

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 14 April 2026 23:12
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2026/0214 FS-Case-827419658

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Lancashire

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2026/0214

Address of Development: Land at Albany Drive Copster Green BB1 9EH

Comments: I am a resident of [REDACTED] and wish to formally object to the proposed development of 26 houses on land off Albany Drive for the reasons outlined below.

Water drainage

The plans indicate that surface run off will divert water into the stream which runs alongside the site. This stream is very narrow and has limited capacity for an increase in water volume without the potential for causing damage further downstream. In times of heavy persistent rainfall, the water level rises quickly. If this new housing development was to go ahead as planned, at peak discharge rate the water level in the stream could rise sufficiently to cause erosion or water ingress to the gardens at the rear of properties situated on Brown Leaves Grove and neighbouring properties alongside the A59.

Wildlife

The bats residing in the roof of my property have previously been observed commuting along the 'dark corridor' commencing at the end of Albany Drive/Brown Leaves Grove towards the wooded area off Lovely Hall Lane. The proposed new housing development and subsequent illumination of the site will have a detrimental impact on this ecological habitat.

Local area and amenities

Copster Green is a tiny village which provides very little in terms of amenities or employment options for its residents.

The amenities in Copster Green currently consist of one restaurant and a plant nursery. There is no shop, health facility, bank, post office or ATM in Copster Green. The nearest pub is in the neighbouring village of Salesbury. There are no youth facilities in Copster Green. The nearest grocery shop is the Co-op store in Wilpshire. Walking to this shop and back would take someone approximately 1hr 30 minutes from the proposed housing development!

Public transport

In accordance with Government policy, new housing developments should provide access to sustainable transport.

The bus service along the A59 in the direction of both Clitheroe and Preston is infrequent (averaging 1 bus per hour Monday-Saturday, and 1 bus every 2 hours on a Sunday). None of the bus-stops situated along the A59 in Copster Green provide weather protection for anyone waiting for a bus.

The nearest train station is Ramsgreave & Wilpshire. This station provides 6 car parking spaces and has no accessible parking spaces. Walking to this train station from the proposed development site will take someone circa 40 minutes.

There are no designated cycle lanes in the local area around Copster Green and the A59 is a very busy road with a large number of HGV's regularly passing through.

As a result of the above, residents of Copster Green are heavily dependent on private car use for their day-to-day requirements. The proposed housing development off Albany Drive would create a further car dependent community.

Local road network

Exit of the proposed housing development would be via Albany Drive onto Lovely Hall Lane. Lovely Hall Lane does not contain a defined footpath and in parts is barely wide enough for two vehicles to pass when there are no pedestrians to take into account.

The speed limit on Lovely Hall Lane is 30mph. During 2024 and 2025 Salesbury Parish Council erected speed indicator devices (SPIDs) to monitor traffic flow on Lovely Hall Lane for a 2 week period. In both monitoring periods, the SPIDs captured vehicles driving in excess of 50mph. Between Spring Cottage and Lovely Hall, pedestrians have to navigate a blind bend in the road with no designated footpath or illumination in place. Lovely Hall Lane would present a danger to any children walking from the new development to Salesbury school.

For the reasons above, I respectfully ask that the planning application is refused.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 14 April 2026 23:28
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2026/0214 FS-Case-827416334

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Lancashire

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2026/0214

Address of Development: Land at the end of Albany Drive, off Lovely Hall Lane

Comments: I would like to register my concern and objections to the proposed building of new homes on the land at the end of Albany Drive.

I am a resident of Copster Green and worry about the additional traffic this development would create. Lovely Hall Lane already experiences traffic backing up at peak times, and as a result the unpaved roads around the green are used as an alternative entry/exit to and from the A59, usually at speed creating danger and causing damage to the unpaved roads. With additional cars from new developments this unfortunately can only get worse.

As there is limited public transport in the area, the use of cars from any new development would be required to access local services, as there are a few within walking distance.

There is no immediate infrastructure to support the influx of residents, putting pressure on schools and NHS services.

Thank you for taking the time to consider these points

From: Contact Centre
Sent: 15 April 2026 11:32
To: Planning
Subject: FW: Planning application 03/2026/0214

Contact Centre
Ribble Valley Borough Council, Council Offices, Church Walk, Clitheroe, Lancashire BB7 2RA
T: 01200 425111 | E: contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk | W: www.ribblevalley.gov.uk

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 14 April 2026 17:17
To: WebMaster <WebMaster@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Planning application 03/2026/0214

 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 Sir/Madam,

I write to formally object to planning application 3/2026/0214 for the proposed development of 26 new houses at the end of Albany Drive, Copster Green.

My objection is based primarily on the significant and cumulative impact this development will have on the area, traffic, access, and local infrastructure.

Firstly, the construction phase itself will inevitably result in substantial disruption. The volume of heavy goods vehicles, construction traffic, and associated activity will place considerable strain on Albany Drive and surrounding roads, which are not well suited to sustained heavy vehicle use and are in poor repair today. This will create safety concerns and inconvenience for existing residents.

Secondly, there is already considerable pressure on the A59, particularly due to ongoing and recent developments in Whalley and Barrow. At peak times, access and egress from Lovely Hall Lane onto the A59 is already difficult and often congested. The additional traffic generated by a further 26 dwellings will only exacerbate this situation, increasing delays and the risk of accidents.

Thirdly, the proposed development will increase traffic flow onto Lovely Hall Lane itself, further compounding the existing challenges of safely entering and exiting the junction with the A59. This road network is already operating under strain, and further development risks pushing it beyond safe and practical limits.

Fourth the primary school already bring significant challenges at peak traffic times on a road that is not sized for 2 modern cars to pass and has a surface that has already significantly degraded over time with no footpaths for safe access.

Fifth the water supply to this area is already of a very low pressure standard and this development will add to that issue I am sure.

Finally, there is a broader concern regarding the cumulative impact of multiple developments across the Ribble Valley. Local infrastructure, including roads and essential services, does not appear to be keeping pace with the scale of housing growth. The lack of corresponding investment in facilities raises serious concerns about the sustainability of continued development in this area.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that the Council carefully considers the cumulative traffic and infrastructure impacts and refuses this application.

Yours faithfully,

A black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of the sender.

Sent from my iPhone

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 14 April 2026 15:23
To: Planning
Subject: 3/2026/0214

⚠ 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 afternoon,

We are writing to [REDACTED] raise our concerns about the planning application regarding the proposed development at the end of Albany Drive.

Our objections are as listed

Traffic - increased traffic not just on the drive, but lovely hall lane and A59. There has only just been a collision into [REDACTED] property on Lovely Hall Lane through a stone wall.

Pedestrian safety- no foot path.

Environmental concerns- we have deers, hedgehogs, badgers etc. Loss of green space.

Increased flooding- drainage and surface water are becoming an increasing concern. Gardens water logged.

Noise - increased traffic.

Lack of amenities- there is not anywhere accessible by foot. Bus routes are very limited. Post office that has advertised is in fact a pop up service that is only available Monday's 2-4pm only offering limited post office services again a walk away without a foot path at the memorial hall.

Kind Regards

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 14 April 2026 15:26
To: Planning
Subject: Planning application objection 3/2026/0214 Albany Drive

⚠ 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.

14th April 2026

FAO Maya Cullen

I write to **object** to planning application **3/2026/0214** for the erection of **26 affordable dwellings** on land at Albany Drive, Copster Green. This proposal is inappropriate for its location and conflicts with local and national planning policies. It would place residents in a settlement with **no services, no safe pedestrian route to public transport, and no demonstrated local need** — concerns the Council's own officers raised with the applicant before this application was submitted. My objections are detailed below and supported with references to the applicant's own documents and the LLFA's consultation response.

1) Copster Green lacks the infrastructure to support this development

The **Planning Statement** confirms the site lies **outside the defined settlement boundary** of Copster Green and within open countryside. Copster Green is classified as a **Tier 2 village** under **Key Statement DS1** of the Core Strategy. The village has **no shop, no GP surgery, no pharmacy, no dentist, no school, no childcare facility and no employment provision**. The nearest primary school (Salesbury CE) is approximately 1.4km away along roads without continuous footways. The nearest supermarket, GP and secondary school are in Langho, Whalley or Blackburn — between 4km and 8km away. There is no post office other than a two-hour-per-week service in Salesbury village hall.

RVBC's Core Strategy is clear on the constraints for development in this location:

Key Statement DS1 requires that within Tier 2 villages, development will be required to "*meet proven local needs or deliver regeneration benefits*". No local need specific to Copster Green has been proven.

Policy DMG2 (Part 2) requires development outside settlement areas to meet at least one of five criteria, including provision of "*local needs housing which meets an identified need*". The applicant concedes at **Section 3.8** of the Planning Statement that waiting list data for the Copster Green area was **not made available to them**. No parish-level Housing Needs Survey exists for Salesbury parish.

Policy DMH3 restricts residential development in open countryside to housing which "*meets an identified local need*". The applicant relies on Borough-wide and broad sub-area figures from the 2025 AHNA covering dozens of Tier 2 villages across the entire Borough. This does not constitute local need.

At **Section 1.7** of the Planning Statement, the applicant discloses the pre-application response from RVBC (ref: **RV/2024/ENQ/00109**). Officers raised *"concerns that the level of affordable housing proposed would not likely be supported in the settlement, and that provision of such units in such a location would increase the cost of living to potential residents due to lack of key services/facilities within walking distance of the site"*. The applicant proceeded with a substantially unchanged scheme despite this advice. The Council should stand by the assessment its own officers gave.

2) Two previous appeals on this site were dismissed on identical grounds

In 2014, an outline application for up to 32 dwellings (ref: **3/2014/0307**) was refused and the appeal (**APP/T2350/A/14/222255**) was dismissed. The inspector found *"a lack of accessibility by a range of means"* and that *"resultant car trips would be unsustainable journeys"*. In 2016, an appeal for 9 dwellings on immediately adjacent land (**APP/T2350/W/15/3134524**) was also dismissed. That inspector specifically noted the applicant *"did not quantify specific, more local need for such development in this location"*.

The fundamental characteristics that led to both dismissals have not changed. Copster Green still has no shop, no school, no GP and no safe footway to bus stops. Repackaging the same site with a different tenure mix does not address the reasons it has already been found unsuitable **twice**.

3) Pedestrian safety and unsustainable transport patterns

The applicant's **Planning Statement** claims bus stops are within 550m of the site. However, it also concedes that *"a short section of Lovely Hall Lane is not a formal footpath"* and that pedestrians must use *"a grass verge along this lightly trafficked length"*. A grass verge is not a footway. It is not paved, not lit, and not accessible for wheelchair users, pushchair users, or those with mobility impairments. On winter evenings when darkness falls by 4pm, this route would be unsafe and impractical.

The scheme includes bungalows stated to be suitable for elderly residents. An elderly resident without a car would need to navigate this unlit, unpaved route to reach an hourly bus on the **A59** simply to visit a GP or buy groceries. **NPPF paragraph 110** acknowledges that sustainable transport solutions will vary between urban and rural areas, but this does not provide licence for development where residents have no realistic alternative to the private car for every journey. The **Transport Statement** itself acknowledges that the nearest supermarket, GP and secondary school all require travel to settlements 4–8km away.

4) Drainage — LLFA formal objection and existing flooding issues

The **Lead Local Flood Authority** (Lancashire County Council) has issued a **formal objection** dated 26 March 2026, identifying **four fundamental failures** against the **National Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems (June 2025)**:

Standard 1: The applicant has not demonstrated that higher-priority drainage destinations (rainwater harvesting, infiltration) have been explored before defaulting to discharge to a field drain.

Standard 2: No evidence that the first 5mm of rainfall would be managed on-site without generating runoff.

Standard 3 (rate): The SuDS are **potentially undersized** — sized on a greenfield discharge rate of approximately **9 l/s** but proposing to discharge at only **3 l/s**, creating an inconsistency in the contributing area calculations.

Standard 3 (volume): No evidence that post-development runoff volumes for the **1-in-100 year event** would be appropriately managed.

The applicant's own **Flood Risk Assessment** acknowledges that the **Albany Drive / Longsight Road junction already experiences surface water flooding** due to local highway drainage constraints. Introducing 26 homes with associated hard-surfacing upstream of this junction, served by a drainage strategy the statutory consultee has deemed fundamentally inadequate, risks worsening an existing problem. The LLFA also raises concern that the applicant proposes to **connect foul drainage into the surface water system** at multiple points — contrary to best practice and posing pollution risk to the local watercourse network.

5) Biodiversity Net Gain deficit

The applicant's own **BNG Metric** shows the development would result in a **net loss of 0.56 habitat units (-24.85%)**. This falls far short of the mandatory **10% net gain** required by the **Environment Act 2021**. The applicant states that **1.53 off-site habitat units** would need to be purchased from a third-party habitat bank, but **no provider has been identified, no agreement submitted, and no evidence provided that suitable units are available**. A statement of future intent does not satisfy a statutory requirement.

6) Settlement character and scale

Albany Drive is a quiet cul-de-sac of approximately **25 bungalows** in a spacious, low-density setting. This proposal would effectively **double the number of homes** served by the Drive, introducing two-storey semi-detached houses and mews terraces at a density of approximately **33 dwellings per hectare**. This bears no resemblance to the existing character. The **Design and Access Statement** compares the density to the adjacent Brown Leaves Grove development (~32 dph), but Brown Leaves Grove lies *within* the settlement boundary and was approved through the development plan process. Using an approved infill scheme to justify a countryside extension is a flawed comparison.

The proposal would extend built form approximately **180 metres further south into open countryside** beyond the settlement boundary, introducing an urbanising suburban layout alien to Copster Green's rural character, contrary to **Key Statement EN2** (landscape protection) and **Policy DME2** (landscape and townscape protection).

7) Precedent

If this application is approved, the reasoning underpinning it — that Borough-wide housing need combined with the tilted balance justifies development outside any settlement boundary regardless of local services — would apply equally to **every Tier 2 village in Ribble Valley**. There would be no principled basis to refuse similar schemes in Read, Grindleton, Tosside, Bashall Eaves or any other small settlement. The spatial strategy of the Core Strategy would be rendered meaningless.

8) Conclusion

The proposal is **contrary to the Development Plan** and would cause **substantial harm**:

1. The site is an **unallocated greenfield site** outside the settlement boundary, in a village with **no services**, contrary to Core Strategy policies **DS1**, **DMG2** and **DMH3**. No local need specific to Copster Green has been demonstrated. The Council's own officers warned the applicant at pre-application stage that housing here would **increase residents' cost of living**.

2. **Two previous appeal inspectors** have dismissed development on this site and adjacent land on identical sustainability and accessibility grounds. The physical characteristics of Copster Green that led to those decisions have not changed.
3. The pedestrian route to bus stops requires walking along an **unlit lane without footways** to reach hourly services on a fast-moving A-road. This is **unsafe and impractical**, particularly for elderly residents and those without cars.
4. The **Lead Local Flood Authority has formally objected**, identifying fundamental deficiencies in the drainage strategy against all three core National Standards. The applicant's own FRA acknowledges **existing surface water flooding** at the site's only access point.
5. The scheme fails to deliver the statutory **10% Biodiversity Net Gain**, with a recorded **deficit of 0.56 habitat units** and no off-site provision identified or secured.
6. The suburban estate layout would **double the built footprint** along Albany Drive and extend **180 metres into open countryside**, producing a form of development alien to Copster Green's rural character.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that RVBC **refuse** planning permission for application 3/2026/0214. Should the Council be minded to approve the scheme, I ask that it secure robust conditions and contributions to address drainage, biodiversity, highways and pedestrian safety impacts. However, given the fundamental policy conflict, the LLFA's formal objection and the site's established history of appeal dismissals, the only appropriate course is to refuse the application.

Yours faithfully,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 14 April 2026 15:37
To: Planning
Subject: Planning objection 3/2026/0214 Albany Drive Copster Green

⚠ 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.

14 April 2026

FAO Maya Cullen

I write to **object** to planning application **3/2026/0214** for the erection of **26 affordable dwellings** on land at Albany Drive, Copster Green. This proposal is inappropriate for its location and conflicts with local and national planning policies. As a resident of a neighbouring village the proposed development would affect the local area with the addition of potentially 52 vehicles accessing a quiet side road off a country lane (Lovely Hall Lane) several times a day. It would place residents in a settlement with **no services, no safe pedestrian route to public transport, and no demonstrated local need** — concerns the Council's own officers raised with the applicant before this application was submitted. My objections are detailed below and supported with references to the applicant's own documents and the LLFA's consultation response.

1) Copster Green lacks the infrastructure to support this development

The **Planning Statement** confirms the site lies **outside the defined settlement boundary** of Copster Green and within open countryside. Copster Green is classified as a **Tier 2 village** under **Key Statement DS1** of the Core Strategy. The village has **no shop, no GP surgery, no pharmacy, no dentist, no school, no childcare facility and no employment provision**. The nearest primary school (Salesbury CE) is approximately 1.4km away along roads without continuous footways. The nearest supermarket, GP and secondary school are in Langho, Whalley or Blackburn — between 4km and 8km away. There is no post office other than a two-hour-per-week service in Salesbury village hall.

RVBC's Core Strategy is clear on the constraints for development in this location:

Key Statement DS1 requires that within Tier 2 villages, development will be required to *"meet proven local needs or deliver regeneration benefits"*. No local need specific to Copster Green has been proven.

Policy DMG2 (Part 2) requires development outside settlement areas to meet at least one of five criteria, including provision of *"local needs housing which meets an identified need"*. The applicant concedes at **Section 3.8** of the Planning Statement that waiting list data for the Copster Green area was **not made available to them**. No parish-level Housing Needs Survey exists for Salesbury parish.

Policy DMH3 restricts residential development in open countryside to housing which *"meets an identified local need"*. The applicant relies on Borough-wide and broad sub-area figures

from the 2025 AHNA covering dozens of Tier 2 villages across the entire Borough. This does not constitute local need.

At **Section 1.7** of the Planning Statement, the applicant discloses the pre-application response from RVBC (ref: **RV/2024/ENQ/00109**). Officers raised "*concerns that the level of affordable housing proposed would not likely be supported in the settlement, and that provision of such units in such a location would increase the cost of living to potential residents due to lack of key services/facilities within walking distance of the site*". The applicant proceeded with a substantially unchanged scheme despite this advice. The Council should stand by the assessment its own officers gave.

2) Two previous appeals on this site were dismissed on identical grounds

In 2014, an outline application for up to 32 dwellings (ref: **3/2014/0307**) was refused and the appeal (**APP/T2350/A/14/222255**) was dismissed. The inspector found "*a lack of accessibility by a range of means*" and that "*resultant car trips would be unsustainable journeys*". In 2016, an appeal for 9 dwellings on immediately adjacent land (**APP/T2350/W/15/3134524**) was also dismissed. That inspector specifically noted the applicant "*did not quantify specific, more local need for such development in this location*".

The fundamental characteristics that led to both dismissals have not changed. Copster Green still has no shop, no school, no GP and no safe footway to bus stops. Repackaging the same site with a different tenure mix does not address the reasons it has already been found unsuitable **twice**.

3) Pedestrian safety and unsustainable transport patterns

The applicant's **Planning Statement** claims bus stops are within 550m of the site. However, it also concedes that "*a short section of Lovely Hall Lane is not a formal footpath*" and that pedestrians must use "*a grass verge along this lightly trafficked length*". A grass verge is not a footway. It is not paved, not lit, and not accessible for wheelchair users, pushchair users, or those with mobility impairments. On winter evenings when darkness falls by 4pm, this route would be unsafe and impractical.

The scheme includes bungalows stated to be suitable for elderly residents. An elderly resident without a car would need to navigate this unlit, unpaved route to reach an hourly bus on the **A59** simply to visit a GP or buy groceries. **NPPF paragraph 110** acknowledges that sustainable transport solutions will vary between urban and rural areas, but this does not provide licence for development where residents have no realistic alternative to the private car for every journey. The **Transport Statement** itself acknowledges that the nearest supermarket, GP and secondary school all require travel to settlements 4–8km away.

4) Drainage — LLFA formal objection and existing flooding issues

The **Lead Local Flood Authority** (Lancashire County Council) has issued a **formal objection** dated 26 March 2026, identifying **four fundamental failures** against the **National Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems (June 2025)**:

Standard 1: The applicant has not demonstrated that higher-priority drainage destinations (rainwater harvesting, infiltration) have been explored before defaulting to discharge to a field drain.

Standard 2: No evidence that the first 5mm of rainfall would be managed on-site without generating runoff.

Standard 3 (rate): The SuDS are **potentially undersized** — sized on a greenfield discharge rate of approximately **9 l/s** but proposing to discharge at only **3 l/s**, creating an inconsistency in the contributing area calculations.

Standard 3 (volume): No evidence that post-development runoff volumes for the **1-in-100 year event** would be appropriately managed.

The applicant's own **Flood Risk Assessment** acknowledges that the **Albany Drive / Longsight Road junction already experiences surface water flooding** due to local highway drainage constraints. Introducing 26 homes with associated hard-surfacing upstream of this junction, served by a drainage strategy the statutory consultee has deemed fundamentally inadequate, risks worsening an existing problem. The LLFA also raises concern that the applicant proposes to **connect foul drainage into the surface water system** at multiple points — contrary to best practice and posing pollution risk to the local watercourse network.

5) Biodiversity Net Gain deficit

The applicant's own **BNG Metric** shows the development would result in a **net loss of 0.56 habitat units (-24.85%)**. This falls far short of the mandatory **10% net gain** required by the **Environment Act 2021**. The applicant states that **1.53 off-site habitat units** would need to be purchased from a third-party habitat bank, but **no provider has been identified, no agreement submitted, and no evidence provided that suitable units are available**. A statement of future intent does not satisfy a statutory requirement.

6) Settlement character and scale

Albany Drive is a quiet cul-de-sac of approximately **25 bungalows** in a spacious, low-density setting. This proposal would effectively **double the number of homes** served by the Drive, introducing two-storey semi-detached houses and mews terraces at a density of approximately **33 dwellings per hectare**. This bears no resemblance to the existing character. The **Design and Access Statement** compares the density to the adjacent Brown Leaves Grove development (~32 dph), but Brown Leaves Grove lies *within* the settlement boundary and was approved through the development plan process. Using an approved infill scheme to justify a countryside extension is a flawed comparison.

The proposal would extend built form approximately **180 metres further south into open countryside** beyond the settlement boundary, introducing an urbanising suburban layout alien to Copster Green's rural character, contrary to **Key Statement EN2** (landscape protection) and **Policy DME2** (landscape and townscape protection).

7) Precedent

If this application is approved, the reasoning underpinning it — that Borough-wide housing need combined with the tilted balance justifies development outside any settlement boundary regardless of local services — would apply equally to **every Tier 2 village in Ribble Valley**. There would be no principled basis to refuse similar schemes in Read, Grindleton, Tosside, Bashall Eaves or any other small settlement. The spatial strategy of the Core Strategy would be rendered meaningless.

8) Conclusion

The proposal is **contrary to the Development Plan** and would cause **substantial harm**:

1. The site is an **unallocated greenfield site** outside the settlement boundary, in a village with **no services**, contrary to Core Strategy policies **DS1, DMG2 and DMH3**. No local need specific to Copster Green has been demonstrated. The Council's own officers warned the applicant at pre-application stage that housing here would **increase residents' cost of living**.
2. **Two previous appeal inspectors** have dismissed development on this site and adjacent land on identical sustainability and accessibility grounds. The physical characteristics of Copster Green that led to those decisions have not changed.
3. The pedestrian route to bus stops requires walking along an **unlit lane without footways** to reach hourly services on a fast-moving A-road. This is **unsafe and impractical**, particularly for elderly residents and those without cars.
4. The **Lead Local Flood Authority has formally objected**, identifying fundamental deficiencies in the drainage strategy against all three core National Standards. The applicant's own FRA acknowledges **existing surface water flooding** at the site's only access point.
5. The scheme fails to deliver the statutory **10% Biodiversity Net Gain**, with a recorded **deficit of 0.56 habitat units** and no off-site provision identified or secured.
6. The suburban estate layout would **double the built footprint** along Albany Drive and extend **180 metres into open countryside**, producing a form of development alien to Copster Green's rural character.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that RVBC **refuse** planning permission for application 3/2026/0214. Should the Council be minded to approve the scheme, I ask that it secure robust conditions and contributions to address drainage, biodiversity, highways and pedestrian safety impacts. However, given the fundamental policy conflict, the LLFA's formal objection and the site's established history of appeal dismissals, the only appropriate course is to refuse the application.

Yours faithfully,

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted name]

[Redacted title]

[Redacted address]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 14 April 2026 17:20
To: Planning
Subject: Planning application 3/2026/0214

⚠ 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 Sir/Madam,

I write to formally object to planning application 3/2026/0214 for the proposed development of 26 new houses at the end of Albany Drive, Copster Green.

My objection is based primarily on the significant and cumulative impact this development will have on the area, traffic, access, and local infrastructure.

Firstly, the construction phase itself will inevitably result in substantial disruption. The volume of heavy goods vehicles, construction traffic, and associated activity will place considerable strain on Albany Drive and surrounding roads, which are not well suited to sustained heavy vehicle use and are in poor repair today. This will create safety concerns and inconvenience for existing residents.

Secondly, there is already considerable pressure on the A59, particularly due to ongoing and recent developments in Whalley and Barrow. At peak times, access and egress from Lovely Hall Lane onto the A59 is already difficult and often congested. The additional traffic generated by a further 26 dwellings will only exacerbate this situation, increasing delays and the risk of accidents.

Thirdly, the proposed development will increase traffic flow onto Lovely Hall Lane itself, further compounding the existing challenges of safely entering and exiting the junction with the A59. This road network is already operating under strain, and further development risks pushing it beyond safe and practical limits.

Fourth the primary school already bring significant challenges at peak traffic times on a road that is not sized for 2 modern cars to pass and has a surface that has already significantly degraded over time with no footpaths for safe access.

Fifth the water supply to this area is already of a very low pressure standard and this development will add to that issue I am sure.

Finally, there is a broader concern regarding the cumulative impact of multiple developments across the Ribble Valley. Local infrastructure, including roads and essential services, does not appear to be keeping pace with the scale of housing growth. The lack of corresponding investment in facilities raises serious concerns about the sustainability of continued development in this area.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that the Council carefully considers the cumulative traffic and infrastructure impacts and refuses this application.

Yours faithfully,
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 14 April 2026 20:07
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2026/0214 FS-Case-827367208

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Lancashire

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2026/0214

Address of Development: Land at Albany Drive Copster Green BB1 9EH

Comments: We are writing to you to formally submit our objection to the above reference planning application for the proposed development of 26 Affordable Houses at the end of Albany Drive by the developer, Pringle Homes.

Our objection is based around us feeling that the area planned for development is not either appropriate or sustainable for the purpose of housing development.

As per a previous refusal for development on the same site, reference APP/T2350/W/15/3134524, it also concluded that the area is not sustainable with no evidence for any housing need in this area and that the proposal conflicted with the council's own core planning strategy. Since that application was refused there has been zero changes to the infrastructure in the area nor any of the previous surveys carried out have been revisited and reviewed.

Copster Green is a small rural village, sitting within a Tier 2 Boundary, with no local amenities, thereby any housing development would be heavily reliant upon a private car and thus proving that this development, as outlined, does not meet with sustainable housing criteria.

Our key objections to this development include the following.

- Conflict with key statement, EN2-Landscape.
The proposed development layout will erode the landscape value, affecting nationally identified protected flora and fauna. In particular, but not limited to, these include a preservation order on trees in this area, badgers located in this area, dormouse and harvest mouse populations in this area, newt habitats and evidence of living newts in this area, evidence of bat roosts in this area, barn owls in this area and using this vicinity as a feeding ground, roe deer in this area and fox in this area. If this development was to proceed this would cause significant environmental impact due to the loss of this green space, with the potential to eliminate these species from their habitats. Additionally, to this there would be significant environmental impact of noise and air pollution, particularly during the construction phase but longer terms due to habitat loss and increased traffic flow and artificial light pollution.

- Policy – DMG1 – General Considerations

The proposed scale and massing of this proposed development is excessive and over developed for the footprint of the plot of land allocated, with height and positioning of proposed housing impacting loss of privacy due to windows overlooking existing properties on Albany Drive and Brown Leaves Grove. There will be further issues with the proposed housing development causing light issues by overshadowing the existing properties due to close proximity to existing boundaries.

- Policy – DMG3 – Transport & Mobility

Additional vehicle movement from this development would exacerbate an already problematic and heavily congested traffic issue in the Copster Green area, particularly on Lovely Hall Lane in the area of Salesbury School and also at peak commuter times on the A59 which can be backed up to beyond Mrs Dowson's farm travelling East Bound and Sanctuary of Healing travelling Westbound.

There are additional concerns with highway and pedestrian safety in this area already. This is as a result of no street lighting along the full length of Lovely Hall Lane and with no footpaths on this road. This causes a significant safety issue, with evidence collected that demonstrates excessive car speeds along this stretch of highway. Additionally on Ribchester Road heading from the traffic lights to Salesbury there is an area of this road with no footpath and on a blind bend. Again, this poses a significant safety concern.

Regarding public transport routes in this area, the nearest bus stops on the A59 are located at the end of Brown Leaves Grove and Yu. This bus route is not heavily supported by regular buses. The 280 bus runs once per hour in both directions, weekdays & Saturdays and every 2 hours Sundays. The Number 45 bus to Blackburn runs on a similar frequency.

The nearest train stations for commuting are at Langho and Ramsgreave and Wilpshire. The nearest being Ramsgreave which is a 40 minute walk from Copster Green. Clearly this does not support easy and sustainable transport links without the need for a private vehicle or taxi to get to the train station.

- Policy – DME6 – Water Management

The application does not provide sufficient evidence that surface water runoff will be effectively managed. The LCC, RVBC and LLFA all state that the drainage in this area is insufficient to cope with additional demand from the new development.

The developers plan show rain water run off being diverted into the culvert that runs at the rear of the west side properties on Brown Leaves Grove. This is already an area of concern that the culvert, during heavy rainfall, rises significantly and has caused land erosion along the culvert edges. Equally the build up of rain water causes the culvert to over flow at the end of Brown Leaves Grove and floods the garden of the house on the A59 that is adjacent to Brown Leaves Grove. Further issues with rain water run off during high rainfall causes water to run from the field into and down the road of Brown Leaves Grove. The surface water drains cannot accommodate this water and therefore a torrent of water runs down the road and onto the A59.

Additional housing at the proposed development site would multiply this rain water because there would be no natural soak away into the permeable ground due to additional roads, foundations, properties etc.

- Infrastructure

The Pringle Homes proposal does not provide any up-to-date surveys or data that substantiates the need for affordable and sustainable housing in the Copster Green area. The area does not have the local amenities that Pringle Homes have quoted, that can be easily and safely reached on foot and in a timely manner. Footpaths and street lighting are limited, as per our previous comments in Transport

& Mobility bullet point above which, when all is considered, would require private vehicles.

Examples of the proximity of these amenities are as follows;

Nearest convenience store – Coop at Wilpshire – 40 minutes' walk away or the Spar at Langho 2.4 miles away/approx. 53min walk.

The nearest “True” post office is located at the Spar at Langho or in Whalley on King Street. Salesbury Memorial Hall hosts a one day per week for 2 hours only pop-up post office with a limited service.

Schools – the nearest junior school is Salesbury school on Lovely Hall Lane or alternatives in Langho and Billington.

The nearest High school is St Augustine's in Billington or alternatives in Blackburn, Clitheroe, Accrington, Longridge etc.

In summary, based on the above examples outlined we formally object to the proposed development. This development does not meet the sustainable or affordable homes criteria and will significantly impact the environment in the Copster Green area.

To: Development Management
Ribble Valley Borough Council
Re: Objection to Planning Application 3/2024/038300 – 26 Affordable Homes, Land
Adjacent to Copster Green

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to strongly object to the above planning application.

I am a resident at [REDACTED] and I am very concerned about the impact this development would have on our village and surrounding countryside.

I make the following points to support my objection.

Previous refusal on this site.

I understand that a similar proposal on this site has already been refused and dismissed at appeal. The Planning Inspector concluded that:

- The site is not a sustainable location for housing
- There was insufficient evidence of local need
- The proposal conflicted with the Core Strategy
-

As far as I am aware, nothing significant has changed since that decision, so I believe it should still carry considerable weight.

Conflict with planning policy.

The site lies outside the settlement boundary in open countryside, where housing is only allowed in very limited circumstances.

Although this proposal is described as affordable housing, I have not seen clear evidence that it meets a specific local need for Copster Green or nearby villages, which is required by policy.

For this reason, I believe the proposal is contrary to the Local Plan.

Unsustainable location.

From my experience living in the area:

- There are very limited local services and amenities
- There are no shops, leisure facilities or employment opportunities
- Public transport is infrequent and unreliable
- Most journeys require a car
- Walking and cycling are not realistic options due to lack of pavements, busy, unlit roads and the terrain is unsuitable for the very young, elderly or those with limited mobility

A development of this size in this location would increase reliance on cars, which is not sustainable.

Impact on the village and countryside.

This site is currently open land that contributes to the rural character of Copster Green.

The development would:

- Extend the village into the countryside
- Change its character
- Reduce the sense of openness

This would harm the appearance and setting of the village.

Scale of development.

A development of 26 houses is large for a village like Copster Green, particularly outside the settlement boundary. It would more than double the size of Albany Drive and increase properties in the immediate area by almost 20%. It would place additional pressure on local roads and infrastructure and would not be in keeping with the scale of the area. Flooding from rainfall and sewage is also a very real risk that the developers have not fully addressed.

Precedent.

I am concerned that approving this application would make it harder to refuse similar developments in the future, leading to further loss of countryside around the village.

Personal impact.

I have serious concerns regarding the proposal to discharge surface water into the existing watercourse bordering my property. This raises the following issues:

Increased risk of flooding to my property and surrounding land.

Potential overloading of the existing watercourse, particularly during periods of heavy rainfall.

Lack of clear evidence that the watercourse has sufficient capacity to accommodate additional runoff.

The application does not appear to provide adequate hydrological assessment or mitigation measures to demonstrate that flood risk will not be increased, contrary to national and local planning policies.

Increased water flow may lead to:

Erosion of the banks of the watercourse.

Damage to boundary structures and land stability.

Long-term deterioration of my property's condition and value.

The proposal may negatively affect the local environment by:

- Altering the natural flow and ecology of the watercourse.
- Increasing pollution from urban runoff (eg clay, silt, debris).

The application lacks sufficient detail regarding:

- Long-term maintenance responsibility for drainage infrastructure.
- Measures to prevent blockage or failure of the system.
- Contingency plans in the event of system failure or extreme weather events.

I have photographic evidence of the effect Brown Leaves Grove estate has had on this watercourse with several instances of water breaching the banks and flooding the gardens of the properties behind. At the time I was under the impression McDermott homes were obliged to maintain this to prevent these occurrences however it has been left to the local residents to clear debris etc. An additional 26 houses gives cause to significant concern that flooding will increase in both frequency and severity.

Conclusion.

While I understand the need for housing, I do not believe this is the right place for a development of this size.

For the reasons above, I respectfully ask that this application is refused.

Yours faithfully,

A solid black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 14 April 2026 21:49
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2026/0214 FS-Case-827385460

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Lancashire

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2026/0214

Address of Development: land off Albany Drive, Copster Green

Comments: Reasons for opposing this application -

1. Creating an increased 'Car dependant community' inconsistent with net zero goals.
2. Limited/insufficient transport links.
3. Lack of accessible local services and facilities, without using a car.
4. Increase in local population will contribute to overall traffic volume on nearby lanes.
5. I feel that the Transport/Traffic statement provided does not fully capture the observations and experiences of residents.

Ribchester road to the A59 via Lovely Hall Lane is increasingly being used as a 'rat run' this lane has no footpaths resulting in severe safety issues for pedestrians.

Backed up traffic queues exiting Lovely Hall Lane onto the A59 has resulted in a new extra 'rat run' through Copster Green resulting in a further deterioration of the Bridleway and safety concerns for the children playing on the green due to lack of pavements.

6. The regular overflowing of the culvert resulting in flooded neighbouring gardens. This development will only intensify this problem.

I also feel that the Flood Risk Assessment provided does not fully capture the observations and experiences of residents.

7. The current plans include open ended/stub roads ,signalling the potential for further development into adjoining countryside, resulting in overdevelopment of the area.
8. The loss of countryside and the continual loss of natural habitat for the ever depleting wildlife.

This land benefits from an array of wildlife, including Badgers

While I do understand the need for new housing, I believe that this Housing Development is wholly inappropriate for this location.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 14 April 2026 22:30
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2026/0214 FS-Case-827405101

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Lancashire

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2026/0214

Address of Development: Land at Albany Drive Copster Green BB1 9EH

Comments: I object to this planning proposal for the following reasons:

Design and appearance of the proposal.

The proposal includes a number of two story homes that is not in keeping with Albany drive that consists of bungalows. It would also significantly increase the throughput in Albany drive which is currently a cup de sac.

Traffic & Road Safety

The proposal does not adequately assess the impact of traffic and road safety. Lovely hall lane has no footpaths on either side near the proposed site. It also does not have street lighting. It is therefore unsuitable for pedestrian access to the closest primary school. Lovely hall lane is frequently congested at the start and end of school, and a number of concerns have been raised by the school to parents regarding road safety. A voluntary one way system is in effect during these times, highlighting the strain already on the local road network.

Environmental Impact

The proposal does not properly assess the impact to the surrounding areas regarding surface water drainage. The development proposal fails to adequately take into consideration its impact on the local environment.



14th April 2026

Ms Nicola Hopkins
RVBC
Council Offices
Church Walk
Clitheroe
Bb7 2RA

Planning Application No. 3/2026/0214
Location: Land at Albany Drive, Copster Green, BB1 9EH

Dear Ms Hopkins

We would like to express our concerns and objections to the proposed housing development of 26 properties off Albany Drive, Copster Green,

Water Egress

We live [redacted], and [redacted]. Currently when we have days of continuous rain or a heavy down pour, [redacted], that then pools at the [redacted], we have had to have raised decking installed that goes above the flooding, so that we can continue to use the garden in all weathers.

As the field does not have soak away, we fear that when the houses are built this situation can only worsen. I have attached in this email a video of the water coming off the field 2 weeks ago, we were [redacted] but this is on [redacted], that [redacted], you can see that water is beginning to build up from the field to [redacted] and is starting to flood two of [redacted]

Footpath Concerns

There is currently no footpath along Lovely Hall Lane from the proposed development to the bus stops on the A59, Longsight Road. Upon reaching the A59, the existing pavement is so narrow that it is impossible to walk side by side; I must have [redacted] in front of me as there simply isn't enough space. You could not walk with a pram or use a wheelchair. The proximity to passing heavy goods vehicles is extremely unnerving, as you can feel the draught as they speed by. The speed limit of 40 mph is far too high for such conditions, making the journey both hazardous and deeply stressful.

Walking from Albany Drive to Salesbury is extremely hazardous due to the absence of a footpath along this busy road. The route features two blind bends and a blind summit, significantly reducing visibility for both pedestrians and drivers. Furthermore, most of the stretch lacks street lighting, making it even more dangerous, especially in poor weather or during the darker hours. This poses a serious risk not only to adults but also to children who need to walk to and from school.

Vehicles are noted speeding up and down Lovely Hall Lane, this can be seen evidenced in the latest Parish News letter.

Please note that I have attached a video and photos of both blind bends and the blind brow / summit, you will notice in the video that I was seen at the last second and the car had to move across the road to pass me.

Amenities

It is important to highlight that the area does not have any of the following amenities:

-

- Doctors – the nearest would be Brownhill Surgery, who were at full capacity only 6 months ago, they would have to take all the new residents, up to approximately 75 as it is out of area for Whalley Surgery.
- Shops – The nearest shop is the Co-op in Wilpshire, which when walking takes an hour and 10 minutes. Considering that several of the houses will be affordable housing, it cannot be assumed that everyone has a car.
- Post Office – Although there is a pop-up Post Office in Salesbury, it is only for 2 hours on a Monday, so not fit for purpose for all residents.
- Schools – St Leonards primary school has been oversubscribed for the last 4 years, and St Augustine's Secondary school is 54 over capacity, therefore choice of schools is limited.

The above bullet points make it impossible for sustainable travel.

Tier 2 Settlement Boundary

The Tier 2 settlement boundary is intended to designate settlements according to their population size and the range of services available, with the aim of managing growth and promoting sustainable development. This boundary guides new development towards locations deemed most appropriate and sustainable. However, in the case of Copster Green, there is no evidence to demonstrate that these criteria are met. As such, Copster Green cannot be considered a suitable location for this proposed development.

Traffic Congestion: Access onto the A59 and at the top of Lovely Hall Lane

The top of Lovely Hall Lane regularly suffers severe congestion, particularly during school drop-off and pick-up times. Parents often park far down the lane while waiting for their children, creating a bottleneck where vehicles struggle to pass each other. This frequently leads to disputes between drivers and makes it almost impossible to

pull over to allow oncoming traffic through. The addition of further vehicles would only exacerbate these issues.

Outside peak hours, exiting Lovely Hall Lane onto the A59 is generally manageable, with minimal waiting times. However, during the morning rush, traffic queues stretch from Ribchester Traffic Lights past the Yu restaurant and extend for approximately half a mile down the hill, making it extremely challenging to join the main road.

Residents leaving Brown Leaves Grove and Lovely Hall Lane in the morning must rely on the courtesy of multiple drivers to be let out. At school times, traffic also backs up onto Lovely Hall Lane itself, further complicating access to the A59.

Transport Links

Access to public transport in the area is highly inadequate for the needs of new residents. Wilpshire train station is located over an hour's walk away, presenting a significant barrier for those without private vehicles. Even for drivers, parking at Wilpshire station is extremely limited; spaces are frequently unavailable, forcing commuters to travel further afield to Blackburn to find suitable parking.

Bus services are sporadic, with long intervals between buses and no service at all after 19:00. This leaves residents facing lengthy waits if a bus is missed, and effectively excludes those working shifts, studying late, or attending evening appointments from relying on public transport. The lack of evening buses severely restricts opportunities for employment, education, and social engagement, undermining the principles of sustainable development and accessibility for all.

Protected Wildlife

Bats

The area is home to a thriving population of bats, which we frequently observe on warm summer evenings as they emerge from the field and swoop towards their bat boxes. The proposed development would not only destroy a vital feeding ground and territory for these bats, but increased light pollution would further disrupt their nocturnal behaviour, placing additional stress on this protected species.

Barn Owl

A magnificent Barn Owl regularly hunts in the surrounding fields, relying on this habitat for its foraging needs. Any loss of these open spaces would severely impact the owl's ability to find prey and could threaten its continued presence in the area.

Badgers, Hedgehogs, and Foxes

A qualified zoologist residing on Albany Drive, adjacent to the field, has recorded substantial badger activity using a night camera in his garden, amassing over 3,000 photographs of badgers. He has also documented the presence of hedgehogs and foxes, demonstrating the ecological importance of this site as a wildlife corridor and sanctuary. The loss of this field would have a devastating effect on these animals, depriving them of habitat and food sources.

Application / Appeal Ref: T2350/A/14/2222255

The previous Planning Application for this area was declined, and I see no meaningful changes in the reasons for its dismissal, except for the reduction of six dwellings. The core issues remain unresolved.

In conclusion

This area is wholly unsuitable for the development of 26 dwellings. Such a proposal would irreparably damage the beautiful countryside, exacerbate traffic congestion, and heighten the risk of accidents. The site's unsustainable location, with limited amenities and inadequate transport links particularly infrequent buses and minimal parking, would make daily life challenging for residents, especially those working shifts. Furthermore, the loss of this field would have a detrimental impact on local wildlife, including bats, barn owls, badgers, hedgehogs, and foxes, threatening their habitats and food sources.

For these reasons, we urge you along with your committee members to uphold the previous decision and reject this application.

Yours sincerely

A solid black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area.

[Redacted]

From: [Redacted]
Sent: 14 April 2026 22:46
To: Planning
Subject: Video of flooding
Attachments: [Redacted]

⚠ 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 Hopkins

Please see video to consider when reviewing our objection to the proposed housing development off Albany Drive, Copster Green.

This video shows the extent of flooding just after a short period of rain.

Thank you

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[REDACTED]

From:

Sent:

[REDACTED]
14 April 2026 22:51

To:

Planning

Subject:

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

⚠ 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 Hopkins

Please see attached video which strengthens our objection for the building of 26 new builds off Albany Drive, Copster Green.

This video shows one of the hazards when walking up Lovely Hall Lane, the brow /summit is a blind spot for pedestrians and drivers.

Kind Regards

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]