

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 13 March 2026 00:40  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Application Comments - 3/2026/0042 FS-Case-811599628

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Lancashire

[REDACTED]

**Planning Application Reference No.:** 3/2026/0042

**Address of Development:** Land adjacent to Fernhill Ribchester Road Clayton Le Dale BB1 9EG

**Comments:** Planning Application No: 3/2026/0042

Grid Ref: 367150 433327

Proposal: Outline application for the proposed erection of two dwelling houses with access applied for.

Location: Land adjacent to Fernhill Ribchester Road Clayton Le Dale BB1 9EG

RE: Planning Application No 3/2026/0042 Grid Ref: 367150 433327

Dear Sir/Madam,

This objection relates to the principle of development on the site.

We, the [REDACTED], are writing to formerly object to the proposed development of two dwelling houses on the land [REDACTED], [REDACTED].

This piece of land lies [REDACTED]. According to my knowledge and information provided by the council, it lies within a biodiverse area. We believe that this application conflicts with numerous policies within the Ribble Valley Core Strategy:

- DMH3 | Dwellings in the open countryside and AONB
- DMG2 | Strategic Considerations
- EN4 | Biodiversity and Geodiversity
- DMI2 | Transport Considerations
- DMG1 | General Considerations

DMH3 | Dwellings in the open countryside and AONB

Policy DMH3 strictly limits residential development within areas defined as Open Countryside or AONB. Housing is only permitted where it meets one of the following specific circumstances:

1. dwellings essential for agriculture or to meet an identified local housing need,

2. the conversion of an existing structurally sound building, or
3. the rebuilding or replacement of an existing dwelling.

The proposed development violates this policy because:

- The proposal introduces new dwellings on a greenfield site in open countryside, which does not fall within any of the permitted categories set out in DMH3.
- The development is not essential for agriculture or forestry, nor has it been demonstrated to meet a specific identified local housing need.
- The proposal is not a conversion or replacement of an existing building, but rather the construction of entirely new dwellings.
- The policy emphasises that protecting the open countryside from sporadic or visually harmful development is a high priority, and constructing new dwellings on undeveloped countryside land risks undermining this objective.

## DMG2 | Strategic Considerations

As this piece of land lies in a DMH3 area, in the defined open countryside and located outside of a defined settlement boundary, we believe any new dwelling would be contrary to Policies DMG2 and DMH3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.

The development is not within either the Tier 1 or Tier 2 villages outlined in the Core Strategy:  
<https://www.ribblevalley.gov.uk/downloads/file/1700/adopted-core-strategy>

Policy DMG2 requires development to follow the Core Strategy Development Strategy and support the spatial vision for sustainable development. The proposal appears to conflict with this policy for the following reasons:

The site lies outside a defined settlement boundary and within open countryside, including deer and other species which regularly move across the area. DMG2 states that development in such locations must meet specific criteria.

Allowing isolated residential development of this nature risks creating sporadic development in the open countryside, which the Core Strategy seeks to avoid.

The proposal does not meet any of the qualifying criteria for development outside settlements areas, in other words, the development:

- Is not essential to the local economy or social wellbeing of the area.
- Is not required for agriculture or forestry.
- Is not local needs housing secured to meet an identified need.
- Is not a small-scale tourism or recreational development.
- Does not demonstrate a specific local rural need or benefit.

## EN4 | Biodiversity and Geodiversity

The site currently forms an underdeveloped agricultural field that supports local wildlife, including deer and other species that regularly move across the area. Development of new buildings on this site risks interrupting natural movement patterns and fragmenting existing habitats or wildlife corridors.

Key Statement EN4 states that the Council will seek to conserve biodiversity and avoid the fragmentation and isolation of natural habitats while supporting the development of green corridors. Introducing residential development on this currently open field could reduce habitat connectivity and introduce additional disturbance through lighting, fencing, vehicles and human activity.

### DMI2 | Transport Considerations

Policy DMI 2 states that new development should be located in places that minimise the need to travel and provide good access by foot, cycle and public transport, thereby reducing reliance on private vehicles and supporting sustainable transport.

Whilst there is a bus stop located nearby, the site itself sits along a twisting rural road with limited pedestrian and cycling infrastructure. The only pavement provision in the immediate area is a narrow section approximately 0.5m in width. Such limited provision restricts safe movement for pedestrians, particularly with limited mobility, or situations where pedestrians must pass each other, and may discourage walking to nearby transport links.

As a result, future residents are likely to rely primarily on private vehicles for day to day travel, which does not fully align with the objective of DMI2 to prioritise sustainable transport and reduce dependence on a private vehicle.

### DMG1 | General Considerations

DMG1 requires development proposals to ensure safe access arrangements and to consider the traffic implications of a scheme. The site is located along a twisting rural road with limited pedestrian infrastructure, including a very narrow pavement. Construction activity associated with the development would likely introduce large delivery vehicles and additional traffic movements, which may create temporary safety concerns and disruption along this stretch of road.

Policy DMG1 also promotes the efficient use of land and states that previously developed sites should be prioritised over greenfield land where possible. The proposal would involve the development of an undeveloped greenfield site in open countryside, rather than the reuse of previously developed land, which conflicts with this objective.

The policy also requires development not to adversely affect the amenity of the surrounding area and to have regard to public safety. Increased traffic during construction and ongoing vehicle movements associated with the completed development may therefore raise concerns regarding road safety and local amenity.

Overall, the proposal would represent sporadic and unsustainable residential development within the open countryside, contrary to the Core Strategy's spatial strategy which seeks to focus new housing within defined settlements while protecting the character and biodiversity of the rural landscape.

### Personal Considerations

[REDACTED], we will be at risk of deprivation of privacy, noise, and environmental pollution. Also, our property will be at higher risk of flooding due to poor drainage of rainwater. We often enjoy seeing wild animals like DEERS running across this area. New dwellings will restrict their movements and we are afraid that we will miss these beautiful creatures [REDACTED]. For sure, it will badly affect our mental wellbeing.

Last but not least, [REDACTED] and the proposed developments [REDACTED] mentioned in the documents. This will create a huge misunderstanding and unnecessary trouble.

For the reasons mentioned above, we humbly request that the Ribble Valley Council refuse the planning permission for these proposed two new dwellings.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application No: 3/2026/0042

Grid Ref: 367150 433327

Proposal: Outline application for the proposed erection of two dwelling houses with access applied for.

Location: Land adjacent to Fernhill Ribchester Road Clayton Le Dale BB1 9EG

RE: Planning Application No 3/2026/0042 Grid Ref: 367150 433327

Dear Sir/Madam,

This objection relates to the principle of development on the site.

We, [REDACTED], are writing to formally object to the proposed development of two dwelling houses on the land [REDACTED], [REDACTED].

This piece of land [REDACTED]. According to my knowledge and information provided by the council, it lies within a biodiverse area. We believe that this application conflicts with numerous policies within the Ribble Valley Core Strategy:

DMH3 | Dwellings in the open countryside and AONB

DMG2 | Strategic Considerations

EN4 | Biodiversity and Geodiversity

DMI2 | Transport Considerations

DMG1 | General Considerations

DMH3 | Dwellings in the open countryside and AONB

Policy DMH3 strictly limits residential development within areas defined as Open Countryside or AONB. Housing is only permitted where it meets one of the following specific circumstances:

1. dwellings essential for agriculture or to meet an identified local housing need,
2. the conversion of an existing structurally sound building, or
3. the rebuilding or replacement of an existing dwelling.

The proposed development violates this policy because:

- The proposal introduces new dwellings on a greenfield site in open countryside, which does not fall within any of the permitted categories set out in DMH3.
- The development is not essential for agriculture or forestry, nor has it been demonstrated to meet a specific identified local housing need.
- The proposal is not a conversion or replacement of an existing building, but rather the construction of entirely new dwellings.
- The policy emphasises that protecting the open countryside from sporadic or visually harmful development is a high priority, and constructing new dwellings on undeveloped countryside land risks undermining this objective.

DMG2 | Strategic Considerations

As this piece of land lies in a DMH3 area, in the defined open countryside and located outside of a defined settlement boundary, we believe any new dwelling would be contrary to Policies DMG2 and DMH3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.

The development is not within either the Tier 1 or Tier 2 villages outlined in the Core Strategy: <https://www.ribbonvalley.gov.uk/downloads/file/1700/adopted-core-strategy>

Policy DMG2 requires development to follow the Core Strategy Development Strategy and support the spatial vision for sustainable development. The proposal appears to conflict with this policy for the following reasons:

The site lies outside a defined settlement boundary and within open countryside, including deer and other species which regularly move across the area. DMG2 states that development in such locations must meet specific criteria.

Allowing isolated residential development of this nature risks creating sporadic development in the open countryside, which the Core Strategy seeks to avoid.

The proposal does not meet any of the qualifying criteria for development outside settlements areas, in other words, the development:

- Is not essential to the local economy or social wellbeing of the area.
- Is not required for agriculture or forestry.
- Is not local needs housing secured to meet an identified need.
- Is not a small-scale tourism or recreational development.
- Does not demonstrate a specific local rural need or benefit.

#### EN4 | Biodiversity and Geodiversity

The site currently forms an underdeveloped agricultural field that supports local wildlife, including deer and other species that regularly move across the area. Development of new buildings on this site risks interrupting natural movement patterns and fragmenting existing habitats or wildlife corridors.

Key Statement EN4 states that the Council will seek to conserve biodiversity and avoid the fragmentation and isolation of natural habitats while supporting the development of green corridors. Introducing residential development on this currently open field could reduce habitat connectivity and introduce additional disturbance through lighting, fencing, vehicles and human activity.

#### DMI2 | Transport Considerations

Policy DMI 2 states that new development should be located in places that minimise the need to travel and provide good access by foot, cycle and public transport, thereby reducing reliance on private vehicles and supporting sustainable transport.

Whilst there is a bus stop located nearby, the site itself sits along a twisting rural road with limited pedestrian and cycling infrastructure. The only pavement provision in the immediate area is a narrow

section approximately 0.5m in width. Such limited provision restricts safe movement for pedestrians, particularly with limited mobility, or situations where pedestrians must pass each other, and may discourage walking to nearby transport links.

As a result, future residents are likely to rely primarily on private vehicles for day to day travel, which does not fully align with the objective of DMI2 to prioritise sustainable transport and reduce dependence on a private vehicle.

#### DMG1 | General Considerations

DMG1 requires development proposals to ensure safe access arrangements and to consider the traffic implications of a scheme. The site is located along a twisting rural road with limited pedestrian infrastructure, including a very narrow pavement. Construction activity associated with the development would likely introduce large delivery vehicles and additional traffic movements, which may create temporary safety concerns and disruption along this stretch of road.

Policy DMG1 also promotes the efficient use of land and states that previously developed sites should be prioritised over greenfield land where possible. The proposal would involve the development of an undeveloped greenfield site in open countryside, rather than the reuse of previously developed land, which conflicts with this objective.

The policy also requires development not to adversely affect the amenity of the surrounding area and to have regard to public safety. Increased traffic during construction and ongoing vehicle movements associated with the completed development may therefore raise concerns regarding road safety and local amenity.

Overall, the proposal would represent sporadic and unsustainable residential development within the open countryside, contrary to the Core Strategy's spatial strategy which seeks to focus new housing within defined settlements while protecting the character and biodiversity of the rural landscape.

#### Personal Considerations

Being [REDACTED] we will be at risk of deprivation of privacy, noise, and environmental pollution. Also, our property will be at higher risk of flooding due to poor drainage of rainwater.

We often enjoy seeing wild animals like DEERS running across this area. New dwellings will restrict their movements and we are afraid that we will miss these beautiful creatures [REDACTED]. For sure, it will badly affect our mental wellbeing.

Last but not least, [REDACTED] and the proposed developments [REDACTED] This will create a huge misunderstanding and unnecessary trouble.

For the reasons mentioned above, we humbly request that the Ribble Valley Council refuse the planning permission for these proposed two new dwellings.

Yours Sincerely,

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]