

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 29 January 2026 16:29
To: Planning
Subject: Planning objection ref 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.

⚠ External Email

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

Dear Planning Team,

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

I write to formally object to the above application.

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

This proposal does the opposite.

1. Fundamental infrastructure failure

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

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

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

2. Emergency access and network resilience

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

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

3. Inadequate and unrealistic Traffic Assessment and Travel Plan

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

Persistent congestion and queuing

Parking on both sides of the carriageway with limited restrictions

Widespread inconsiderate and illegal parking

Poor compliance with speed limits and minimal enforcement

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

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

4. Speeding and unsafe conditions for sustainable travel

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

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

5. Policy conflict and unsustainable development

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

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

6. No meaningful public benefit

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

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

Conclusion

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

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

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

Yours faithfully,

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted address]

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 29 January 2026 17:47
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0997 FS-Case-792327889

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0997

Address of Development: Land off Henthorn road. GRID REF: 372961 440676

Comments: OBJECTION LETTER TO PLANNING APPLICATION – 3/2025/0997
GRID REF: 372961 440676

Proposal: outline application for the erection of up to 115 dwellings, including affordable housing, with public open space, landscaping, sustainable urban drainage system (SuDS) and vehicular access.

Location: Land off Henthorn road.

Dear Kathryn Hughes, I am writing as a local resident to strongly object to the above planning application.

Summary of Objection

I am writing as a local resident to strongly object to the above planning application. I firmly believe that the proposal constitutes unnecessary, inappropriate and unsustainable development extending beyond the built-up limits of the town into the attractive open countryside surrounding its layout which fails to respond to local landscape character, and surrounding context and should be refused as harming the visual and rural amenities of the area. The town is under threat from development following the application, limited capacity, lack of facilities and poor accessibility damaging the rural nature, character and attractive qualities of our area and its beautiful surroundings on the edge of the town. The reasons for objection are because the proposal causes will be:

1. Infrastructure issues
2. Environmental/character impact
3. Impact on Amenity
4. Sewage and Drainage capacity

1. A proposed extra 115-dwelling development in a rural town.

Objection: "The local road network, particularly Henthorn Road, Woone Lane, is already operating beyond its capacity and is unsuitable for the increased traffic this development will further generate causing severe residual impact. Most households have on average 2 cars this would mean an extra potentially 300 cars up and down the same roads, this is not taking into consideration visitors, there is no extra parking for them. It can take me an hour to get to my house through traffic queues in Clitheroe in peak times. The road surfaces around this area are already in a state of disrepair with vehicles swerving to dodge the potholes and speeds I encounter on a daily basis far exceeding the

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 29 January 2026 19:16
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0997 FS-Case-792357489

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0997

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

Comments: We need more housing. Please make it section 106 affordable.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 29 January 2026 19:55
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0997 FS-Case-792367904

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0997

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

Comments: My specific grounds for objection are as follows:

1. Highways Safety and Cumulative Traffic Impact

Capacity Overload: Henthorn Road serves as the sole artery for an extensive residential network. The existing volume of traffic already exceeds the practical capacity of the road; adding 115 additional households will result in "severe" cumulative impacts on the local road network, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Vulnerability of Single-Point Access: The area south of Kenilworth Drive is effectively a dead-end network. Reliance on a single point of ingress and egress creates a critical lack of resilience. Any disruption—whether for utility works or emergency incidents—effectively isolates hundreds of homes.

2. Flawed Baseline Data in Applicant Assessments

Unrealistic Traffic Modeling: The submitted Transport Assessment appears to rely on theoretical flow rates that do not account for the high levels of on-street parking and the frequent presence of heavy agricultural machinery and HGVs, which significantly reduce the effective width of the carriage.

Pavement Parking & Pedestrian Risk: The assessments overlook the safety implications for pedestrians. With the government moving toward stricter enforcement on pavement parking, the narrowness of Henthorn Road will become an even greater bottleneck that the developer has failed to mitigate.

3. Conflicts with the Adopted Core Strategy

Unallocated Greenfield Site: This land is not designated for housing within the current Development Plan and sits outside the established settlement boundary of Clitheroe.

Policy Departure: The proposal directly contradicts Key Statement DS1 and Policy DMG1, as it does not constitute sustainable development. Given the borough's current housing land supply position, there is no "tilted balance" or over-riding necessity to approve speculative applications on unallocated greenfield land.

4. Impact on Sustainable Transport and Amenity

Active Travel Deterrence: The high speeds and heavy vehicle traffic on Henthorn Road create a hostile environment for cyclists and walkers. This undermines the "Sustainable Travel" claims made in the application and fails to promote healthy, safe communities.

Loss of Character: The incremental erosion of Clitheroe's rural fringe reduces the town's appeal and puts unsustainable pressure on local primary care and education services that are already at breaking point.

Conclusion For the reasons stated above, this application fails to meet the basic requirements for sustainable, plan-led growth. I respectfully request that the Planning Committee refuses this application to protect the safety and infrastructure of the Clitheroe community.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 28 January 2026 11:26
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0997 FS-Case-791659899

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0997

Address of Development: Henthorn Road, Clitheroe

Comments: Dear Planning Officer,

I wish to formally object to planning application 3/2025/0997 for up to 115 dwellings on land off Henthorn Road, Clitheroe, on the grounds of transport, traffic, and highway safety.

The submitted Transport Assessment significantly underestimates the real-world impact of the proposed development on the local highway network. Henthorn Road already experiences congestion at peak times, particularly during school drop-off and pick-up periods, and the introduction of traffic generated by up to 115 additional dwellings would place unacceptable pressure on an already constrained route.

The Transport Assessment relies on generic trip-rate assumptions and theoretical junction capacity modelling, which does not reflect actual local travel behaviour. Car dependency in this area is high, and the assessment places unrealistic reliance on walking, cycling, and bus use, despite limited and unreliable public transport options and the impracticality of non-car travel for many daily journeys.

Highway safety is also a significant concern. Henthorn Road is used daily by pedestrians, families, and cyclists, and increased traffic volumes will heighten the risk of accidents, particularly at junctions, access points, and informal crossing locations. The assessment does not adequately consider the lived experience of residents or existing safety issues along this route.

Furthermore, the cumulative impact of this development alongside nearby and recently approved housing schemes has not been properly addressed. When considered collectively, the level of growth proposed is disproportionate to the capacity and character of the local road network.

For these reasons, I believe the proposal fails to demonstrate that the development would be safe, sustainable, or acceptable in transport terms, and it conflicts with both local and national planning policy aimed at preventing severe residual transport impacts.

I respectfully request that this application is refused.

Yours faithfully,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 28 January 2026 11:53
To: Planning
Subject: Planning 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.

Dear Planning Team,

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

I write to formally object to the above application for the erection of 115 dwellings on land off Henthorn Road.

My objections are as follows:

Road safety

Henthorn Road is currently extremely busy and the extra traffic from this new development must only make this worse.

The road is difficult to cross with many drivers not obeying the speed limit and there have already been several collisions and incidents of pedestrians being knocked down.

Inadequate access

Henthorn Road is the only access to the development, and this is already unsuitable for the amount of traffic using it resulting in congestion.

There is no alternative route in and there are often roadworks restricting access even further. This must also affect the ability of emergency services to get through.

Loss of valuable greenfield area.

This area is valuable countryside vital for wildlife. Clitheroe has already lost a significant amount of green space due to housing developments over the last few years and this would be a further erosion of a valuable and important amenity.

Flooding

The site is close to the River Ribble and is important in absorbing rainfall entering the river which can cause flooding.

Infrastructure

I feel that the proposed development would put an even greater strain on existing services such as doctors, dentists, schools and other public services.

Kind regards

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 28 January 2026 12:16
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0997 FS-Case-791683653

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0997

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

Comments: I strongly oppose the proposed development for a number of reasons.

Henthorn Road is not fit for purpose as it is, traffic regularly backs up around the top where it is only one car wide, and a pedestrian was hit and seriously injured in recent years. An additional ~200+ cars will only compound this problem. If traffic backs up past Garnett Road, the rest of Henthorn Road is entirely cut off from emergency services should they be required. The road is narrow and in poor condition, with a lot of parked cars and pedestrians, and is not fit to handle this volume of traffic.

I also object at the prospect of Ingleton Crescent being used as the main route into part of the development. Ingleton Crescent is a quiet, dead-end street with a lot of families who have small children. Young children from all over the estate come on foot or by bicycle to feed the ducks at the pond, many without parental supervision.

Ingleton Crescent itself is a narrow, unmarked road which is suitable for the small number of houses it services and resultant infrequent traffic. The top of Ingleton Crescent is not wide enough for two vehicles; if one car is at the junction, another cannot pass by without the other vehicle moving. The road is simply not suitable for the drastic increase in traffic it would see if used as an access point.

The fields which are proposed for development are farmers fields and support an abundance of wildlife whose habitats have already been significantly eroded by existing developments. I regularly see wildlife including owls, deer and other species, whose habitats will be further destroyed if this development is approved. I find the idea of the proposed development including natural, open space ridiculous; it already is a natural open space.

For the safety and welfare of all of the families who live down Henthorn Road, and for our local wildlife, I strongly object to this proposal. If you haven't already, please head down Henthorn Road at rush hour, or drive down Ingleton Crescent. These roads are not fit to support the additional traffic, and if this development goes ahead, there will be more congestion, resulting in more accidents and more local people being hospitalised.

Sharon Craig

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 28 January 2026 12:22
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0997 FS-Case-791692095

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0997

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

Comments: I strongly oppose the proposed development for a number of reasons.

Henthorn Road is not fit for purpose as it is, traffic regularly backs up around the top where it is only one car wide, and a pedestrian was hit and seriously injured in recent years. An additional 200+ cars will only compound this problem. If traffic backs up past Garnett Road, the rest of Henthorn Road is entirely cut off from emergency services should they be required. The road is narrow and in poor condition, with a lot of parked cars and pedestrians, and is not fit to handle this volume of traffic.

I also object at the prospect of Ingleton Crescent being used as the main route into part of the development. Ingleton Crescent is a quiet, dead-end street with a lot of families who have small children. Young children from all over the estate come on foot or by bicycle to feed the ducks at the pond, many without parental supervision.

Ingleton Crescent itself is a narrow, unmarked road which is suitable for the small number of houses it services and resultant infrequent traffic. The top of Ingleton Crescent is not wide enough for two vehicles; if one car is at the junction, another cannot pass by without the other vehicle moving. The road is simply not suitable for the drastic increase in traffic it would see if used as an access point.

The fields which are proposed for development are farmers fields and support an abundance of wildlife whose habitats have already been significantly eroded by existing developments. I regularly see wildlife including owls, deer and other species, whose habitats will be further destroyed if this development is approved. I find the idea of the proposed development including natural, open space ridiculous; it already is a natural open space.

For the safety and welfare of all of the families who live down Henthorn Road, and for our local wildlife, I strongly object to this proposal. If you haven't already, please head down Henthorn Road at rush hour, or drive down Ingleton Crescent. These roads are not fit to support the additional traffic, and if this development goes ahead, there will be more congestion, resulting in more accidents and more local people being seriously injured.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 28 January 2026 12:22
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0997 FS-Case-791691557

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0997

Address of Development: Development off Henthorn Road (at the bottom)

Comments: Dear Sir or Madam,

I am writing to formally object to the above planning application for the proposed housing development.

My objection is based on the following material planning considerations:

1. Traffic and Highway Safety

The development will significantly increase traffic, which is already congested and poses safety risks for pedestrians, cyclists, and local residents. The proposed access arrangements are inadequate and may worsen accident risks.

2. Impact on Local Infrastructure and Services. Local services such as schools, GP surgeries, and public transport are already under pressure. The development does not appear to provide sufficient infrastructure improvements to support the increased population.

3. Loss of Green Space / Environmental Impact. The site currently provides important green space / wildlife habitat. The proposal will result in loss of biodiversity and contradicts local and national planning policies on environmental protection and sustainability.

4. Overdevelopment and Character of the Area. The scale, density, and design of the proposed development are out of keeping with the existing character of the surrounding area, which is predominantly rural. The proposal would harm the visual amenity and local character.

6. Noise, Disturbance, and Construction Impact. Construction will cause prolonged noise, dust, and disruption to nearby residents.

For these reasons, I request that the planning authority refuses this application or requires substantial amendments to address these concerns.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Yours faithfully,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 28 January 2026 15:22
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0997 FS-Case-791787997

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0997

Address of Development: Henthorn road

Comments: Please please please stop developing and building more properties in our town. It's ruining the countryside we have left. There's more people moving into the town than it can even accommodate for, if you build these houses it's going to put a bigger strain on the doctors, dentists, schools etc for the residents that are already homed here. Let's keep the town beautiful and leave it as it is. I sometimes think money is more important to these developers and they don't care about how the town feels and ruining the wholesome feel of the town. It looks more like Blackburn and that's definitely not a compliment.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 28 January 2026 16:10
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 03/2025/0997 FS-Case-791804840

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 03/2025/0997

Address of Development: Henthorn Road
Grid Ref: 372961 440676

Comments: The Plans propose accessing part of the new development via Waterfall Gardens and Ingleton Crescent. I believe this will have a significant adverse impact on the amenity of residents of Ingleton Crescent which is a quiet cul-de-sac but it will also directly impact my own property at Waterfall Gardens. The junction of Waterfall Gardens and Ingleton Crescent is [REDACTED]. I am concerned regarding the impact of significantly increased traffic volume with an increase in noise, loss of privacy and in particular headlights shining directly towards my [REDACTED] room that will result from this. I am also concerned that a previously quiet junction will become a much busier junction and create difficulties for me entering or leaving my driveway making this essential task much less safe as my [REDACTED]. On road parking already causes a safety issue with the narrow width of Waterfall Gardens and Ingleton Crescent in particular meaning vehicles find it difficult to pass or have to park on the pavement causing a further hazard; this hazard will only increase if the volume of traffic increases compromising highway safety and pedestrian. I suggest access is not permitted via Waterfall Gardens and Ingleton Crescent. Instead the Plans should be amended to give access via Henthorn Road to the part of the site adjacent to Ingleton Crescent. This could be accomplished by changing the emergency access path indicated on the plans to a proper access road, this would deliver separate access to the new development via Henthorn Road and not via Waterfall Gardens and Ingleton Crescent. I am also concerned regarding the general impact on the nature of the area and the wildlife which can be seen on the proposed sites (deer often present).

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 28 January 2026 16:21
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0997 FS-Case-791812455

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0997

Address of Development: Land off Henthorn Road, Clitheroe

Comments: I object to this application for the reasons below. My comments are based on the submitted Transport Assessment/Travel Plan, Heritage Desk-Based Assessment, Mineral Resource Assessment, Air Quality Assessment, Noise Screening Report, Statement of Community Involvement, Waste Management Strategy, Crime Impact Statement, Lighting Strategy, application form and notices. If the Council is nonetheless minded to approve, I request that the specific conditions, obligations and further assessments identified in Section 4 are imposed before any permission is issued.

1) Summary of principal concerns

- Highway safety and traffic impacts: The Transport documents and Travel Plan do not provide enforceable mitigation to prevent unacceptable traffic, safety and rat-running on Henthorn Road and surrounding streets. On the evidence available, the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe and there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety (NPPF tests).
- Strategic A59 commuting impacts: Before determination, the application must include a corridor-wide assessment of the A59 (Whalley–Clitheroe bypass) and its key downstream junctions towards Preston, Blackburn and other employment hubs, grounded in realistic out-commuting patterns given limited local job opportunities in Clitheroe. Peak-hour commutes on this corridor can already approach or exceed one hour depending on destination; additional development traffic therefore risks severe residual cumulative impacts and an unacceptable impact on highway safety.
- Alternative sites and avoidable town-centre impacts: More accessible and less disruptive sites exist along/adjacent to the A59 corridor. These must be assessed and transparently discounted through a comparative site selection before bringing further traffic into Clitheroe’s constrained streets. Failing to do so would unnecessarily intensify congestion and heighten collision risk for vulnerable road users, including schoolchildren.
- Townscape character and visitor economy: Clitheroe is a picturesque, well-sought-after market town. Continued ad-hoc edge-of-centre growth risks eroding local character and harming the visitor economy. Determination must be informed by a Landscape and Visual Impact Appraisal (LVIA) and townscape assessment demonstrating no unacceptable harm and compliance with local design/landscape policies and the NPPF on well-designed places and local distinctiveness.
- Inadequate traffic survey scope/duration: The Transport Assessment appears to rely on a short data

collection window that is not representative of typical and seasonal conditions. Determination should be deferred pending a minimum 6-month continuous survey programme (automatic traffic counts on key links, monthly junction turning/queue surveys at agreed peaks, and journey-time monitoring) spanning school term/holiday periods, events and typical weather.

- Affordable housing clarity: The application form cites 35 affordable units, but there is no plan showing percentage, tenure mix, plot locations, types/bedroom sizes or phasing. Delivery and quality can't be assessed or secured.

Land use status and greenfield release: The submission does not show the land is allocated for housing or provide robust justification for releasing greenfield agricultural land. No ALC report or policy compliance statement is provided.

- Previous refusals: Earlier residential schemes on this site were refused (e.g., highways, landscape, services). This proposal reduces numbers only marginally and does not demonstrate how each reason has been overcome.

- Heritage and archaeology: The Heritage work identifies nearby listed buildings and possible medieval features, yet there is no setting analysis or evaluation capable of ruling out harm. The s.66 statutory duty to have special regard to listed building settings has not been satisfied.

- Air quality and public health: The AQ assessment needs updated emission factors, verification against recent monitoring, and a cumulative appraisal with the Whalley Road AQMA. Local receptors (e.g., St James' School, Greenacre Street) must be robustly assessed with final traffic flows.

- Noise and amenity: For a site close to the railway, waste recycling facility and Henthorn Road, a full Noise Impact Assessment is required (BS8233, BS4142, ProPG; plus BS5228 for construction).

- Biodiversity, lighting and landscape: No demonstrable, enforceable 10% Biodiversity Net Gain (Environment Act 2021) using the statutory metric or legally binding 30-year management. The lighting scheme lacks bat-sensitive lux controls/curfews (ILP GN08/GN01). Tree and hedgerow protection and long-term management are not secured.

- Minerals and soils: The Minerals note dismisses alluvial sand/gravel without site-specific boreholes/trial pits. The Mineral Planning Authority must be consulted.

- Waste, crime and drainage: Operational waste storage/collection, long-term SuDS adoption/maintenance (CIRIA C753), and Secured by Design measures are not secured by condition/S106.

- Local services and health provision: NHS dentistry checks indicate no adult NHS capacity within ~5 miles; the application offers no mitigation or Health Services Capacity Statement.

- Specific junction risks: Traffic is concentrated through Eshton Terrace/Woone Lane; Woone Lane/Moor Lane; Greenacre Street/Whalley Road; Henthorn Road/Bawdlands. Each requires junction-specific investigation before determination.

2) Detailed grounds

2.1 Transport, access and Travel Plan

Survey period & representativeness: The TA's baseline traffic survey period was too short to capture normal variability (school terms vs. holidays, seasonal demand, incidents, weather, roadworks). A minimum 6-month monitoring programme is required before determination, comprising:

- Continuous ATCs on Henthorn Road, Woone Lane, Bawdlands, Greenacre Street and A59 feeder links;
- Periodic junction turning counts and queue length/saturation surveys at Eshton Terrace/Woone Lane, Woone Lane/Moor Lane, Greenacre Street/Whalley Road, Henthorn Road/Bawdlands (at least monthly including AM/PM and school peaks);
- Journey-time monitoring on the town approaches and the A59 corridor to validate peak delays; and
- A validation note reconciling survey results with model inputs and observed route choices.

Without this, the TA cannot provide a reliable basis for assessing residual cumulative impacts or

highway safety.

- No binding mitigation: The “framework” Travel Plan lacks a S106-secured funded Travel Plan Coordinator (≥5 years), targets, monitoring/reporting, and remedial measures (financial contingencies) if targets are missed.
- Construction routing & safety: There is no robust CTMP showing HGV routing, hours, wheel-wash/track-out controls, protection of Ingleton Crescent and school routes, pedestrian safety measures, and a community liaison contact.
- Junction capacity & safety: The TA must be independently peer-reviewed by the Highway Authority. Known constraints — level crossing, local bottlenecks, and HGV access to the wastewater works — are not adequately addressed.
- Parking/on-street impacts: No adoptable parking strategy to prevent displacement onto Henthorn Road/adjacent streets.
- Network/junction risks: Material increases in traffic will focus on Eshton Terrace/Woone Lane; Woone Lane/Moor Lane; Greenacre Street/Whalley Road; Henthorn Road/Bawdlands, risking severe congestion, queueing and safety hazards. Determination should be deferred pending linked junction modelling (ARCADY/PICADY/LINSIG and, where appropriate, micro-simulation), Road Safety Audit (GG119), level crossing interaction study, and pedestrian/cycle safety appraisal.

Strategic network and A59 corridor (out-commuting):

- Missing strategic assignment: The TA does not show how development trips load onto the A59 Whalley–Clitheroe corridor and downstream junctions to Preston, Blackburn and wider employment hubs. Given limited local employment, a high share of residents will out-commute, so impacts cannot be captured by local junction modelling alone.

What’s required before determination:

- Trip distribution/assignment based on Journey-to-Work data with sensitivity tests for higher outbound commute shares, applied to AM/PM and school peaks.
- Capacity/queue assessments on the A59 corridor and key junctions, with linked modelling (LINSIG/ARCADY/PICADY and micro-simulation where appropriate), testing queue storage/blocking-back and interaction with the level crossing.
- Cumulative testing with background growth and committed developments, reporting delay, v/c, RFC and queues.
- Safety review (collision analysis; GG119 Road Safety Audit) of affected links/junctions, including pedestrian/cycle crossings on A59 feeders and town approaches.
- Validation against observed peak journey times (noting local commutes can approach/exceed one hour) and route choice (A59 to M6/M65). Engage Lancashire County Council (and National Highways if impacts propagate to SRN interfaces).

2.2 Affordable housing

- Lack of spatial/detail: 35 affordable dwellings are claimed with no plan of plot-level locations, tenure mix, types/bedroom sizes or phasing.
- Delivery & quality: Without a S106 heads of terms and an Affordable Housing Plan (tenure-blind design/equivalence), the Council cannot be satisfied delivery meets local need.
- An assessment should be undertaken on the potential impact (financial) of any social housing locations near housing on Ingleton Crescent, Hatchbrook Avenue and the large house next the field that will be built on. Residents must be adequately compensated by the developer as a result of any lowering of house prices or failure to keep up with local market trends now and within the next 10 years as a result of the build and selected plots for their type of housing.

2.3 Land use status & previous refusals

- Allocation/justification: Absence of an ALC report and Planning Policy Compliance Statement means greenfield release is not justified against the plan-led approach.
- History of refusals: The application fails to provide a comparative statement showing how each previous reason for refusal has been overcome with evidence.

2.4 Heritage, townscape & archaeology

- Listed buildings' setting: Henthorn Farm, Siddows Farmhouse, Primrose House may be affected. The Heritage work lacks visual/landscape setting analysis. Under s.66, great weight must be given to the conservation of listed buildings; any less than substantial harm must be clearly and convincingly justified and weighed against demonstrable public benefits.
- Townscape character & visitor economy: Clitheroe's picturesque character and visitor appeal require high design and landscape standards. A LVIA and townscape assessment should demonstrate no unacceptable harm to the settlement edge, key views, residential amenity and the town's distinctiveness, and show compliance with Local Plan design/landscape policies and the NPPF well-designed places provisions.
- Archaeology: LIDAR/historic sources indicate possible medieval settlement. A programme of geophysics and trial trenching is needed to determine presence/extent/significance and secure mitigation (preservation in situ or excavation).

2.5 Air quality, noise & health

- AQ model & verification: Update with latest emission factors, LAQM/IAQM guidance and verification against recent monitoring; assess cumulative effects with the Whalley Road AQMA; re-run using final traffic flows and peak periods.
- Noise: A full NIA is required (BS8233 internal/external criteria, BS4142 rating of industrial sound, ProPG planning guidance for new residential, WHO night-time noise, and BS5228 for construction). Include façade insulation/ventilation strategy and any acoustic barriers necessary.
- Health services: Provide a Health Services Capacity Statement quantifying additional demand for primary care and NHS dentistry with S106 mitigation if shortfalls exist.

2.6 Biodiversity, lighting & landscape

- BNG: Submit a final statutory biodiversity metric showing $\geq 10\%$ net gain, a delivery plan prioritising on-site habitats, and a legally binding 30-year management (S106 or conservation covenant) with monitoring triggers.
- Bat-sensitive lighting: Provide lux contour plots and a bat-sensitive lighting plan (e.g., ≤ 0.2 lx along key hedgerow/watercourse buffers, warm-white spectra, curfews/dimming) in line with ILP GN08 and GN01.
- Trees/hedgerows: Submit BS5837 tree survey, Arboricultural Impact/Method Statements, and a long-term landscape management plan.

2.7 Minerals, soils & waste

- Mineral safeguarding: The "not viable" conclusion is unsupported without site-specific boreholes/trial pits. The Mineral Planning Authority (Lancashire CC) should review targeted ground investigation before determination.
- Soils: Provide a Soil Handling & Reuse Plan (Defra CoP) to preserve topsoil.

- Waste: A detailed Operational Waste Management Plan (bin storage, collection points, swept paths, adoptable arrangements) must be secured by condition.

2.8 Flood risk & drainage

- SuDS: Provide a detailed SuDS design, adoption/maintenance plan and funding mechanism (CIRIA C753 principles). Secure by S106 with confirmation of no increase in flood risk elsewhere.

2.9 Crime & community infrastructure

- Secured by Design: Confirm consultation with the Designing Out Crime Officer. Secure SBD measures by condition or require SBD certification at reserved matters.

- Infrastructure: The SCI records concerns on schools and medical capacity. Any approval must secure CIL Reg 122-compliant S106 contributions/phasing triggers to mitigate impacts.

3) Local streets and receptors referenced in the application

The AQ Assessment models receptors on the affected network, including:

- Eshton Terrace & Woone Lane (e.g., ESR7 20 Woone Lane; ESR8 7 Eshton Terrace)
- Woone Lane & Moor Lane (e.g., ESR6 Moor Lane; ESR7 Woone Lane)
- Greenacre Street & Whalley Road (ESR14 St James' C of E Primary School; ESR9/ESR10 near AQMA)
- Henthorn Road & Bawdlands (e.g., ESR4 10 Bawdlands)

The TA must explicitly model junction performance, queueing and rat-running at these locations and across the wider network.

4) Required conditions, obligations and further assessments (pre-permission)

4.1 Transport & construction

- Independent peer review of the TA by the Highway Authority/independent consultant.
 - Traffic data collection & validation: A minimum 6-month multimodal survey programme prior to determination, including continuous ATCs on agreed links, monthly junction turning counts/queue surveys (AM/PM and school peaks) at named junctions, and journey-time monitoring on town approaches and the A59 corridor, followed by a validation report reconciling model inputs to observations.
 - Linked junction & network modelling (ARCADY/PICADY/LINSIG; micro-simulation where appropriate) covering AM/PM and school peaks at Eshton Terrace/Woone Lane, Woone Lane/Moor Lane, Greenacre Street/Whalley Road, Henthorn Road/Bawdlands.
 - Level crossing interaction study assessing delay/queue effects with development flows.
- CTMP (pre-commencement): routing, hours, wheel wash/track-out, HGV restrictions, protection of Ingleton Crescent and school routes, pedestrian management, and community liaison.
- Travel Plan via S106: funded TPC (≥5 years), targets, monitoring/reporting, and financial contingencies/remedial measures.
 - Any highway improvement works identified to be delivered before development is undertaken.

4.2 Affordable housing & planning status

- Affordable Housing Delivery Plan (number/%, tenure mix, plot locations, types/bed spaces, phasing, tenure-blind design standards) secured by S106.
- Planning Policy Compliance Statement and ALC report to justify greenfield release if unallocated.

- Comparative Statement addressing each previous refusal reason with supporting evidence.

4.3 Heritage, townscape & archaeology

- Archaeological evaluation (geophysics + trial trenching) pre-determination or pre-commencement, with mitigation secured (preservation in situ/excavation).
- Heritage/townscape addendum with visual/setting analysis for nearby listed buildings, LVIA/townscape work on the settlement edge, and a clear NPPF harm/public benefits balance.

4.4 Air quality, noise & health

- Updated AQ Assessment using latest emission factors and verification; include cumulative impacts with Whalley Road AQMA and final traffic flows.
- AQ mitigation package (condition/S106): EV charging (fast chargers to a set %), active travel improvements, monitoring and contingency measures.
- Full NIA (BS8233/BS4142/ProPG/WHO) with façade specification, external amenity, and acoustic mitigation.
- Health Services Capacity Statement (primary care & NHS dentistry) with S106 contributions/service expansion where shortfalls are shown.

4.5 Biodiversity, lighting & landscape

- Statutory BNG metric demonstrating $\geq 10\%$ and an on-site first delivery plan; secure 30-year management (S106/conservation covenant) with monitoring triggers.
- Ecological mitigation & management plan, bat surveys, buffers and a bat-sensitive lighting plan with lux contours, curfew/dimming, warm-white spectra (ILP GN08/GN01).
- BS5837 tree protection and a landscape management plan with long-term maintenance.

4.6 Minerals, soils & waste

- Ground investigation (boreholes/trial pits) to verify extent/quality/viability of alluvium; independent review by the MPA.
- Soils management plan (Defra CoP).
- Operational Waste Management Plan: bin stores, collection points, swept paths, adoptable arrangements (condition).

4.7 Flood risk & drainage

- Detailed SuDS design and maintenance/adoption/funding plan (CIRIA C753), secured by S106; confirm no off-site flood risk increase.

4.8 Crime & community mitigation (including education)

- Secured by Design certification or condition requiring detailed SBD measures at reserved matters.
- Education contributions targeted to local schools impacted, including Edisford Primary School (Edisford Bridge): require an Education Capacity & Mitigation Statement from the Local Education Authority demonstrating need; secure multi-year, phased S106 contributions (capital works, facilities improvement and, if necessary, expansion) proportionate to the development's pupil yield and timed to pre-occupation triggers.
- CIL Reg 122-compliant S106 contributions to education, healthcare and highways where need is evidenced.

4.9 Monitoring & review

- Five-year monitoring for Travel Plan, AQ, BNG and noise, with clear remedial triggers and secured funding.

5) Strategic alternatives

Significant, more accessible opportunities exist along/adjacent to the A59 Whalley–Clitheroe bypass corridor, offering stronger strategic access and avoiding the need to route additional traffic through narrow residential streets and school routes in the town centre. Before preferring Henthorn Road, the Council should require a transparent comparative site selection appraisal (drawing on the latest HELAA/SHLAA and committed supply) that assesses and clearly discounts these A59-adjacent options on consistent criteria (transport, safety, public transport integration, utilities/SuDS delivery, environmental constraints). Absent that evidence, bringing further traffic into the centre would worsen congestion and increase collision risk for vulnerable users (including children) where exposure is highest.

6) Conclusion

For the reasons above, the application should be refused. If the Council is nonetheless minded to approve, it should defer determination until the technical deficiencies are addressed and then impose the pre-commencement conditions and S106 obligations in Section 4.

Non-planning governance note (Council Tax): If the applicant seeks to rely on projected Council Tax receipts as a “benefit,” please note this is not a material planning consideration and cannot weigh in favour of approval. Separately from the planning decision, I request that the Council commits to a full fiscal impact review of development-driven changes to the tax base and considers pausing any 2027 Council Tax increase pending that review to avoid unintended burdens on residents.

Please confirm receipt and place this objection on the public planning file. I request notification of the decision and any committee date.

Yours faithfully,

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 28 January 2026 16:33
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0997 FS-Case-791827505

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0997

Address of Development: Henthorn Road

Comments: 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 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 sincerely,

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