

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 10 February 2026 11:57
To: Planning
Subject: Planning application no. 3/2026/0050

⚠ 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.

Good morning. In respect to the planning application referred to above, I wish to put on record an objection to the erection of 'up to two dwellings' on land adjacent to Boadicea Park on Preston Road in Ribchester.

I fully understand the requirement to address the acute housing crisis nationally and the fact that the Council has demonstrated a shortfall in respect of its 5YHLS commitment. However, my objection is not that no dwellings should be constructed on this site but that any approval should be limited to the one property.

My objection is based wholly on safety. The plans indicate the construction of a driveway leading to the two dwellings from the entranceway to Boadicea Park. This driveway, in turn, feeds a single parking area at the front of each bungalow, together with an integrated garage for each.

The plans make clear the potential for three bedrooms, which could, quite easily, consist of four or more occupants. If this was to be the case, and more than two of the occupants owned vehicles, where would the additional car(s) be parked? If there were only two car owners in the household, where would visitors park their vehicles? The answer has to be on Preston Road on the south west side.

Any observer at this location would clearly see that this area is already congested with parked cars, throughout the day and evening, and that any additional parked vehicles would further imperil the safety of road users, both pedestrians and drivers. The situation has become so problematic that a local farmer has had to place cones on Preston Road to either side of the access road to his fields (opposite the proposed development) to enable safe access and egress.

Whilst the applicant may put forward an argument that it's unlikely that the properties would accommodate the number of vehicle owners I have outlined as a possibility, or that visitors would add to the problem; I believe the onus should be on the applicant to clearly show that such a potential is completely unlikely in all circumstances, and demonstrate how this could be achieved.

Given that such an undertaking is not realistic, I propose that limiting construction to a single dwelling with increased parking capacity would reasonably mitigate the potential safety issues I have highlighted.

Regards,

[REDACTED]