sustainable outcomes or protect residential and environmental amenity.

Taken together, the proposal would result in increased traffic, parking congestion, environmental harm, loss of countryside character and reduced residential amenity. These impacts conflict with Core Strategy Policies DMG1, DMG2, DMG3 and DMH3. As the key reasons for the previous refusal remain unresolved and no material change in circumstances has been demonstrated, I strongly believe this application should again be refused.

I would also like to raise serious concerns regarding the consultation period for this application. A 21 day consultation period may be appropriate for a small domestic extension, but it is not sufficient for a large scale development of this nature involving extensive technical documentation and long term impacts on the local community. The applicant has had many years, significant financial resources,

and access to solicitors, planning consultants and technical specialists to prepare this submission, particularly following the refusal of the previous application in 2021. By contrast, local residents have been given just 21 days to review a large volume of highly technical information and prepare meaningful responses.

The timing of the consultation further compounds this issue. The notification letter is dated 8 January, yet did not arrive at my property until around 12 January, effectively reducing the available response period. The consultation also falls immediately after the Christmas and New Year holidays, a time when many residents are away, returning to work, or managing additional commitments. Some residents may be away for extended periods during January and would have little or no opportunity to respond.

In addition, the Ribble Valley has a significant elderly population, many of whom would understandably find it difficult to access, download and navigate large technical planning documents online within such a limited timeframe. For a proposal of this scale and significance, I do not believe the consultation period has been reasonable, proportionate or genuinely inclusive, and this should be given weight when considering the level of public engagement and the representations received.

Many thanks,

A solid black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 18 January 2026 18:38
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0997 FS-Case-787458925

[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

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. This also includes additional indirect traffic for services such as deliveries, waste collection and contractors for this housing.
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.

6. The area highlighted for development is home to a significant level of wildlife and the removal of this poses a risk to the local ecosystem.

I respectfully urge the council to refuse this application.

Could I please ask for confirmation that this objection has been received.

Please keep me informed of progress, including any committee date.

Thank you for considering my objection.

Kind regards,



We

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 18 January 2026 21:55
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0997 FS-Case-787507667

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0997

Address of Development: Henthorn Road

Comments: I 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 school.

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

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.

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 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 a development of this scale.

Thank you for taking the time to consider my objections.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 18 January 2026 21:56
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0997 FS-Case-787507597

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0997

Address of Development: Land off Henthorn Road

Comments: I 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 school.

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

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.

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 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 a development of this scale.

Thank you for taking the time to consider my objections.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 18 January 2026 23:41
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0997 FS-Case-787526301

[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 the proposed development of 115 new homes using the land off Henthorn Rd. Planning application: Application 3/2025/0997.

Gladman submitted a proposal to develop this parcel of land back in 2021. Planning application: 3/2019/0999. This was rightfully rejected by Ribble valley council, and whilst Gladman attempted to use bullying tactics in a letter to the council they failed to use their rights for appeal. They have now submitted a new application, but nothing has changed for this to have a different outcome from the first application and should be rejected on the following (but not limited to) grounds:

TRANSPORT CONSIDERATIONS,

Henthorn Road leads down to a farm access road, no through road, one way in and one way out. All vehicles travelling down to the proposed development site must leave via the same overused road. The road serves multiple estates including 3 new estates. It also serves the Recycling centre and Treatment works, multiple heavy goods vehicles need to commute up and down Henthorn Road. The section of Henthorn Road that will serve as access to the proposed development site is very narrow country lane with no pavements and designed for light traffic and agricultural use. On the days that the Recycling centre is open queues can often be seen backed up over Siddow's bridge some half a mile up the road.

Documents submitted by Gladman to support this application include 25 0997 Transport Assessment. Unfortunately, this document carries very little merit to the fact that Henthorn Road is at breaking point on most days. The assessment refers to dates when the country was in lockdown due to Covid 19 and people were isolating, working from home with schools closed and essential travel only. Of course, during this time Henthorn Road would appear to be quiet, so was the M1. They have since conducted two further assessments where they selected the two days that the extremely busy Recycling centre was closed.

Whilst there is a public bus service half a mile up the road, it is sadly underutilised, often seen driving through the estate with nobody but the driver onboard. The walk up to the town centre is all uphill and one not easily undertaken by youngsters or elderly. There are no suitable cycling paths either and the road is so busy it is not safe for inexperienced cyclists. All this results in more people being reliant on a vehicle to commute from their homes.

BIODIVERSITY AND GEODIVERSITY CONSIDERTIONS,

This proposal will create a negative impact on the biodiversity in this area. Otters have been seen using the brook that runs through the field as a means to travel between Pendleton brook and the River Ribble, as do the king fishers that have a nesting burrow in the banking of Pendleton brook. Prior to the most recent development (Miller homes) Deer were frequent visitors in the area but they appear to have been moved on now with the lack of safe space.

STRATEGIC CONSIDERATIONS,

I also wish to object to the proposal as it would lead to the creation of new residential dwellings in the defined open countryside. It would be located outside of a defined settlement boundary, without sufficient justification insofar that it has not been adequately demonstrated that the proposal is for that of local needs housing that meets a current identified and evidenced outstanding need.

Gladman will claim that this development adjoins the settlement boundary, as this claim was already utilized when the appeal was accepted in Gladman's favour on what is now the Miller home estate. If developers can continue to build onto settlement boundaries, then our open countryside is not protected and policy DMG2 cannot be relied upon.

The impact on the area would be detrimental and if the latest Miller homes site (that Gladman got the approval for) is anything to go by I am not put at ease. The site is not maintained with overgrown hedgerows that leads to safety concerns for pedestrians and motorist exiting the site from lack of visibility, an increased security risk with lack of visibility, the mains sewer is undergoing constant maintenance work as it continues to back up and frequently releases into the surrounding fields, the river is now known to burst its banks and encroach onto the houses local to Siddow's bridge, prior to the new developments this was not an issue and the new houses are not in keeping with those in the area.

I personally have chosen to live in the open countryside, this development if approved will have a negative impact on my mental health. As a [REDACTED] over a rotation of shifts I need to be able to sleep during the day, this will be more difficult with the increase in daytime activity, not just during the building stage but also once complete.

Gladman have submitted this proposal for their own commercial gain with no regard to the safety and wellbeing impact to the residents of this characteristic historic town.

Kind Regards.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 19 January 2026 09:28
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - Ref:3/2025/0997 FS-Case-787637875

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

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

Address of Development: Land off Henthorn Road

Comments: Objection letter re: housing development off Henthorn Road Ref:3/2025/0997

I am writing to strongly object to the planning application for the proposed introduction of 115 new houses into the open countryside off Henthorn Road.

I am a local resident of Clitheroe and my objection is based on it being entirely unsuitable for our town and the severe, negative impact it would have on the local community, wildlife and environment.

Environmental and Infrastructure Concerns

Firstly, I am concerned about the impact of the proposed development undermining the character, openness and visual appearance of the surrounding area, overdevelopment of the site and, most importantly, the detrimental impact it will have on the junction at Henthorn Road, Eshton Terrace and Woone Lane, which is already at a breaking point.

Secondly, I am fearful about the proposal's effect on highway safety. 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 well over 200 vehicles, that this development would generate.

Increased congestion will heighten safety risks. The development would also increase traffic movements on Henthorn Road towards the recycling centre, already subject to congestion, increasing the safety risks for pedestrians, cyclists and existing residents, particularly children walking to and from school.

Thirdly, 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 natural habitats and further erode the limited open spaces that residents rely on for recreation and wellbeing.

Another environmental factor to consider is 'excess surface water drainage' into the existing stream which runs through the site. More houses and less green area to soak up water could cause a flood risk. The weather is constantly changing these days and we now have high flooding threats which are a big issue. This in turn could affect home insurance, particularly flood risk cover.

This site has already been rejected before (Ref: 3/2019/0999) for being an unjustified intrusion into open countryside. Even if fewer house are being proposing this time round, the core problems remain and it is simply the wrong place for development.

Nothing has changed in terms of local policy or site circumstances to justify overturning the previous

refusal. I will also add that the developers (Miller Homes) have been somewhat under handed proposing this development in the guise of a separate application, owing to the fact that if more than 1,200 houses are being built it would mean they would need to provide extra amenities such as a doctors surgery, schools and also alternate means of access/exit routes easing traffic flow on Henthorn Road out to the A671 or A59.

Loss of Community Character

Furthermore, I am concerned that approving this application could set an undesirable precedent for similar forms of development in the area, making it more difficult for the local planning authority to resist future proposals that would further erode the character and amenity of the neighbourhood. 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, merely expansion at the expense of the very qualities that make our community a desirable and cohesive place to live.

I respectfully request that the local planning authority fully considers these objections and decides to refuse planning permission for this application.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Regards



[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 19 January 2026 10:34
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0997 FS-Case-787670543

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0997

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

Comments: I live at [REDACTED] and I'm writing to object to planning application 3/2025/0997, which proposes 115 new homes on the agricultural land at the bottom of the road. I have significant concerns about flooding and drainage, road safety and capacity, emergency access, the impact on local character and green space, and the ability of local services and infrastructure to cope. I hope the council will carefully consider the concerns set out below when deciding the application.

Flood risk and drainage

The fields at the bottom of Henthorn Road regularly become waterlogged after rainfall, and flood alerts for the area are common. Large areas of standing water appear on and around the site throughout the year, which shows how limited natural drainage currently is. Introducing extensive hard surfaces from 115 homes would increase run off into a network that already struggles during heavy rain. I would appreciate reassurance that the drainage implications are fully understood and addressed.

Road safety, capacity and the single access

Henthorn Road is the only vehicle route in and out for residents at the lower end of the street. The surface is in poor condition, with frequent potholes and patch repairs, and parked cars narrow the road and reduce visibility. There have been incidents involving pedestrians, and there is particular concern for children and residents who walk and cycle here daily.

Given the existing deterioration of the road surface and how quickly it wears under current traffic levels, I am concerned about whether it can safely accommodate the additional traffic generated by 115 homes. I would ask the council to consider whether a higher quality resurfacing, designed for heavier and more frequent use, may be necessary to avoid ongoing safety issues and continual maintenance disruption.

Roadworks already cause significant disruption, often leaving residents with no alternative route in or out. This raises concerns about emergency access and evacuation, and I hope the council will consider these risks carefully.

Construction traffic

Construction traffic would add to congestion and safety issues. I would welcome reassurance that any construction plan will manage routing, hours, noise, dust and emergency access in a way that protects residents.

Local amenity, green space and settlement character

Clitheroe's natural beauty, open countryside and accessible walking routes are part of what attracts visitors and are highly valued by residents. The fields at the bottom of Henthorn Road, and routes leading towards the tip, the farmyards, Whalley and the Aspinall Arms, are used daily — including by many dog walkers. They offer quiet, scenic and safe places to walk without needing to drive out of town.

Losing these fields and altering the character of the adjoining routes would remove an important amenity and change the feel of this part of Clitheroe. I hope the council will consider the impact on residents and on the wider character of the town when assessing the proposal.

Local services and infrastructure

Local GP services, schools and open space are already under pressure. I would be grateful if the council could consider whether the application provides sufficient, deliverable measures to address the additional demand created by 115 new homes.

Conclusion

For the reasons above, I do not support the application in its current form. I hope the council will carefully consider the issues raised and ensure that these concerns are fully addressed in its assessment.

If the application is approved, I would ask that the following matters are fully considered and addressed to protect residents and ensure the development is safe and sustainable:

1. Highways and access

- Exploring whether a second vehicle access is necessary to ensure resilience
- Considering whether a higher standard resurfacing of Henthorn Road is required
- Managing parking at narrow points to improve safety
- Providing safe pedestrian crossing points and continuous footways
- Ensuring any designs receive appropriate safety audits

2. Flood risk and drainage

- Ensuring surface water run off can be safely managed
- Confirming foul network capacity and any required upgrades
- Setting appropriate finished floor levels relative to flood risk

3. Amenity, landscape and ecology

- Retaining and enhancing hedgerows and mature trees where possible
- Providing meaningful green space on site

Securing long term biodiversity gains

4. Sustainable travel and air quality

Ensuring safe walking and cycling connections

Providing secure cycle storage

Supporting low emission travel through EV charging

5. Construction and neighbour protection

Managing noise, dust and working hours

Maintaining emergency access at all times

Carrying out road condition surveys with appropriate safeguards

I would be grateful for acknowledgement of this objection and to be kept informed of committee dates and any changes to the proposal.

Yours faithfully,



From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 19 January 2026 11:26
To: Planning
Subject: Objection- Planning application no: 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.

Objection to Outline Planning Application
3/2025/0997

Land off Henthorn Road, Clitheroe, BB7 3BY

To Whom It May Concern,

We are writing to formally object to the proposed housing development in our local area. Firstly, the development would result in the loss of valuable agricultural fields that are currently used for farming. These fields contribute to local food production, the rural character of the area, and the wider environment. Once lost, this land cannot be easily replaced. Also, the land in question has been used by walkers for many years. Local residents also regularly use it for walking, exercise, dog walking, and enjoying the natural environment. Although the land may be privately owned, it has become an important informal recreational space and is part of people's daily routines. If the development goes ahead, public access to the land may be reduced or completely removed. This would prevent walkers from continuing to use the area as they have done previously.

In addition, the proposed site is poorly accessible. There is only one road providing access in and out of the area, which already operates under strain. This limited access raises serious concerns about daily usability as well as emergency access for ambulances, fire services, and other essential services. Furthermore, the increase in housing will inevitably lead to a significant rise in traffic. The existing congestion is already severe, and further traffic will worsen delays and create additional road safety risks for residents, pedestrians, and cyclists. This is a serious concern that has not been adequately addressed.

I am also deeply concerned by the assumptions made in the traffic report. The suggestion that the majority of residents will travel by bus, walk, or cycle is a complete fabrication, totally unrealistic to predict and does not reflect current travel patterns, local infrastructure, or the practical realities of commuting, work, and family life. These assumptions significantly underestimate the true traffic impact of the development and therefore we would strongly urge an in depth look at the actual data from what seems a very manufactured report.

We grew up in this town and always felt privileged to live in such a beautiful and distinctive place. Its open spaces, character, and sense of community were central to what made it special. However,

over time the area has become increasingly overpopulated and congested, with infrastructure struggling to keep pace with development. Much of the character that once defined the town has already been eroded, and further large-scale housing will only accelerate this decline, fundamentally changing the nature of the place that so many residents value and call home. While we recognise the need for more houses, the sheer volume of houses already being built on Halfpenny meadows to the south of the town is surely sufficient enough for a town the size of Clitheroe.

For the reasons outlined above, we believe this proposal is unsustainable, poorly planned, and harmful to both the local community and the surrounding environment. We urge the council to completely dismiss this application and reject the proposed development.

Thank you for taking our views into consideration.

Please could you confirm that this has been received.

Yours faithfully,

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature and name of the sender.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 19 January 2026 12:05
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0997 FS-Case-787719825

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0997

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

Comments: I wish to object to this planning application.

As a result of the numerous recent large-scale housing developments, the village of Sabden has become a significant rat-run for vehicles travelling between Clitheroe, surrounding towns, and the wider motorway network. Our rural road infrastructure is simply not designed to cope with the volume of traffic now passing through the village on a daily basis.

There are frequent instances where traffic comes to a complete standstill due to the narrowness of the roads, along with long queues forming at the give-way on Bull Bridge. In addition, the number of vehicles speeding through the village poses a serious danger to residents—particularly in areas where there are no footpaths and pedestrians are forced to walk on the road.

Sabden lies within a designated Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), and much of the village is within the conservation area. The Sabden Conservation Area Appraisal, compiled by Ribble Valley Borough Council, specifically identifies fast-moving rush-hour traffic as one of the major threats to the character and safety of the village. This proposal would only exacerbate those existing pressures.

I strongly urge the planning authority to reject this application. The cumulative impact of the additional traffic generated by the development would have far-reaching negative consequences not only for Clitheroe but for the wider Ribble Valley. The planning authority acts as custodian of our Borough and has a responsibility to protect the rural character, natural beauty, and long-term sustainability of the area in which we live.

For these reasons, I object to the proposed development.

█

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 19 January 2026 22:06
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0997 FS-Case-788007732

[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 the proposed development of 115 new homes using the land off Henthorn Rd as proposed in the application above.

I am against this development due to a number of reasons which I will mention below.

Infrastructure and Access

Henthorn Road already has a huge amount of cars going up and down it daily due to it being a one way in and one way out road with no exit out the other end. Not only that but with the amount of skip wagons and tankers going to and from the recycling centre and the water treatment works the road is at full capacity. The fact that the recycling centre is located on a dead end road already adds a huge amount of traffic volume and this is without adding another potential 200 or so more cars.

If the traffic surveys that Gladman conducted had not been carried out firstly in COVID in 2020 and more recently on a Wednesday and Thursday whilst the recycling centre was closed then this might have been picked up on.

Increased congestion will also heighten safety risks for pedestrians, cyclists, and existing residents, particularly children walking to and from school.

The road is already in poor condition which requires repeated resurfacing attempts.

Letting this go ahead is an accident waiting to happen.

The 3 new estates have already but a strain on the drainage system in which the main drain is repeatedly being unblocked as they can't cope with the amount of houses already. Adding more houses will potentially end up as a human health hazard.

Impact on Local Services

Local schools, GP surgeries, and essential services are already operating at or near full capacity. Trying to get an appointment anywhere is already hard enough. 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.

What about the residents of Clitheroe, do we not matter at all??

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 natural habitats and further erode the limited open spaces that residents rely on for recreation and wellbeing.

It is already noticeable that deer that was once a common sight in the fields down Henthorn (prior to the already 3 NEW ESTATES that have been built) have disappeared and if this goes ahead it will no doubt scare off the other wildlife in the area like the otters and the kingfishers.

Why should these be forced out of the area to make way for more houses on a road that has already taken its fair share?

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 a development of this scale.

Thank you for taking the time to consider my objections.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 20 January 2026 10:20
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0997 FS-Case-788173111

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0997

Address of Development: Land off Henthorne Road, Clitheroe BB73BY

Comments: I would like to add my reservations about the safety and feasibility of this proposed new development alongside those already posted. I live in a new build so it would be unreasonable to complain about further development except to say what is already established at the bottom of Henthorne Road fits naturally into the area. Further additional housing would impact strongly on the semi rural feel of the area, situated as we are on the edge of lovely accessible countryside.

We are opposed to the new application mainly on the grounds of the access to part of it being via Ingleton Crescent. Why can't the entrance be from Henthorne Road? It would be dangerous for the existing residents to be subjected to many months of heavy goods vehicles passing to and from the site on a daily basis.

The traffic situation on the cul- de- sac that is Henthorne Road is already very congested, especially at peak times. The addition of yet more traffic both during and after the build would cause major delays along this already very busy road. Recent repair to the road caused horrendous queues either way.

Please do not grant this application without more consideration being given to access.
Thank you

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 20 January 2026 10:53
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0997 FS-Case-788191480

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0997

Address of Development: Land of Henthorn Rd

Comments: I have lived in Clitheroe for over 30 years and I am totally shocked and dismayed to see the resubmission of the planning application without any amendments. The application was refused due to the poor access via Henthorn Rd and the outcome was before any planning passed the infrastructure had to be improved with a link to the main roads for safety reasons. The traffic monitoring was fudged and took place on Wednesday and Thursday when the tip was closed and during Covid and did not represent true figures. At present Henthorn Rd and the junction struggles to cope safely with the congestion and is an accident waiting to happen. Also there was talks regarding the relocation of the tip which at weekends is a nightmare with endless queues. What are the current plans? I realise Ribble Valley is compelled to build a certain amount of new homes but why saturate just Clitheroe and spoil its beautiful riverside walks and wild life that attracts many people into Croe as now we are rapidly becoming one huge housing estate !!

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 20 January 2026 11:37
To: Planning
Subject: Proposed plans

⚠ External Email

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

Re: Objection to Outline Planning Application 3/2025/0997 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 keep me informed of progress, including any committee date. Thank you for considering my objection. Yours faithfully,

[REDACTED]

We have put in an objection letter

[Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone](#)



Director of Economic Development & Planning

Planning Council Offices

Church Walk

Clitheroe

BB7 2RA

20 JAN 2026

17th January 2026

Re Planning Application No 3/2025/0997 Land off Henthorn Road, Clitheroe, BB7 3BY

Dear Sir / Madam

With respect with the above Planning Application I would like to make the following objections:

Henthorn road which would be the main access road to the site is already very congested during the morning and evening and there are several pinch points where cars have to give way to oncoming vehicles due to parked cars causing an obstruction. Particular areas are between Ludlow road /Kenilworth Drive and Eshton Terrace/Brown Street.

The road surface on Henthorn road is in a very bad condition with many potholes this is not helped by the large wagons which use it to access the Recycling centre and Sewerage facility. Another 115 plus cars using the road will only make the road condition much worse apart from the damage which will be caused by the building contractors wagons.

Many cars park on the pavement along Henthorn road and with the Government set to announce plans to ban pavement parking and for councils to enforce it there will be even more obstructions encountered.

I am also very concerned that the site plan shows the potential for houses to be built adjacent to Pendleton Brook. This is classified by the Environment Agency and is subject to environmental management like the Pendleton Fish Easement etc to improve fish migration. Building this close to the brook will cause lots of building residue to pollute the brook. At the very least the building line should be moved to at least the current path through the field.

Clitheroe is already a very busy town with several new developments completed or under construction. It is too early yet to see what effect the people in these developments are going to have on local services like schools and doctors. It would therefore be prudent to stop any further housing estate development until this is observed.

I note that in the Transport Assessment submitted as part of the application that large assumptions are made that the residents of these houses will mainly use public transport, cycle or walk which will be highly unlikely. They have also conducted traffic surveys to justify that the development will not cause any problems on Henthorn road. I would just like to say that once they have built the houses and walked away with their profit it's the residents who have to suffer the consequences.

