

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 21 May 2026 23:29
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2026/0078 FS-Case-840096298

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Lancashire

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2026/0078

Address of Development: Causeway farm development

Comments: The land has a pond that has a newt pond which is protected and bats which can not be removed. The traffic on the A59 is horrendous now, this will make it much worse. Why do we need to lose more green land, where are the animals meant to live, we have deer that roam the fields, where do you propose they go, they don't have a voice, so we must be their voice. Building on this land is not needed and not wanted. If we wanted buildings and loads of houses we would live in the city, we chose a the clue is in the name VILLAGE, we wanted green fields not houses on every corner of green fields.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 21 May 2026 20:07
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2026/0078 FS-Case-840065033

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Lancashire

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2026/0078

Address of Development: Land at causeway farm, Longsight road, balerstone bb27hz

Comments: Very concerned about surface water running into the southwest brook, this has a culvert which should be maintained by LCC, the brook runs into an underground pipe thereafter under the willows development. This development should be rejected as it puts our property's at risk of flood. 2 houses on [REDACTED] have been flooded in past years. This will just add extra pressure to the existing infrastructure. There's also a major development of 120 houses being built at the time of writing in the area, this is not needed, it's a lovely green belt area with wildlife habitat. Please stop these greedy developers and landowners that are just for profit.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 21 May 2026 18:32
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2026/0078 FS-Case-840047969

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Lancashire

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2026/0078

Address of Development: Land at Causeway Farm, Longsight Road, Balderstone BB2 7HZ

Comments: I object to this application for the principal reason that the land in question is designated "Open Countryside" and RVBC will only allow developments on this land designation if there are significant exception criteria and I do not believe there are any such criteria.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 21 May 2026 10:16
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2026/0078 FS-Case-839842496

[REDACTED]

Address:

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2026/0078

Address of Development: Land at Causeway Farm Longsight Road Balderstone BB2 7HZ

Comments: I object to this application to build an estate of about 80 houses.

Ribble Valley local plan broadly has policies to build housing near the existing built up areas of Clitheroe, Whalley and Longridge. There is also provision to fill gaps in existing built areas. The proposed development meets neither of these policies.

The planning statement lists a range of facilities near by. It doesn't say that there is a 200 foot climb up to Mellor, which makes for a stiff outing by push-bike or on foot. Or that the route to Mellor is by grassy field, or by the narrow lanes of Abbot Brow and Mellor Brow without footpaths. The truth is that the site is not sensibly integrated with a good range of existing facilities, and what there is will not be accessed on foot. The development is not part of a sensible larger plan and doesn't meet sustainability criteria.

Compare the thought of walking or waiting for a bus in Whalley/Longridge/Clitheroe with walking or waiting at a bus stop on the A59 near the site. Or cycling in Whalley/Longridge/Clitheroe and on the A59. It is clear that the proposed development is not integrated with travel except by car/motor bike.

The A59 Longsight road from Mellor Brook to Clayton-Le-Dale has a significant ribbon of buildings, houses, old petrol stations, and light industrial activity on either side, with fields in the spaces. To prevent a complete sprawl we must value and keep the green spaces that remain.

If the council grants permission, I hope they insist that the footpath/bridleway/cycleway and its continuation on Whalley Road to Mellor Brook can be accessed from the new houses without going on to the A59.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 20 May 2026 16:49
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/3026/0078 FS-Case-839665354

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Lancashire

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/3026/0078

Address of Development: Land at causeway farm

Comments: OBJECTION

Open Countryside' and RVBC will only allow developments on this land if there are significant exception criteria.

- The land is outside any settlement boundary.
- RVBC policy is to prefer brownfield sites, which this is not.
- RVBC Core Strategy dictates that major developments will be focussed on Clitheroe, Whalley and Longridge.
- There is a flood risk particularly with those houses on the Willows.
- There is no housing crisis in the Ribble Valley with Mellor Brook being over supplied when the housing development off Branch Road is up and running.
- For housing to be built in these numbers there must be an 'Identified Local Need', which there is not in the Mellor Brook / Balderstone area.
- Loss of habitat for wildlife.
- This proposal will put pressure on already inadequate local infrastructure eg schools, shops, doctor's surgery etc.
- It is claimed that the residents will mainly use public transport. Clearly the applicant does not live in the real world and cars will predominate.

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 26 May 2026 11:00
To: Planning
Subject: Planning application3/2026/0078

⚠ 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 Kathryn,

Please find this communication as way of opposing the planning permission detailed in the subject matter . As a resident of the area located on [REDACTED] and if someone who totally appreciates the beauty of the Ribble Valley, I am appalled that the planning of 85 houses could even be considered . This development would not only be a blight on the landscape but cause significant increased traffic on an already very busy A59 and the surrounding country lanes .

Indeed Abbott Brow and Saccary Lane, Osbaldeston Lane are used as a thoroughfare for school and work traffic with queues consistently occurring each day . Indeed conjunction with this the speed limit is the national speed limit which is unbelievable.

The lane that the housing is planned for has already been refused for non residential dwelling so why it would be considered for increasing the population and congestion of the area? There is already the commencement of residential building less than a quarter of a mile away for in excess of over 150 houses which if it is assumed each house is a two car family it adds up to a significant increase of traffic in the village .

I sincerely hope that the planning permission is not granted and thereby allowing the Ribble Valley to retain its natural beauty and be an area that residents of long standing can enjoy .

Kind Regards
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 26 May 2026 15:50
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2026/0078 FS-Case-841155956

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Lancashire

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2026/0078

Address of Development: Land south of Causeway Farm Balderstone

Comments: The area proposed for development is in open countryside outside any of the settlement boundaries of the nearby villages of Mellor Brook, Osbaldeston and Mellor. I understand building in such an area is only considered in exceptional circumstances. This proposal makes no such case.

A development of this size would be totally out of place and would be an incongruent, isolated housing estate with no relationship to the villages mentioned above.

There would be huge amenity loss, with impoverished access along the footpaths which are greatly appreciated by locals and walkers from other areas. I regularly walk through this field and onwards to Mellor or Mellor Brow, to lose this land to housing would be an abomination.

Environmental degradation is highly likely. Indicators of a well balanced ecosystem are evident. There is a wide number of bird species in this area, including several types of raptor along with ample evidence of small and large mammals. Again, as in so many places, this would be more permanent habitat destruction. No wonder we continue to see plummeting wildlife populations.

Access would only be too and from the A59. This road is now so busy that pedestrian and cycling usage is at least, unpleasant and at worst dangerous. More housing will compound this and surely the location would just encourage more car usage, making the whole proposal unsustainable.

A large housing estate of well over 100 houses is underway in Mellor Brook, surely this in itself is enough of a contribution from our community to local housing need.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 26 May 2026 17:57
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2026/0078 FS-Case-841228431

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Lancashire

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2026/0078

Address of Development: Land at Causeway Farm, Longsight Road, Balderstone, BB2 7HZ

Comments: I write in objection to the above outline planning application.

This application is a proposal for, up to 85, residential dwellings on land opposite Causeway Farm. This same plot has had two previous planning applications for commercial/industrial units rejected.

- The proposed development is outside any settlement boundary and on green belt, which the council seeks to protect, using brownfield sites, in preference. This is a rural area typified by farm dwellings, pasture and arable land, which is much needed in Lancashire.
- There is a large housing development already under construction in Mellor Brook. Although this is outside of Ribble Valley, it is very close to the proposed site and negates any further need for local housing.
- The proposal discusses the use of walking, cycling and public transport, thereby negating the use of a car. Whilst the number 280 bus runs along the A59 between Clitheroe and Preston, and the number 25A bus does run from the Fielden's Arms in Mellor Brook, the latter only starts running into Blackburn at 08.53, with the last bus back at 14.25, not conducive for working full time! Although there are alternative options for buses into Blackburn and/or Preston, someone would have to walk to the Windmill on the A677 or into Mellor village, the latter has no footpath and is quite a climb up Mellor Brow, making it unsuitable for young children, the elderly and disabled. Therefore, it is likely that the car would be the most used transport option, which this application does not adequately address. The A59 is already a very busy road, this proposal would only add more cars onto an already congested road.
- The area does have a flood risk which has not been adequately addressed by the current plans. I note the response from the Lead Local Flood Authority.
- There will be an impact on local schools and medical facilities. I note the objection from LCC with regards education.
- The potential negative impact of the development on the local wildlife population has been

underestimated. I believe there is evidence of a nearby badger set and the area supports a greater variety of birds than has been included in the reports. The UK is already one of the most wildlife depleted countries in the world, this development only worsens this fact. Adding in a few bat and bird boxes really does not 'cut it', the plans also have pictures of hedgehog highways but nothing mentioned in writing.

Thank you.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 26 May 2026 20:13
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2026/0078 FS-Case-841261895

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Lancashire

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2026/0078

Address of Development: Land at Causeway Farm Longsight Road, Balderstone BB2 7Hz

Comments: I wish to object to the above planning application in the strongest terms. Taking a holistic review please see below my concerns:

- 1) This is open countryside and I do not see any significant exception criteria. The land is outside any settlement boundary and is not Brownfield.
- 2) The scale of the development envisaged is alarming, with up to 85 residential units of an existing busy A road, meters from my property.
- 3) There is already a burden on local amenities including schools and medical facilities.
- 4) There is already a contiguous development only recently approved for housing off Branch road. There is no identified local need.
- 5) An increase in air and noise pollution with significant vehicular activity - not considering the impact on nearby local amenities including schools. Mellor is a small peaceful rural village. We are already seeing a large increase in traffic with traffic avoiding the mains roads and using the village as a cut through. This means something as simple as my children walking to their local village primary school is unsafe.
- 6) A negative impact on negative species including deer, roe, barn owls, pheasant and great crested newts inhabiting ponds (which remain protected) found in the area.
- 7) Negative effect on the local views for those existing residents.
- 8) Unsustainable countryside development which would significantly erode the rural character of the area.
- 9) I have concerns of flood risk and water run off. United utilities have done work on multiple occasions on Mellor Brow to reduce the flooding risk.

This planning applications marks, in my view an underhanded reason maximising profit over community. I refer you to previous planning applications for this exact piece of land. A housing development of this scale would even be worse than previously rejected applications

Thank you for considering my views when reviewing the application.

Kind regards

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 26 May 2026 23:26
To: Planning
Subject: Objection to Planning Application 3/2026/0078 – Land at Causeway Farm, Longsight Road, Balderstone

⚠ 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]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Dear Planning Officer,

RE: Objection to Planning Application 3/2026/0078 – Causeway Farm, Osbaldeston

I write to strongly object to the above application for up to 85 dwellings at Causeway Farm and respectfully request that planning permission be refused.

This proposal would introduce a large housing development into open countryside on a site previously identified by officers as harmful to landscape character, openness and residential amenity. As the occupier of Lower Abbott House, immediately adjoining the site, I am deeply concerned about the significant impact this development would have upon my family, particularly my autistic son.

Consultation Concerns and Procedural Error

At the outset, I wish to raise serious concern regarding the neighbour consultation process associated with this application. My property, [REDACTED], which lies [REDACTED] to and affected by the proposed development site, was entirely omitted from the neighbour notification process.

Given the scale and sensitivity of this proposal, I do not consider this to be a minor administrative oversight. Other nearby properties were included within the consultation exercise, yet my household, which is one of the most directly affected, received no notification whatsoever. I only became aware of the application independently.

I consider this omission to demonstrate a concerning lack of care and accuracy within the consultation process for a major development proposal of this scale. Proper neighbour notification is an essential part of fair public participation in the planning process, particularly where proposals may significantly affect neighbouring residents and engage the Council's duties toward disabled people.

Conflict with Previous Refusal and Planning Policy

This site remains open countryside outside any defined settlement boundary. The previous officer assessment concluded that development of this site would result in significant conflict with development plan policies intended to protect the countryside, landscape character and rural setting of the area.

In my view, the current application has not materially overcome the conflicts with the Ribble Valley Core Strategy, specifically:

- Policy DS1 (Development Strategy), which restricts inappropriate development outside defined settlement boundaries;
- Policy EN2 (Landscape), which requires development to respect and be in keeping with landscape character;
- Policy DMG1 (General Considerations), which seeks to protect residential amenity and ensure development is sympathetic to its surroundings;
- Policy DMG2 (Strategic Considerations), which requires development to respect the character, landscape and physical features of the area; and
- Policy DME2 (Landscape and Townscape Protection), which seeks to protect and conserve important landscape character and features.

The previous assessment concluded that development within this location would appear incongruous and discordant within the surrounding rural landscape. Despite revised supporting documentation and mitigation proposals, I do not believe the current scheme overcomes that concern.

While additional technical reports have been submitted, the fundamental characteristics of the site remain unchanged. It remains an open and visually sensitive rural site where development would significantly alter the existing landscape and settlement pattern.

The submitted documents repeatedly acknowledge the rural and agricultural nature of the site, the importance of existing hedgerows and vegetation, and the visibility of the site from surrounding viewpoints and public rights of way.

Landscape, Environmental and Amenity Harm

The proposal would result in the gradual urbanisation of the area through:

- built development;
- roads and hard surfacing;
- lighting;
- engineered drainage infrastructure;
- acoustic barriers;
- increased traffic and construction activity; and
- loss of open countryside character.

Furthermore, the application fails to demonstrate how the proposed acoustic barriers, which are likely to involve substantial fencing and screening structures, will affect the visual amenity and openness of the surrounding area and neighbouring properties.

There also appears to be a clear tension between the level of acoustic mitigation likely required to protect residential amenity and the Council's own policies seeking to preserve the rural landscape character and openness of the site. In my view, this further demonstrates the inherent constraints and sensitivity of the location.

The proposal would also significantly affect the character and setting of surrounding public rights of way, contrary to the wider amenity objectives of Policy DMG1.

Additional traffic associated with both the construction phase and long-term occupation of the development would place further pressure upon an area already experiencing significant traffic issues associated with the A59 corridor, Abbott Brow and surrounding routes used during school peak times.

The introduction of substantial additional vehicle movements, construction traffic and delivery vehicles would further increase congestion, noise, disturbance and environmental pressure upon neighbouring residents and surrounding communities. Concerns also remain regarding the cumulative impact of nearby and committed development within the wider Mellor Brook area.

I am not persuaded that the cumulative effect of existing and committed development within the wider area has been adequately assessed, particularly given the increasing pressure already experienced on surrounding road infrastructure and local services.

Ecology and Environmental Concerns

The ecological importance of the site may extend beyond the application boundary itself due to the surrounding woodland, ponds, hedgerows and watercourses connecting to nearby habitats around Abbott Brow and Mammon Wood.

Concerns have also been raised regarding protected and notable species within the wider area, including badgers, owls, bats and amphibians. In this context, I am not persuaded that the cumulative ecological value and habitat connectivity of the site and surrounding landscape has been fully understood or adequately assessed, particularly given the biodiversity obligations arising under the Environment Act 2021.

I respectfully request that the Council satisfies itself that sufficient and up-to-date ecological and habitat connectivity assessments have been undertaken before determining the application.

Technical Constraints and Reserved Matters

The application relies heavily upon future mitigation measures in order to make development acceptable within what is clearly a constrained rural site. These include structural landscaping, ecological mitigation, acoustic mitigation and drainage attenuation infrastructure.

In my view, the application seeks outline approval whilst leaving too many important matters unresolved. Given the acknowledged sensitivity of the site, significant matters are deferred to future reserved matters stages, including landscaping effectiveness, acoustic mitigation and long-term environmental management.

At outline stage, the effectiveness and long-term delivery of key mitigation measures remains unproven. The immediate consequence would be the urbanisation of a currently open agricultural landscape long before any proposed mitigation planting matures sufficiently to provide meaningful screening.

Equality Act and Disability Considerations

I also ask the Council to give proper regard to its obligations under the Equality Act 2010 and the Public Sector Equality Duty when assessing this application and its impact upon disabled residents.

[REDACTED]

Furthermore, due to the significance [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Conclusion

The previous refusal demonstrates that the Council has already recognised the sensitivity of this site and the substantial harm that development in this location would cause.

Despite the additional reports and mitigation now proposed, the core concerns identified previously remain unresolved. In my view, this proposal would result in unacceptable harm to the countryside, landscape character, openness and neighbouring amenity.

The Council has previously refused large-scale residential development on this site, and I do not believe the current application has materially overcome the fundamental concerns identified within those earlier decisions.

For all of these reasons, I respectfully request that planning permission is refused.

Yours faithfully,

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

From: [REDACTED] >
Sent: 26 May 2026 23:58
To: Planning
Subject: Objection to planning application 3/2026/0078 - Land at Causeway Farm

⚠ 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.



Re: Planning Application : 3/2026/0078

Dear Planning Officer

I write as the owner and occupier [REDACTED], to formally object to the above application on the material planning grounds set out below. My property is the [REDACTED] at approximately [REDACTED] development boundary. I respectfully request that the Planning and Development Committee refuses this application.

1. Procedural Concern: Failure of Neighbour Notification

Despite [REDACTED] [REDACTED] to the application site, [REDACTED] was not included in the neighbour notification exercise for this application. I became aware of the proposal through my own enquiries. I note that properties at greater distance from the site boundary were notified.

Neighbour notification is a statutory requirement under Article 15 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015. The omission of the most directly affected neighbouring property from that process is a procedural irregularity that I ask the council to address before proceeding to determination.

2. Conflict with the Development Plan

Under Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, applications must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The application conflicts with the following adopted policies of the Ribble Valley Local Development Framework comprising the Core Strategy (adopted December 2014) and the Housing and Economic Development DPD (adopted November 2019)

Key Statement DS1 (Development Strategy): directs residential growth to settlements identified within the settlement hierarchy. The site lies outside the defined settlement boundary. The applicant's own planning statement acknowledges this. Mellor Brook is not identified as a settlement of sufficient scale to accommodate 85 dwellings, and the applicant's assertion that the site is

“functionally and physically related” to the settlement does not constitute a recognised policy exception under DS1.

Policy DMG2 (Strategic Considerations): requires development outside settlement boundaries to be restricted and small in scale, and development in the open countryside to be in keeping with the character of the landscape. A scheme of 85 dwellings on 4.1 hectares of open agricultural land does not satisfy either criterion.

Key Statement EN2 (Landscape): requires development to be in keeping with the character of the landscape, reflecting local distinctiveness, scale and siting. The council’s own officer assessment on application 3/2024/0771 concluded that development on this site would be incongruous and discordant within the rural landscape. That assessment stands.

Policy DME2 (Landscape and Townscape Protection): seeks to protect the landscape character and visual quality of the open countryside. The development of this site with 85 dwellings and associated infrastructure would cause direct and permanent harm to the landscape character and visual quality of this rural location.

Policy DMG1 (General Considerations): requires development to safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents, to be sympathetic to existing land uses, and to address highway safety. For the reasons set out in this letter, the proposal fails on all three counts.

3. History of Refusal: No Material Change in Circumstances

This is the third application brought by the same developer for the same parcel of land. Applications 3/2023/1408 and 3/2024/0771 were both refused by Ribble Valley Borough Council. The stated grounds of refusal included loss of habitat, the development constituting an incongruous and discordant form in the landscape, and failure to satisfy exception criteria for development outside the settlement boundary.

The change in proposed use from employment to residential does not address or resolve any of those grounds. The landscape character of the site, its location in open countryside outside the settlement boundary, and its ecological constraints are materially unchanged. In the absence of any change in planning circumstances sufficient to justify a different conclusion, the committee should refuse this application on the same grounds.

4. Landscape Harm and Internal Policy Contradiction

The development of 4.1 hectares of open agricultural land would introduce permanent urbanising elements onto a site twice assessed by the council as unsuitable for built development. These include residential built form, internal roads and hard surfacing, street and domestic lighting, engineered drainage and attenuation infrastructure, and acoustic screening structures.

The acoustic screening element is of particular concern. Given the site’s proximity to the A59 corridor, substantial acoustic barriers are likely to be required to make the development acceptable in residential amenity terms. Those structures would themselves cause harm to the openness and landscape character of the site and the surrounding area, contrary to Key Statement EN2 and Policy DME2. The applicant has not demonstrated how this direct conflict between the mitigation required and the policies it must comply with is resolved. This is an inherent constraint of the site that the submitted documents do not adequately address.

5. Outline Approval with Inadequate Mitigation Detail

The application seeks outline planning permission while deferring to reserved matters stage the critical detail of structural landscaping, acoustic mitigation, ecological mitigation, and drainage infrastructure. On a site of acknowledged landscape and ecological sensitivity that has been refused twice, this is not an adequate basis for granting permission.

Structural landscaping in particular will not provide meaningful screening for many years after construction begins. Granting outline permission on the basis of unproven future mitigation would result in the immediate and irreversible urbanisation of this agricultural site before any proposed landscaping can take effect. In my view, the committee should adopt a precautionary approach where the effectiveness of proposed mitigation cannot yet be properly assessed at outline stage.

6. Impact on Residential Amenity

As the occupier of the [REDACTED] site, the impact on the amenity of my household under Policy DMG1 is direct and significant. The development would result in a material and permanent increase in noise, activity and artificial light from an immediately adjacent residential estate of 85 dwellings. I ask that any reserved matters layout is rigorously assessed against Policy DMG1 to ensure that adequate separation distances and privacy standards are achieved between proposed dwellings and existing properties, particularly Lower Abbott House given its proximity to the site boundary.

I also draw the committee's attention to the construction phase. A development of this scale represents a construction programme of two to three years or more of sustained activity immediately adjacent to my property, including heavy machinery, piling, excavation, HGV movements, and significant vibration. I have a disabled child with autism who is home-educated and is present at the property throughout the day. Under Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010, the council is subject to the Public Sector Equality Duty and must have due regard to the impact of its decisions on disabled people. I ask that this is specifically considered within the officer's report and committee assessment.

7. Highway Safety

Abbott Brow and Longsight Road are subject to existing traffic pressure. The junction of Abbott Brow and Longsight Road, immediately adjacent to my property, has restricted visibility and limited footway provision. Abbott Brow functions as an alternative route to the A59, and traffic volumes are particularly high at school hours due to St Mary's Church of England School on Longsight Road.

The vehicle movements generated by 85 dwellings, combined with a sustained construction traffic phase via Longsight Road, would materially increase highway safety risk at this junction. The submitted transport information does not appear to have assessed the Abbott Brow junction specifically or the cumulative interaction with school-related traffic. I ask that Lancashire County Council Highways is required to assess this junction and route before the application is determined, and that its response is given full weight under Policy DMG3 (Transport and Mobility).

8. Infrastructure and Service Capacity

St Mary's Church of England School on Longsight Road is the nearest primary school to the application site. The submitted documents include no assessment of the school's capacity to accommodate the additional pupils generated by 85 dwellings. I ask that the Local Education Authority is formally consulted and its response given full weight in the determination.

The cumulative impact on GP provision and local services in the Mellor Brook and Balderstone area has also not been addressed. NPPF paragraph 99 requires that planning decisions ensure adequate

infrastructure exists or will be provided to serve new development. That test has not been met by the submitted information.

9. Biodiversity Net Gain and Ecological Constraints

Habitat loss was a stated reason for refusing application 3/2024/0771 on this site. The site supports established hedgerows and field boundary habitats, and previous surveys identified the presence of great crested newts and bats. Key Statement EN4 (Biodiversity and Geodiversity) of the Core Strategy requires the council to seek to conserve and enhance biodiversity wherever possible.

Under the Environment Act 2021, a mandatory Biodiversity Net Gain of 10% is required. The submitted BNG assessment should be scrutinised carefully given the ecological constraints of this site. I also note that ecology surveys included in the submission appear to date from 2022 and 2023. Given that the mandatory BNG regime and the associated measurement methodology have developed since those surveys were conducted, I ask the council to satisfy itself that the ecological information is current and that the BNG requirement can genuinely be achieved on this site rather than deferred to reserved matters stage.

Conclusion

This application conflicts with multiple adopted policies of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy, none of which, in my view, have been materially overcome since the two previous refusals on this site. The landscape and ecological sensitivities of the site are unchanged, the acoustic mitigation required creates a direct internal policy conflict, the proposed mitigation is unproven at outline stage, and the infrastructure and highway impacts have not been adequately assessed.

The council has refused this developer on this site twice. The cumulative weight of the harms identified above warrants the same conclusion here, and I respectfully request that planning permission is refused.

Yours faithfully,



[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 27 May 2026 08:29
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2026/0078 FS-Case-841366015

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Lancashire

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2026/0078

Address of Development: Land south of Causeway Farm Balderstone

Comments: The area proposed for development is in open countryside outside any of the settlement boundaries of the nearby villages of Mellor Brook, Osbaldeston and Mellor. I understand building in such an area is only considered in exceptional circumstances. This proposal makes no such case.

A development of this size would be totally out of place and would be an incongruent, isolated housing estate with no relationship to the villages mentioned above.

There would be huge amenity loss, with impoverished access along the footpaths which are greatly appreciated by locals and walkers from other areas. I regularly walk through this field and onwards to Mellor or Mellor Brow, to lose this land to housing would be an abomination.

Environmental degradation is highly likely. Indicators of a well balanced ecosystem are evident. There is a wide number of bird species in this area, including several types of raptor along with ample evidence of small and large mammals. Again, as in so many places, this would be more permanent habitat destruction. No wonder we continue to see plummeting wildlife populations.

Access would only be too and from the A59. This road is now so busy that pedestrian and cycling usage is at least, unpleasant and at worst dangerous. More housing will compound this and surely the location would just encourage more car usage, making the whole proposal unsustainable.

A large housing estate of well over 100 houses is underway in Mellor Brook, surely this in itself is enough of a contribution from our community to local housing need.