

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 22 February 2026 16:17
To: Planning
Subject: Comments on a planning application 3/2026/0089 Land at High moor Farm Clitheroe BB7 1PN
Attachments: IMG_20260222_094254.jpg; IMG_20260222_111341.jpg

⚠ 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.

Comments from [REDACTED] of [REDACTED] 22nd February 2026

As a resident on the [REDACTED] development site I was expecting to see detailed plans for landscaping between my home and the site. I would ask that the developer agree to discussing and then implementing a planting/ fencing scheme preferable to those residents affected.

At this [REDACTED] edge of the development ground water is above the surface of the field so my greatest concern regards ground water flooding which many existing residents of homes beside similar housing developments have experienced. Listening to recent news reporting it appears that either sufficient provision is not made to prevent consequential flooding due to ground water or the lack of enforcement officers means limited monitoring resulting in reduced provision. What guarantees can you give? Photographs of the surface water next to the boundary of my home taken today are attached.

Consideration has not been given to nesting curlews on the site.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 23 February 2026 10:31
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2026/0089 FS-Case-802383571

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Lancashire

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2026/0089

Address of Development: Land at Highmoor Farm Clitheroe, BB7 1PN

Comments: We are submitting this objection fully aware that, in practice, the consultation process feels like a tick-box exercise rather than a meaningful opportunity for residents to influence decisions. Nevertheless, we want our objection formally recorded.

The proposed development fails to address, or even acknowledge, the already inadequate local infrastructure, which is being compounded by the already approved, but yet to be completed developments in Clitheroe. The road network surrounding the site is in a poor state and already struggles with current traffic levels. Despite this, there are no proposed improvements to the A59, which is the main link road for many residents and already heavily congested at peak times.

Public transport is equally unreliable and does not provide a viable alternative to car use for most journeys. The rail service is also insufficient, as a rail user: one train per hour to Manchester, with the return train regularly formed of only four carriages, making it entirely unpredictable whether passengers can board. When trains are full, the only option is often an hour-long wait for the next service. This level of service is already unacceptable for the existing population, let alone with hundreds of additional homes feeding into the same network.

Building new houses without meaningful, guaranteed infrastructure improvements will worsen congestion, increase pressure on already overstretched services, and reduce the overall quality of services for existing residents.

For these reasons, we object to the proposed development and ask that our concerns be formally noted.

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 24 February 2026 21:46
To: Planning
Cc: Cllr Ian Brown; jonathan.hinder.mp@parliament.uk
Subject: Fwd: Planning Application 3/2026/0089 -Land at Highmoor Farm, Clitheroe BB7 1PN

⚠ 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 Officer,

Following on from my previous Mail, and after further reading into the application of reserve matters I write to formally object to the above application in respect of the proposed pedestrian link running immediately adjacent to my property boundary, as shown on the Landscape Structure Plan.

My objection is based on material planning considerations, specifically the unacceptable impact on residential amenity, privacy and security.

The proposed route runs at the same ground level as my property and [REDACTED]. My home has [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] a [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] property is partly driveway and partly a grassed area used [REDACTED]. The introduction of a dedicated pedestrian link in such close proximity will create direct and [REDACTED] and [REDACTED].

The submitted Landscape Structure Plan indicates only a small hedge adjacent to the boundary. This does not constitute meaningful mitigation. A low hedge provides no effective screening, particularly during early establishment or winter months, and does not prevent overlooking or protect the sense of defensible space expected for existing residential properties.

This situation is materially different from a typical highway frontage. A purpose-built pedestrian route serving a new housing development will encourage regular foot traffic, slower movement, stopping and gathering. The cumulative effect of this level of pedestrian activity [REDACTED] [REDACTED] will significantly erode privacy and quiet enjoyment of the property.

In my view, the proposal conflicts with the requirement under the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) that development should secure a high standard of amenity for existing and future occupants. Furthermore, Ribble Valley Local Plan policies relating to design quality and residential amenity require development to protect existing residents from unacceptable overlooking, loss of privacy and adverse impacts arising from layout.

The current design fails to demonstrate that the amenity of neighbouring properties has been adequately safeguarded. The absence of a robust boundary treatment, such as 1.8m close-board fencing combined with substantial structural planting, represents a clear design deficiency.

I respectfully request that Ribble Valley Borough Council:

- Requires the realignment of the pedestrian route to provide adequate separation from existing dwellings. Realign to the footpath next to the road to the new development, a leave the area in front of the existing houses as open space.

Without such amendments, I consider the proposal to result in unacceptable harm to existing residential amenity and therefore it should not be approved in its current form.

I trust these concerns will be fully considered in the determination of this application.

If you would be interested in a site visit to discuss, then please do let me know so we can arrange this.

Kind Regards

[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: [REDACTED]
Date: 19 February 2026 at 4:01:32 pm GMT
To: planning@ribblevalley.gov.uk
Cc: Cllr Ian Brown <Cllr.Brown@ribblevalley.gov.uk>, jonathan.hinder.mp@parliament.uk
Subject: Re: Planning Application 3/2026/0089 -Land at Highmoor Farm, Clitheroe BB7 1PN

Dear Sir/Madam,

I write to formally object to Reserved Matters application 3/2026/0089 relating to 124 dwellings at Land at Highmoor Farm, Clitheroe.

Whilst outline consent has been granted, the Local Planning Authority remains under a statutory duty pursuant to Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 to determine this application in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Reserved Matters approval must not be granted where the detailed scheme conflicts with adopted policy or fails to adequately address cumulative impacts.

1. Conflict with Core Strategy Policy DMG1 (General Considerations)

Policy DMG1 requires development proposals to:

- Be of a high standard of design which respects local character and settlement pattern
- Not result in unacceptable impacts on infrastructure
- Provide adequate arrangements for drainage
- Protect residential amenity
- Ensure safe and convenient access

The cumulative scale of housing development within Clitheroe has already placed significant and observable pressure on highways, education, healthcare and drainage infrastructure. This proposal fails to demonstrate that infrastructure capacity is sufficient to accommodate a further 124 dwellings without material harm.

In particular:

- There is insufficient evidence that the residual cumulative impact on the local highway network would not be severe, contrary to NPPF paragraph 115.
- There is inadequate reassurance that drainage infrastructure can accommodate additional surface water discharge without increasing flood risk, contrary to NPPF paragraphs 165–175.

As such, the proposal conflicts directly with the infrastructure and environmental safeguards embedded within Policy DMG1.

2. Harm to Landscape and Settlement Character – Policy DME6

Policy DME6 seeks to protect the landscape character of the borough and requires development to respect local distinctiveness, settlement form and the relationship between built form and the countryside.

Clitheroe’s character as a market town set within a rural landscape is a defining attribute. Continued peripheral expansion through large-scale estate-style developments risks incremental suburbanisation and erosion of that identity.

The scale, density and layout proposed under this Reserved Matters submission do not convincingly demonstrate that the development will assimilate sympathetically into the settlement edge. The cumulative impact of repeated edge-of-town schemes materially alters the town’s character and conflicts with Policy DME6.

3. Failure to Satisfy NPPF Sustainable Development Objectives

Paragraphs 7 and 8 of the NPPF require development to achieve economic, social and environmental objectives in a mutually supportive way.

The proposal fails to demonstrate that social and environmental objectives — particularly infrastructure provision, transport capacity, drainage resilience and townscape quality — are being met alongside housing delivery.

If the Council can demonstrate a five-year housing land supply, the tilted balance under paragraph 11(d) is not engaged and there is no presumption in favour of additional housing irrespective of harm. Even if engaged, paragraph 11(d) is clear that permission should be refused where adverse impacts significantly and demonstrably outweigh benefits.

Given the cumulative and compounding infrastructure pressures within Clitheroe, that threshold is increasingly relevant.

4. Cumulative Impact and Planning Balance

Planning law and policy require cumulative impacts to be properly assessed. The repeated approval of large-scale residential developments without proportionate and timely infrastructure upgrades undermines the plan-led system and risks unsustainable growth.

The harms arising from:

- Highway congestion and network capacity strain
- Pressure on education and healthcare services
- Increased surface water management risk
- Erosion of settlement character

are not speculative; they are tangible and ongoing. When taken together, they weigh materially against the benefits of additional housing delivery at this location.

Formal Planning Conclusion

For the reasons set out above, the proposal:

- Conflicts with Core Strategy Policy DMG1 due to inadequate demonstration of infrastructure capacity, drainage sufficiency and cumulative highway impact;
- Conflicts with Core Strategy Policy DME6 due to harm to settlement character and landscape context;
- Fails to fully satisfy the sustainable development principles of the NPPF, including paragraphs 7, 8, 11, 115 and 135.

Accordingly, the Reserved Matters application should be refused.

Yours faithfully

[Redacted signature block]