

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 13 April 2026 16:07
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2026/0214 FS-Case-826710502

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Lancashire

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2026/0214

Address of Development: Albany Drive

Comments: We are objecting to the proposed building of 26 new homes on farm land off Albany Drive.

Our objections are.

1/ The increase in traffic flow along Lovely Hall Lane which does not have pavements for pedestrians. This will result in a significant danger to pedestrians safety.

2/ Salesbury Primary School which is located on Lovely Hall Lane parking at the start and end of the school day results in parents already parking on the lane and extends down to Lovely Hall. This results in single file traffic only and means parents with children walking in the road which is already very dangerous.

3/ The lack of local amenities ie doctors surgery's,shops etc.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 13 April 2026 18:33
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2026/0214 FS-Case-826781842

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Lancashire

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2026/0214

Address of Development: Land at Albany Drive, Copster Green.

Comments: I strongly object to this application, Access to this site is only available via a small lane, onto Lovely hall Lane, traffic is queuing daily to access the A59 without the need for possibly 52 extra vehicles. The A59 can hardly cope now with the amount of traffic in a morning and evening with traffic often queuing back to Osbsldeston and Northcote Manor.

Lovely hall lane, does not have a safe footpath/ pavement all the way to the school. Neither can the school cope with any more pupils.

Nothing has changed since the last planning application was made to build houses on this land which was refused due to the amount of traffic flow.

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 13 April 2026 19:23
To: Planning
Subject: 3/2026/0214 - Planning Application Comments

⚠ 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.

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, and which **every single resident** who responded to the applicant's own consultation also raised. My objections are detailed below and supported with references to the applicant's own documents and the LLFA's consultation response.

1) The applicant's own consultation produced 31 unanimous objections

The applicant's **Statement of Community Involvement** (Sections 3.13–3.16) confirms that an information leaflet was circulated to approximately **60 properties** across Albany Drive, Brown Leaves Grove, Longsight Road and Lovely Hall Lane in February 2026. The applicant received **31 responses** - and **all 31 expressed objection to the proposal**. Not one resident voiced support.

The applicant's own SCI summarises the community's concerns as: *site sustainability and location, strain on local infrastructure and services, environmental impacts, highway and parking concerns, and impacts to local character*. This represents a **100% objection rate** from the residents the applicant chose to consult. The **ward councillor** was also notified by the applicant in February 2026 and did not respond. The application has proceeded in the face of unanimous local opposition. This unbroken weight of community evidence is a material consideration in its own right and underlines that the planning concerns set out below are not isolated views.

2) 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.

The Council's own officers identified this problem before the application was submitted. The pre-application response from RVBC (ref: **RV/2024/ENQ/00109**), issued on **12 February 2025** and disclosed at **Section 1.7** of the Planning Statement and Section 3.6 of the SCI, 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.

3) The application is an opportunistic response to the housing supply position

At **Section 3.8** of the SCI, the applicant explicitly states that at the time of the pre-application response (12 February 2025), *"RVBC were able to evidence a 5-year housing land supply resulting in the referenced policies being considered up to date"*. At Section 3.9, the applicant confirms the scheme was progressed regardless, *"with further supporting justifications provided to address feedback points"* and with *"an updated position in respect of the Council's housing land supply"* to be relied upon.

This is a candid admission that the application is not a response to a **local need** - it is an attempt to exploit the **subsequent erosion** of the Borough's housing land supply position (now 3.45 years following the Chatburn appeal) to overcome a refusal that was anticipated under up-to-date policy. The site's sustainability characteristics have not changed. The advice that this location would harm its own residents has not changed. Only the applicant's tactical opportunity has changed. The tilted balance under **NPPF paragraph 11(d)** is not a mechanism for retrofitting policy compliance onto schemes that have already been advised against on their substantive merits.

4) 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/14/2222255**) 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**.

5) 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.

6) 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.

7) 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.

8) 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).

9) 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.

10) Conclusion

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

- The applicant's own consultation produced **31 unanimous objections** from local residents, with no support recorded. The ward councillor did not respond. The application has proceeded despite a 100% objection rate at the developer's own consultation.
- 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 on 12 February 2025 that housing here would **increase residents' cost of living**.
- The application is an **opportunistic submission** relying on a subsequent change in the Borough's housing land supply position rather than addressing the substantive sustainability concerns raised at pre-application stage.
- **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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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. Given the fundamental policy conflict, the LLFA's formal objection, the unanimous community opposition recorded in the applicant's own SCI, and the site's established history of appeal dismissals, the only appropriate course is to refuse the application.

Yours faithfully,



[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 13 April 2026 20:22
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/20260214 FS-Case-826828621

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Lancashire

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/20260214

Address of Development: Albany Drive Salesbury Copster Green BB1 9EH

Comments: I note that a very similar application was refused on appeal - ref 3/2014/0307, and I refer to extracts below from the appeal decision document regarding this. It is my belief that nothing has changed since the 2014 refused application, so the current application should also be refused on the same basis:

Sustainable Pattern of Development

7. The Framework recognises the need to locate significant development in sustainable and accessible locations as a core planning principle and seeks to locate rural housing where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. In general, new residential development is most appropriate in locations where there is access to services, opportunities for employment and alternative modes of transport than the private car (paragraphs 30 and 37).

8. As part of the proposed modifications to the Core Strategy the Council have produced an assessment of the more sustainable settlements and patterns of development with its Development Strategy. This assesses available facilities and services, constraints and capacity for growth. The relative weightings given to each of the sustainability variables is not explicit and the Council acknowledges that, particularly in relation to information on the nature of local facilities and some local bus services, the approach is necessarily broadbrush. Nonetheless, it is clear from the analysis that the settlements in the Borough vary greatly in terms of size, their level of facilities and their accessibility.

9. Copster Green has a day nursery and a restaurant. It has no shop, post office or pub and the local primary school is located in Salesbury at a distance where families with younger children are more likely to drive. The local bus service provides some links to larger local settlements, however, services at peak commuting times are limited.

10. The Framework acknowledges that opportunities to travel by sustainable means, and to minimise journey lengths will vary from urban to rural areas and in this regard I note the appellants' view that an assessment of sustainability should take account of the proximity of services available in adjoining settlements, and the relative distance travelled by private car. Nevertheless, in

relation to Copster Green, the absence of any notable local services would require residents to travel outside the village for even basic needs, and they would be largely dependent upon the private car to do so. Although the proposal might not, of itself, generate very large amounts of traffic, the cumulative effect of allowing such development in the countryside would increase the amount of unsustainable journeys made. Furthermore, in the absence of any notable local services, new residential development would not help sustain existing facilities or contribute to vitality.

11. Taking these factors into account I conclude that the proposal would perpetuate an unsustainable pattern of development which would conflict with guidance within paragraphs 30 and 37 of the Framework.

Housing Land Supply

12. There is no date, as yet, for the Inspectors Report on the Modifications to the Core Strategy to be submitted. At the time of the hearing there was therefore no definitive position in relation to housing supply and it was a matter of dispute between the parties.

Other Matters

20. The matter of how the site would be drained was a matter of particular concern to residents of Albany Drive. Whilst I note that statutory undertakers may have particular requirements from a potential developer in relation to how the site is drained, based on the evidence before me I have no reason to conclude that an effective means of draining the site could not be found, or that it would preclude the development of the site in principle.

21. Finally, I have also considered the Council's argument that the current proposal would set a precedent for similar developments. My findings on this case relate to the specific circumstances of the proposed development, and I have dealt with it according to its individual merits. Nonetheless, I noted during the site visit that another parcel of land on Albany Drive is effectively landlocked by the appeal proposal. I can appreciate the residents and Council's concern that the approval of this proposal could be used in support of further development, the cumulative effect of which would exacerbate the unsustainable pattern of development and the harm arising from it which is outlined above. This adds weight to my conclusions in relation to the matter of a sustainable pattern of development.

My summary and comments based generally on the 2024 appeal decision:

In my view, nothing has changed since the application in 2014 and believe that the development proposed would not be accessible and would perpetuate an unsustainable pattern of development which the Framework seeks to resist. Granting permission for it would also make it more difficult for the Council to resist other similar unsustainable development in the locality. The benefits to housing supply would not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the harm that perpetuating an unsustainable pattern of development would cause. The development could not therefore be considered a sustainable development when assessed against the Framework as a whole.

Furthermore, the proposed development application states that the dwellings will be "affordable". How can the proposed detached houses be deemed affordable in such a prosperous upmarket highly gentrified locality in the borough?

I therefore conclude that taking into account the mutually dependant social, environmental and economic aspects of the development, the proposal would not comprise sustainable development as defined by the Framework. Having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the application should be refused.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 13 April 2026 20:34
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2026/0214 FS-Case-826834847

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Lancashire

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2026/0214

Address of Development: Land near Albany Drive , Copster Green. BB1 9EH

Comments: Hi,

I am responding on behalf of [REDACTED] to the above application. We have concerns due to the presence of setts in this area. Our records show that there are 7 setts within a 2km radius, one that is 0.75kms and another that is 1.32kms, from the centre of the proposed site. The badgers will have access to this green field site at present. Any reduction in foraging area will have an impact on the number of badgers.

It is unacceptable to isolate badgers from their foraging area, or in this case remove it completely. There is clearly an active badger group around this site and given this information, we would hope that the relevant surveys/investigations are carried out before this request is determined, and appropriate mitigation put in place dependant on what is found.

We would be happy to work with yourselves and the developer to ensure the best outcome for the badgers.

Yours faithfully

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 13 April 2026 21:05
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2026/0214 FS-Case-826847377

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Lancashire

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2026/0214

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

Comments: I would like to make the following points in relation to this application 3/2026/0214 land off Albany Drive :

- Copster Green is a small tier 2 hamlet not suitable for sustainable or affordable housing due to the lack of local amenities such as a school, shop, medical services, a post office, pub or convenient public transport. All these services are currently accessed by Copster Green residents by car since they cannot be accessed safely and easily on foot, by bus or by bike, contrary to what the applicant is implying. It is illogical to suggest that new residents would access these services in any other way than by car. Copster Green is not a sustainable location and the proposal goes against the Core Strategy.
- Ribble Valley Borough Council has not carried out a recent survey to assess the need for local housing, and without up-to-date figures, it is unclear how any such need can be demonstrated.
- The nearest Ribble Valley Health Centre is Whalley. However, Whalley practise will not accept new patients from Copster Green, due to its services already being over stretched (I know this since I used to be a patient at Whalley Health Centre, but when I moved to Albany Drive I was informed I was no longer in their catchment area.)The only alternative Health Centre still accepting patients is in the centre of Blackburn, 4 miles away and not on a bus route from Copster Green.
- The local primary school is over half a mile away on Lovely Hall Lane. There is no paved footpath and it has no street lighting. This would be a very hazardous walk, twice per day, for a mother and her children. The alternative would be to use a car. Parents have no option but to park on Lovely Hall Lane when dropping off and collecting their children, making the lane single track and extremely dangerous for pedestrians. There is currently a one-way system in place during school times to try to alleviate the problem. More houses in Copster Green would only add to the existing problem.
- People who tend to buy affordable houses tend to be on low income and need to be careful with their money. The round trip to school, via the one-way system in place, is 2 miles, meaning parents would do 4 miles per day, 20 miles per week. Based on current HMRC figures, this would cost £9 per

week in transport cost.

- Albany Drive is a quiet cul-de-sac where children are free to play and where residents confined to wheelchairs are able to get around. I am deeply concerned about the impact this project would have on the quality of life of those living nearby. Construction activities involve prolonged periods of loud noise, heavy machinery and increased traffic, which is highly disruptive.
- The proposed development would double the size of Albany Drive which is a substantial increase in the number of houses and number of vehicles using the narrow road.
- The proposed site is currently fields used for grazing horses. There is an abundance of wildlife in the vicinity including, deer, foxes, badgers, newts, hazel dormice and a host of birds including woodpeckers, greenfinches and owls. Building on this land would permanently and irrevocably change the landscape, resulting in the loss of wildlife habitats. The ecology report submitted fails to mention any of these species, including those which are protected.

I would like to highlight the following errors in various reports submitted by the applicant, which make me wonder if anyone has actually visited the proposed site.

- In the Design and Access statement 2.0 it states, “Copster Green is a small village.” Copster Green comprises of houses and one award winning restaurant; it is clearly NOT a village since it has no amenities. It also states, “The site is currently accessed directly from Albany Drive which leads directly to the A59 Longsight Road connecting Preston to Blackburn.” Albany Drive does NOT have direct access to the A59 road. In addition, the A59 does NOT connect Preston to Blackburn.
- The Transport Planning Document submitted by the applicant makes various statements that are ridiculous. Firstly, it states the proposed houses are “in walking distance of Copster Green Village”. As already mentioned, there is no village to walk to. It also states the houses will be in walking distance of Salesbury Village where there is a school and a post office. What it fails to state, is that Lovely Hall Lane, the only direct road to Salesbury, has no footpaths and no street lighting. It would be highly dangerous to try and walk up this steep hill with young children and possibly a pram to the local school, especially in the winter months on a unlit road with no footpaths. It is a 22 minute walk each way. It also fails to state that the pop up post office is only open 2 hours per week, so can barely be classed as a local amenity. It also fails to state there is no shop in Salesbury Village.
- The Transport Planning Document also states “the local area benefits from street lights and footpaths on both sides of the carriageway” suggesting residents can walk rather than require a car. As mentioned, Lovely Hall Lane, which is the road residents would need to walk along to reach the villages of Salesbury and Wilpshire and the train station does not benefit from either of these things. The only road in the vicinity with pavements and streetlights is the A59 road. A walk to the nearest village of Langho along this road is a 4.6 mile round trip. Hardly feasible when carrying shopping.
- The Transport Planning Document also suggests residents would be able to use public transport to access local towns such a Blackburn for work. The infrequency of the buses and lack of connections to the industrial parts of Blackburn make this impossible and it is definitely not a 60 minute commute as suggested in the document.
- The Transport Planning Document also states that cycling would be an alternative option for transport to car use. The residents would need to be extremely fit if they were to cycle up a steep hill daily to reach the villages of Salesbury and Wilpshire or the train station or the town of Blackburn.

The proposal would lead to the creation of new dwellings in the open countryside without sufficient justification. It would also create a harmful precedent for the acceptance of other similar proposals, which the property developers are clearly considering, since the plans include roads into an empty fields, marked on the plans as “potential secondary access.” I hope you are able to take my objections into consideration when discussing the proposed development.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 13 April 2026 21:10
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2026/0214 FS-Case-826849894

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Lancashire

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2026/0214

Address of Development: Land adjacent to Albany Drive BB1 9EH

Comments: Application number: 3/2026/0214 land adjacent to Albany Drive

Thank you for reading the comments below

I strongly object to the application for 26 dwellings on the land adjacent to Albany Drive for the following reasons:

- Firstly, I have noticed that in various documents including the “Design & Access Statement” and “Transport Planning Document” submitted by the applicant, refer to Copster Green as a village. Copster Green has no school, no church, no shops, no communal facilities and only one awarding winning expensive restaurant (average £59 per head). Copster Green is therefore a hamlet, NOT a village.
- The access to the proposed development is via Albany Drive, a quiet residential road. The building works would result in noise pollution for Albany drive residents and congestion on the narrow road from HGVs using it. In addition Lovely Hall Lane is a narrow lane not suitable for the number of HGV vehicles needed to build such a large development.
- The scale of the proposed development would result in more than double the number of houses currently on Albany Drive. This is a substantial increase.
- Ribble Valley Borough Council has not carried out a recent survey to assess the need for local housing, and without up-to-date figures, it is unclear how any such need can be demonstrated. Copster Green is not a sustainable location and therefore conflicts with the core strategy.
- The proposed building work is on land currently used for grazing. Local residents report seeing wildlife daily such as deer, foxes, woodpeckers, badgers, newts and hazel dormice, despite the ecology report submitted suggesting there are no animals of significance. The habitat for these animals would be lost for ever. Is this the legacy we are leaving for our children? No green spaces.
- 26 new dwellings would result in at least 52 more cars using Albany Drive daily, plus countless

delivery vans. Albany Drive leads onto Lovely Hall Lane. The junction of Lovely Hall Lane and the A59 is very busy, especially at peak times and the addition of more cars would only exasperate the problem. In addition, there is an extremely difficult and hazardous junction where Lovely Hall Lane meets Ribchester road. To reach the local shops residents would need to go through this junction.

- It is my understanding that sustainable developments should be in places where residents can easily access schools, shops, healthcare, public transport and jobs. Copster Green is definitely not easily accessible on public transport, residents would need a car. This goes against the principles of sustainable housing. I would also question whether residents, who live in affordable houses, can always afford to buy and maintain a car.
- I understand the houses are affordable houses aimed at families. The “Design and Access Statement” refers to the local school, Salesbury School. It is 0.7 miles away, but due to traffic and parking issues, a one way system is in place during school hours (Please see LCC road sign on the school car park) so residents would be asked to drive up Ribchester Road and down Lovely Hall Lane, a total of 2.4 miles per day, 12.5 miles per week. In the current climate, is this sustainable for a family who needs help to get on the property ladder?
- The proposed doctor’s surgery is in Brownhill, a 4 mile round trip up hill. The only way to get there would be by car, despite the Transport Planning Document suggesting it would be possible to reach it via bus.
- The Lead Local Flood Authority has many objections about this development, since the drainage strategy is inadequate. Albany drive residents frequently have blocked drains. Adding more houses would further exasperate this issue. In addition, residents of “Brown Leaves” development and residents on the A59 regularly report surface water flooding and problems with the culvert being unable to handle the volume of water, resulting in more flooding. The proposed development would add to the already serious drainage issue that I understand the council is already aware of.
- The Transport Planning Document submitted by the applicant makes various statements that I would like to contest. Firstly, it states the proposed houses are “in walking distance of Copster Green Village”. As already mentioned, there is no village to walk to. It also states the houses will be in walking distance of Salesbury Village where there is a school and a post office. What it fails to state, is that Lovely Hall Lane, the only direct road to Salesbury, has no footpaths and no street lighting. It would be highly dangerous to try and walk up this steep hill with young children and possibly a pram to the local school, especially in the winter months on a unlit road with no footpaths. It is a 22 minute walk each way. It also fails to state that the pop up post office is only open a few hours per week, so can barely be classed as a local amenity. It also fails to state there is no shop in Salesbury.
- The Transport Planning Document also states “the local area benefits from street lights and footpaths on both sides of the carriageway” suggesting residents can walk rather than require a car. As mentioned, Lovely Hall Lane, which is the road residents would need to walk along to reach the villages of Salesbury and Wilpshire and the train station does not benefit from either of these things. The only road in the vicinity with pavements and streetlights is the A59 road. A walk to the nearest village of Langho along this road is a 4.6 mile round trip. Hardly feasible when carrying shopping.
- The Transport Planning Document also suggests residents would be able to use public transport to access local towns such as Blackburn for work. The infrequency of the buses and lack of connections

make this impossible and it is definitely not a 60 minute commute as suggested in the document. I know because my son found it impossible to get to work in Blackburn on public transport from the village of Salesbury.

- The Transport Planning Document also states that cycling would be an alternative option for transport to car use. The residents would need to be extremely fit if they were to cycle up a steep hill daily to reach the villages of Salesbury and Wilpshire or the train station or the town of Blackburn.

In conclusion, I strongly object to this application on the grounds of it not being in a sustainable area, transport and traffic issues, drainage issues and the effects on the local ecology.

[REDACTED]



Application number: 3/2026/0214 land adjacent to Albany Drive

Thank you for reading the comments below

I strongly object to the application for 26 dwellings on the land adjacent to Albany Drive for the following reasons:

- Firstly, I have noticed that in various documents including the “Design & Access Statement” and “Transport Planning Document” submitted by the applicant, refer to Copster Green as a village. Copster Green has no school, no church, no shops, no communal facilities and only one awarding winning expensive restaurant (average £59 per head). Copster Green is therefore a hamlet, NOT a village.
- The access to the proposed development is via Albany Drive, a quiet residential road. The building works would result in noise pollution for Albany drive residents and congestion on the narrow road from HGVs using it. In addition Lovely Hall Lane is a narrow lane not suitable for the number of HGV vehicles needed to build such a large development.
- The scale of the proposed development would result in more than double the number of houses currently on Albany Drive. This is a substantial increase.
- Ribble Valley Borough Council has not carried out a recent survey to assess the need for local housing, and without up-to-date figures, it is unclear how any such need can be demonstrated. Copster Green is not a sustainable location and therefore conflicts with the core strategy.
- The proposed building work is on land currently used for grazing. Local residents report seeing wildlife daily such as deer, foxes, woodpeckers, badgers, newts and hazel dormice, despite the ecology report submitted suggesting there are no animals of significance. The habitat for these animals would be lost for ever. Is this the legacy we are leaving for our children? No green spaces.
- 26 new dwellings would result in at least 52 more cars using Albany Drive daily, plus countless delivery vans. Albany Drive leads onto Lovely Hall Lane. The junction of Lovely Hall Lane and the A59 is very busy, especially at peak times and the addition of more cars would only exasperate the problem. In addition, there is an extremely difficult and hazardous junction where Lovely Hall Lane meets Ribchester road. To reach the local shops residents would need to go through this junction.

- It is my understanding that sustainable developments should be in places where residents can easily access schools, shops, healthcare, public transport and jobs. Copster Green is definitely not easily accessible on public transport, residents would need a car. This goes against the principles of sustainable housing. I would also question whether residents, who live in affordable houses, can always afford to buy and maintain a car.
- I understand the houses are affordable houses aimed at families. The “Design and Access Statement” refers to the local school, Salesbury School. It is 0.7 miles away, but due to traffic and parking issues, a one way system is in place during school hours (Please see LCC road sign on the school car park) so residents would be asked to drive up Ribchester Road and down Lovely Hall Lane, a total of 2.4 miles per day, 12.5 miles per week. In the current climate, is this sustainable for a family who needs help to get on the property ladder?
- The proposed doctor’s surgery is in Brownhill, a 4 mile round trip up hill. The only way to get there would be by car, despite the Transport Planning Document suggesting it would be possible to reach it via bus.
- The Lead Local Flood Authority has many objections about this development, since the drainage strategy is inadequate. Albany drive residents frequently have blocked drains. Adding more house would further exasperate this issue. In addition, residents of “Brown Leaves” development and residents on the A59 regularly report surface water flooding and problems with the culvert being unable to handle the volume of water, resulting in more flooding. The proposed development would add to the already serious drainage issue that I understand the council is already aware of.
- The Transport Planning Document submitted by the applicant makes various statements that I would like to contest. Firstly, it states the proposed houses are “in walking distance of Copster Green Village”. As already mentioned, there is no village to walk to. It also states the houses will be in walking distance of Salesbury Village where there is a school and a post office. What it fails to state, is that Lovely Hall Lane, the only direct road to Salesbury, has no footpaths and no street lighting. It would be highly dangerous to try and walk up this steep hill with young children and possibly a pram to the local school, especially in the winter months on a unlit road with no footpaths. It is a 22 minute walk each way. It also fails to state that the pop up post office is only open a few hours per week, so can barely be classed as a local amenity. It also fails to state there is no shop in Salesbury.
- The Transport Planning Document also states “the local area benefits from street lights and footpaths on both sides of the carriageway” suggesting residents can walk rather than require a car. As mentioned, Lovely Hall Lane, which is the road residents would need to walk along to reach the villages of Salesbury and Wilpshire and the train station does not benefit from either of these things. The only road in the vicinity with pavements and streetlights is the A59 road. A walk to the nearest village of Langho along this road is a 4.6 mile round trip. Hardly feasible when carrying shopping.

- The Transport Planning Document also suggests residents would be able to use public transport to access local towns such as Blackburn for work. The infrequency of the buses and lack of connections make this impossible and it is definitely not a 60 minute commute as suggested in the document. I know because my son found it impossible to get to work in Blackburn on public transport from the village of Salesbury.
- The Transport Planning Document also states that cycling would be an alternative option for transport to car use. The residents would need to be extremely fit if they were to cycle up a steep hill daily to reach the villages of Salesbury and Wilpshire or the train station or the town of Blackburn.

In conclusion, I strongly object to this application on the grounds of it not being in a sustainable area, transport and traffic issues, drainage issues and the effects on the local ecology.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

I would like to make the following points in relation to this application [3/2026/0214](#) **land off Albany Drive** :

- Copster Green is a small tier 2 hamlet not suitable for sustainable or affordable housing due to the lack of local amenities such as a school, shop, medical services, a post office, pub or convenient public transport. All these services are currently accessed by Copster Green residents by car since they cannot be accessed safely and easily on foot, by bus or by bike, contrary to what the applicant is implying. It is illogical to suggest that new residents would access these services in any other way than by car. Copster Green is not a sustainable location and the proposal goes against the Core Strategy.
- Ribble Valley Borough Council has not carried out a recent survey to assess the need for local housing, and without up-to-date figures, it is unclear how any such need can be demonstrated.
- The nearest Ribble Valley Health Centre is Whalley. However, Whalley practise will not accept new patients from Copster Green, due to its services already being over stretched (I know this since I used to be a patient at Whalley Health Centre, but when I moved to Albany Drive I was informed I was no longer in their catchment area.)The only alternative Health Centre still accepting patients is in the centre of Blackburn, 4 miles away and not on a bus route from Copster Green.
- The local primary school is over half a mile away on Lovely Hall Lane. There is no paved footpath and it has no street lighting. This would be a very hazardous walk, twice per day, for a mother and her children. The alternative would be to use a car. Parents have no option but to park on Lovely Hall Lane when dropping off and collecting their children, making the lane single track and extremely dangerous for pedestrians. There is currently a one-way system in place during school times to try to alleviate the problem. More houses in Copster Green would only add to the existing problem.
- People who tend to buy affordable houses tend to be on low income and need to be careful with their money. The round trip to school, via the one-way system in place, is 2 miles, meaning parents would do 4 miles per day, 20 miles per week. Based on current HMRC figures, this would cost £9 per week in transport cost.
- Albany Drive is a quiet cul-de-sac where children are free to play and where residents confined to wheelchairs are able to get around. I am deeply concerned about the impact this project would have on the quality of life of those living nearby. Construction activities involve prolonged periods of loud noise, heavy machinery and increased traffic, which is highly disruptive.

- The proposed development would double the size of Albany Drive which is a substantial increase in the number of houses and number of vehicles using the narrow road.
- The proposed site is currently fields used for grazing horses. There is an abundance of wildlife in the vicinity including, deer, foxes, badgers, newts, hazel dormice and a host of birds including woodpeckers, greenfinches and owls. Building on this land would permanently and irrevocably change the landscape, resulting in the loss of wildlife habitats. The ecology report submitted fails to mention any of these species, including those which are protected.

I would like to highlight the following errors in various reports submitted by the applicant, which make me wonder if anyone has actually visited the proposed site.

- In the Design and Access statement 2.0 it states, "Copster Green is a small village." Copster Green comprises of houses and one award winning restaurant; it is clearly NOT a village since it has no amenities. It also states, "The site is currently accessed directly from Albany Drive which leads directly to the A59 Longsight Road connecting Preston to Blackburn." Albany Drive does NOT have direct access to the A59 road. In addition, the A59 does NOT connect Preston to Blackburn.
- The Transport Planning Document submitted by the applicant makes various statements that are ridiculous. Firstly, it states the proposed houses are "in walking distance of Copster Green Village". As already mentioned, there is no village to walk to. It also states the houses will be in walking distance of Salesbury Village where there is a school and a post office. What it fails to state, is that Lovely Hall Lane, the only direct road to Salesbury, has no footpaths and no street lighting. It would be highly dangerous to try and walk up this steep hill with young children and possibly a pram to the local school, especially in the winter months on a unlit road with no footpaths. It is a 22 minute walk each way. It also fails to state that the pop up post office is only open 2 hours per week, so can barely be classed as a local amenity. It also fails to state there is no shop in Salesbury Village.
- The Transport Planning Document also states "the local area benefits from street lights and footpaths on both sides of the carriageway" suggesting residents can walk rather than require a car. As mentioned, Lovely Hall Lane, which is the road residents would need to walk along to reach the villages of Salesbury and Wilpshire and the train station does not benefit from either of these things. The only road in the vicinity with pavements and streetlights is the A59 road. A walk to the nearest village of Langho along this road is a 4.6 mile round trip. Hardly feasible when carrying shopping.
- The Transport Planning Document also suggests residents would be able to use public transport to access local towns such a Blackburn for work. The infrequency of the buses and lack of connections to the industrial parts of Blackburn make this impossible and it is definitely not a 60 minute commute as suggested in the document.

- The Transport Planning Document also states that cycling would be an alternative option for transport to car use. The residents would need to be extremely fit if they were to cycle up a steep hill daily to reach the villages of Salesbury and Wilpshire or the train station or the town of Blackburn.

The proposal would lead to the creation of new dwellings in the open countryside without sufficient justification. It would also create a harmful precedent for the acceptance of other similar proposals, which the property developers are clearly considering, since the plans include roads into an empty fields, marked on the plans as "potential secondary access." I hope you are able to take my objections into consideration when discussing the proposed development.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 13 April 2026 23:14
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2026/0214 FS-Case-826876989

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Lancashire

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2026/0214

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

Comments: Dear Sir/Madam

Re: Planning Application 3/2026/0214
Land off Albany Drive, Copster Green

I am writing to object to this application.

The site lies outside the defined settlement boundary for Copster Green, which is identified as a Tier 3 settlement in the adopted Core Strategy. It is therefore classed as countryside, where new housing of this type is not supported. The proposal conflicts with the overall strategy for the location of development.

This site has previously been the subject of a dismissed appeal. In that case, the Planning Inspector concluded that it was not a suitable location for housing, citing its poor access to services, limited public transport and reliance on private vehicles for everyday needs. Those circumstances have not changed.

The Council is able to demonstrate more than a five year housing land supply, and there is therefore no justification for releasing unallocated greenfield land outside the settlement boundary.

The Planning Statement suggests that the development represents a sustainable form of development. However, this does not reflect the reality of the location. Copster Green has very limited services, with no GP, dentist or meaningful retail provision, and public transport is limited. The nearest shop is around a 1.5 hour round trip on foot, which is not realistic for day to day needs. Future residents would be reliant on cars.

There are also existing issues with traffic. The A59 is a fast and busy road, and roads such as Lovely Hall Lane already experience pressure and safety concerns. Additional housing in this location would inevitably add to that.

Furthermore, Lovely Hall Lane and Ribchester Road do not have continuous footpaths, and include

sections with winding and blind bends. This makes walking along these routes unsafe, particularly for children and the elderly, and is of particular concern given that they would need to be used to access the nearest shop on foot.

I note that the Lead Local Flood Authority has raised an objection to the proposal, indicating that flood risk and drainage have not been satisfactorily addressed. This reflects existing concerns locally, with residents in Brown Leaves Grove already experiencing surface water issues during heavy rainfall. There is also a nearby stream which adds further concern to the water/drainage issue.

The Preliminary Ecological Appraisal is limited in scope and based on a single survey visit. This does not reflect local knowledge of the site and surrounding land, where wildlife including deer, badgers and bats are regularly seen. The loss of this greenfield land would have a clear impact on the rural character of the area.

Finally, the applicant has submitted a Statement of Community Involvement, however it is not clear how concerns raised by residents have influenced the proposal, which appears largely unchanged.

Overall, the proposal represents development in an unsustainable countryside location which has previously been found unacceptable on appeal, and where the key issues identified at that time remain materially unchanged.

For these reasons, I would ask that planning permission is refused.