

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 21 January 2026 09:43
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0997 FS-Case-788658005

[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 the above outline planning application.

It makes no sense to have the access road via Ingleton Crescent, this road is not designed to take all the heavy duty traffic that would be required for the development of the site. IF the site was to go ahead the access should be via Henthorn Road like the other sites that have been added to the Road. Henthorn Road is not fit for purpose and is already severely congested, adding another potential 200+ cars to this will make access and exit very difficult and most importantly, dangerous as families regularly use Henthorn Road.

Can you provide information if there are plans to introduce a new through road with access to Whalley Road or the A59?

The only way I see this development being viable is to have a through road built to Whalley Road or the A59 and for the access to the site to be via Henthorn Road and a relocation of the Waste Refuge centre to another part of Clitheroe.

Kind regards

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 21 January 2026 12:37
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0997 FS-Case-788762595

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0997

Address of Development: Land off Henthorn Road BB7 3BY

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.

Ribble Valley Borough Council
Planning Dept
Council Offices
Church Walk
Cuthbert
BB7 2KA

21st January 2024

Dear Sir/Madam,

re Planning Application No 3/2025/0997
land off Henthorn Rd, Cuthbert, BB7 3BY

- I wish to object to the above application for the erection of 115 dwellings.
- It is of great concern to me that this will create even more congestion on Henthorn Rd, especially at its junction with Thorn St. It is single track at this point due to parked cars, and when traffic is waiting to cross the level crossing, it backs up onto Henthorn Rd causing gridlock.
- The site is at least a 20 minute walk to any services/amenities so residents would rely on their own transport, also extra delivery vans etc. I do not feel cycling would be an option as due to the lack of cycle paths this would cause even more congestion.

Continuation

- The site lies outside the settlement boundary of Chithore & represents unjustified encroachment into the open countryside, contrary to policies.
- It will cause harm to the countryside character, openness & visual amenity, as well as wildlife which will be greatly disturbed.
- I am concerned about infrastructure capacity in the town, & whilst I recognise that a new primary school has been opened, this is on the other side of town, which would again result in more traffic movements.

I request that you refuse this application.
Please confirm receipt of this letter & thank you for reading this.

Kind Regards,



From:

21 January 2026 18:40

To:

Cc:

Planning

Subject:

Re: Objection to Planning Ref 3/2025/0997 - land off Henthorn Rd proposed by Gladman Homes

⚠ External Email

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

Dear Ms Hughes

We received a response stating that the attachment could not be opened, the below is the content of the attachment. Please confirm receipt.

RE: FORMAL OBJECTION STATEMENT: PLANNING APPLICATION 3/2025/0997

I am writing as a local resident to formally object to the above planning application. Having reviewed the submitted documents and the relevant local and national planning policies and present the following reasons.

Before detailing my material planning objections, I must first raise a significant procedural concern regarding the validation and publicity of this application.

1. Procedural Irregularity and Defective Consultation

I observed that the Public Notice erected adjacent to the proposed site for this application was dated **7 January 2026**. However, the application documents were not accessible or registered on the Council's planning portal until **8 January 2026**. Furthermore, it appears that several technical documents were added to the portal subsequent to this date.

This discrepancy creates a "blind period" where the statutory consultation clock was ticking, yet the public had no means to inspect the application. This violates the principles of fair consultation established in *R v Brent London Borough Council, ex parte Gunning*, specifically the requirement that "sufficient information must be supplied" at the start of the process to allow for intelligent consideration. A consultation period that runs while documents are unavailable is legally defective. I request that the Council formally restarts the 21-day consultation period from the date *all* mandatory documents (including the BNG Statement and compliant Flood Risk Assessment) were made available to the public.

2. Conflict with Development Plan and Housing Supply

The application represents major development on an unallocated greenfield site outside the settlement boundary.

- **Housing Land Supply:** Ribble Valley Borough Council has successfully delivered 6,525 dwellings against a Core Strategy target of 5,600. There is no deficit in the five-year housing land supply. Therefore, the "tilted balance" under NPPF Paragraph 11(d) is **not engaged**.
- **Policy Conflict:** The proposal conflicts with **Core Strategy Policy DMG2**. It cannot be considered "rounding off" or "small scale," but is rather a significant extension of the urban area into the open countryside. With no overriding housing need, there is no justification for setting aside the protection of the countryside mandated by the Development Plan.

3. Critical Infrastructure Failure (Wastewater)

I object in the strongest possible terms regarding the capacity of the local wastewater infrastructure. The application fails to demonstrate compliance with **NPPF Paragraph 180(e)**, which requires that development does not contribute to unacceptable levels of water pollution.

- **Evidence of Failure:** Data from 2024 confirms that the receiving Clitheroe Wastewater Treatment Works (Asset UUP00511) is operating significantly beyond its hydraulic capacity. In 2024 alone, this facility recorded **100 spill events** totalling **1,070 hours** of untreated sewage discharge into the catchment.
- **Local Impact:** The Combined Sewer Overflow (CSO) at **Henthorn Road Bridge**, located immediately adjacent to the site, recorded **56 spills** (379 hours) in the same period. CSO UUP00510 also spilled 65 times in 2024.
- **Implication:** Adding the foul load of 115 new dwellings to a sewer network that is already ejecting untreated sewage due to capacity limitations is environmentally negligent. It directly exacerbates the pollution of Pendleton Brook and the River Ribble. The application offers no proposals to upgrade this capacity prior to occupation.

4. Flood Risk and Cumulative Impact

The Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) submitted with the application appears to assess the site in isolation. This is contrary to the NPPF (December 2024 Revision) Paragraph 156, which explicitly requires planning decisions to consider "cumulative flood risk impacts from all sources."

The cumulative runoff from this site, combined with the extensive impermeable surfacing recently created at the nearby Standen Hall (1,040 homes), Pendleton Meadows and Montague Place developments, places unacceptable stress on the hydrological catchment. The Pendleton Brook feed into the Ribble of which there is documented history of downstream flooding in Whalley. Without a cumulative catchment model that accounts for the desynchronisation of peak flows from all recent developments, the safety of downstream communities cannot be guaranteed.

It should be noted that since the increase in directed discharge into Pendleton Brook, which is itself a designated main river, the land adjacent to the proposed site has been eroded significantly.

5. Landscape and Amenity

The site borders the **Ribble Way**, a significant long-distance footpath. The encroachment of a dense suburban housing estate (up to 115 units) onto the immediate setting of this trail degrades its recreational value and visual amenity, contrary to **Core Strategy Policy DME2**. Furthermore, the proximity of the site (approx. 135m) to the Clitheroe WwTW raises severe amenity concerns regarding odour—a factor United Utilities has previously cited as a reason for refusal in this location.

6. Conclusion

This application is procedurally flawed, strategically unnecessary due to the Council's robust housing supply, and technically unsustainable given the collapse of local sewage infrastructure capacity. It contravenes Policies DS1, DMG2, and DME2 of the Core Strategy and Paragraphs 156 and 180 of the NPPF.

On Wed, 21 Jan 2026 at 16:14, [REDACTED] > wrote:

Hi,

Please find attached an objection letter re planning proposal for land off Henthorn Rd (ref 3/2025/0997) submitted by Gladman Homes.

Please can you confirm receipt of this email and the attachment via email?

Thank you,



[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 21 January 2026 17:04
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0997 FS-Case-788906247

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0997

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

Comments: I am concerned about the increased level of traffic this proposed development would bring.

[REDACTED] live on [REDACTED] and regularly experience backed up traffic along Eshton Terrace with cars trying to get down Henthorn Road.

Cars are unable to pass two way on Henthorn Road due to parked cars. Adding another 100-200 cars into the mix is going to increase the issues enormously.

There isn't the infrastructure in place to deal with another development down Henthorn Road unless a new road is built. Even then, the issue of doctors surgeries and schools will need to be considered.

The fact that the recycling centre is at the bottom of Henthorn Road also creates a huge issues with traffic.

Henthorn Road cannot deal with more traffic!

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 21 January 2026 16:57
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0997 FS-Case-788904239

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0997

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

Comments: I am concerned about the increased level of traffic this proposed development would bring. [REDACTED] live on [REDACTED] and regularly experience backed up traffic along Eshton Terrace with cars trying to get down Henthorn Road.

Cars are unable to pass two way on Henthorn Road

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 22 January 2026 15:54
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0997 FS-Case-789317954

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0997

Address of Development: Land Off Henthorn Road, Clitheroe

Comments: I object to this planning proposal in its current form based mainly on the access plan.

Access to the northern part of the proposed development is planned via Ingleton Crescent. This is part of the existing Miller Homes development which already has 110 properties and associated vehicles using it daily. Adding traffic from the additional 35 proposed homes on this side of the development will lead to increased congestion at the junction of Waterfall Gardens with Henthorn Road as well as increased noise and pollution.

In addition, the junction of Waterfall Gardens into Henthorn Road has severely restricted visibility due to the constantly overgrown hedges in both directions.

Moving the proposed entrance for the northern aspect of the proposed development further along Henthorn Road would more evenly distribute vehicular access / egress to Henthorn Road. This could easily be accommodated since the access statement also proposes widening of Henthorn Road to 5.5m as far as the proposed entrance to the southern side of the development.

Visibility of traffic leaving the wastewater treatment and household waste recycling centres at the far end of Henthorn Road is also clearer from further down Henthorn Road so I suggest that this would be a safer location for all road users.