

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 18 May 2026 17:11  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Application Comments - 3/2026/0230 FS-Case-838927298

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Lancashire

[REDACTED]

**Planning Application Reference No.:** 3/2026/0230

**Address of Development:** Higher Standen Drive  
Clitheroe

**Comments:** I would like to object to the above Application to build 60 houses on the site. I believe that the site or part of this site was in the Local Plan for Economic Development.

- 1) In the Planning and Affordable Housing Statement provided by the Applicant, they say that the Council do not give the same weight to Economic Development as they do to Housing (para6.14). Surely the Council should be trying encourage Employment in the Borough, which has at present a very high percentage of residents working outside the Town (in Manchester, Blackburn, Burnley etc.) I'm sure along side the Shop that will be built on the Estate by Taylor Wimpey, maybe a Restaurant or Financial Services offices or a Daycare/ Leisure Centre would make more sense.
- 2) There is also an Application for 200 houses on the other side of Pendle Rd going to Planning (3/2025/1006) off Pendle Rd. Surely by the very nature of the word Planning, this should be taken into account by assessing the needs of the Town and it's affect on traffic in the area, especially on the roundabout where all the extra traffic will travel across in order to access and leave the estates. There are 960 house on Half Penny Meadows, most homes have two cars that is approximately 1900 cars, the 60 houses on this site adds 120 cars, plus the new proposed estate of 200 cars adds another 400 cars, so potential extra 2060 cars on the road going up or down Pendle Rd either to get into Clitheroe or to get on the A59. Deliveries from Parcel Carriers would also increase traffic on the estates and roads.
- 3) The Applicant makes a case for varied Transport alternatives; bus shelters but no buses running, cycle ways, there are none, and a public pathway that is really a muddy path.
- 4) surely the Council does not want to consolidate the existing Built up area so that we end up with one massive Estate divided by the Pendle Rd, where all the Greenfields are gone.

I feel that these material considerations indicate that this Application should be turned down and efforts are made to try and pursue Economic Development as was originally put into the plans first submitted. We need employment in the Town and not more Employees/ Business leaving to commute elsewhere daily

Before any decision is made concerning this Application and the affect it might have on traffic movements at the junction onto Pendle Rd and include the potential effect that the Application 3/2025/1006 might have on the roundabout and if that roundabout is fit for

purpose.

If there is to be a generous amount of Publicly accessible green space, then there needs to be joined up thinking as to the pathways because there are 3 quite large surface Drainage areas.

The Social Affordable and Immediate Rent consists of Four 1 bedroom Flat/ Maisonettes and the Affordable Home Ownership consists of Ten 2 bedroom homes. I can't work out how many are for the elderly because it is not that clear.

Quote: 15% of the units would be for Older people, within that 15% 50% would be for Affordable and 7.5% would be Market Housing for Older people.