

From:
Subject:

Planning
FW: Application in Principle 3/2026/0513

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

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 22 July 2026 11:28
To: Planning <planning@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Subject: Application in Principle 3/2026/0513

▲ 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.

Please find this communication as way of opposing the application in principle detailed in the subject matter . As a resident of the area located on [REDACTED] and of someone who totally appreciates the beauty of the Ribble Valley, I am appalled that the planning of 9 houses on a field so close in proximity to the A59 could even be considered . The field proposed for the building backs directly onto houses which have been standing for considerable years and the field is one of natural beauty which houses lots of wildlife. This development would not only be a blight on the landscape but cause significant increased traffic on an already very busy A59 and the surrounding country lanes . The access for the houses would be perilously close to Abbott Brow and Osbaldeston Lane turnings and also very close to the primary school and church .

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

There is already the commencement of residential building less than a quarter of a mile away for in excess of over 150 houses which if it is assumed each house is a two car family it adds up to a significant increase of traffic in the village .

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

Kind Regards
[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPhone

[REDACTED]

From: Planning
Subject: FW: Planning Application Comments - 3/2026/0513 FS-Case-858574249

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 20 July 2026 21:44
To: Planning <planning@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2026/0513 FS-Case-858574249

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2026/0513

Address of Development: Land off Longsight Road, Osbaldeston, BB2 7JB

Comments: I am writing to formally and strongly object to the proposed planning application 3/2026/0513 for the following reasons:

1. Highway Safety

There is currently a speed camera located almost exactly where the proposed new site access would be positioned. Speed cameras are installed only where there is a recognised history or risk of danger, which in itself highlights the highway safety concerns associated with this location. Creating a new access onto this stretch of the A59 would inevitably increase the risk to motorists and other road users.

2. Loss of Wildlife Habitat and Change of Land Use

Although the site is designated as agricultural land, for a number of years it was regularly mown by the current landowner as an extension of their residential property. Since selling that property and moving away, the mowing has ceased and the land has naturally begun to recover. As a result, a diverse habitat is re-establishing itself.

I have personally observed barn owls, tawny owls and swallows regularly feeding over the land once again. This demonstrates the ecological value the site is regaining and the importance of allowing this habitat to continue to recover rather than destroying it through development.

I would also ask the Local Planning Authority to investigate whether the landowner was entitled to manage agricultural land as mown residential garden land for such an extended period, and whether this constituted an unauthorised change of use.

3. Protected Species

There are ponds within the site which may provide suitable habitat for great crested newts and other protected species. Even if surveys do not currently identify their presence, the recovering habitat means it may only be a matter of time before they naturally recolonise the area. A thorough ecological assessment should therefore be undertaken before any planning decision is made.

4. Pressure on Local Infrastructure

There is already a shortage of secondary school places in this area, with many local children having to travel to Clitheroe to secure a place. The significant housing developments already approved and under construction around Clitheroe will only increase demand, making it even more difficult for children from our area to obtain school places.

Similarly, local GP surgeries and other healthcare services are already under considerable pressure. Additional housing should not be approved without clear evidence that the necessary infrastructure can adequately support the increased population.

5. Protecting the Character of the Ribble Valley

Approving this application would set a worrying precedent for further development along the A59 corridor. Once one application is permitted, it is likely to encourage a succession of similar proposals from landowners seeking to profit from residential development, with little regard for the cumulative impact on the landscape.

The A59 is one of the principal gateways into the Ribble Valley, an area renowned for its outstanding natural beauty and rural character. Incremental development along this route would erode the very qualities that make the Ribble Valley such a special place to live and visit.

I therefore urge the Council to refuse this application and to protect the landscape, wildlife, highway safety and the limited local infrastructure for the benefit of current and future generations.

As someone whose family has lived in this area for generations, spanning hundreds of years, I care deeply about preserving the unique character of the Ribble Valley. I respectfully ask the Council to give full weight to the concerns of local residents and refuse this application.

From:
Subject:

Planning
FW: Planning Application Comments - 3/2026/0513 FS-Case-858457397

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 20 July 2026 15:49
To: Planning <planning@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2026/0513 FS-Case-858457397

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2026/0513

Address of Development: Land off Longsight Road, Osbaldeston, BB2 7JB.

Comments: I have a few concerns regarding this development.

1. Road Safety. The development creates another access point onto the very busy A59. There is a primary school next to the development and a Church plus the crossroads at AbbottBrow/Osbaldeston Lane thus increasing the risk of accidents where there has been fatalities on the A59 before. This section of the road already carries a very high volume of traffic.
2. Concerns about the drainage and sewerage. Existing systems run alongside the proposed site and if not fully assessed would cause flooding, blockages and overloading.
3. Loss of Wildlife. The land currently has Barn Owls, Tawny Owls, Buzzards, Bats, Deer, Great Crested Newts, Rabbits and Hares. Also has an existing pond. Building on the site would damage all habitats and effect future breeding.
4. The environmental area on the plans below the proposed buildings has no access, who will maintain this area?

For the above reason, I would respectfully ask for refusal of this application

From: Planning
Subject: FW: Planning Application Comments - 3/2026/0513 FS-Case-858441333

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 20 July 2026 14:28
To: Planning <planning@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2026/0513 FS-Case-858441333

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2026/0513

Address of Development: Land off Longsight Road, Osbaldeston, BB2 7JB

Comments:

FORMAL REPRESENTATION OF OBJECTION

Planning Application 3/2026/0513

Land off Longsight Road, Osbaldeston, BB2 7JB

Date 20/07/2026

Objector: [REDACTED]

Property: [REDACTED]

1. Introduction

I wish to object to the above Permission in Principle (PiP) application for the erection of up to nine dwellings on land off Longsight Road, Osbaldeston.

As the [REDACTED] site and would be one of the most directly affected by the proposed development.

Whilst I recognise the importance of delivering new housing within Ribble Valley, I do not consider that sufficient evidence has been submitted to demonstrate that residential development is acceptable in principle on this site.

The application relies heavily upon the site's location within the settlement boundary and the Council's housing land supply position. However, these considerations do not remove the need to properly assess the proposal against the environmental, heritage and residential amenity objectives of the Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

2. Ecology and Biodiversity

This is my principal concern.

The Planning Statement repeatedly states that the site is not affected by statutory ecological designations. However, the absence of statutory designation does not demonstrate that the site has limited ecological value.

As the neighbouring occupier overlooking the application site, I regularly observe a barn owl hunting over the field at dusk.

Barn owls are a protected species and rely upon rough grassland for hunting small mammals. The existing grazing paddock clearly provides suitable foraging habitat.

In addition, I regularly observe:

- bats flying over the field and along the mature hedgerows during spring and summer evenings;
- deer using the field and surrounding hedgerows as a movement corridor;
- numerous breeding birds associated with the mature hedgerows and trees.

These are regular first-hand observations gathered over time from my property.

The submitted Planning Statement provides very little ecological assessment beyond a statement that land elsewhere will be retained for Biodiversity Net Gain.

No evidence has been provided demonstrating:

- how the existing foraging habitat used by the barn owl will be retained or replaced;
- the effect of increased lighting on bats;
- the impact upon habitat connectivity;
- whether mature hedgerows will continue to function as wildlife corridors.

Whilst replacement landscaping is proposed, private domestic gardens cannot reasonably replace an established grazing paddock used by a barn owl for hunting.

I respectfully request that the Council is satisfied that appropriate ecological surveys have been completed before establishing the principle of residential development.

3. Character of the Area

The Planning Statement repeatedly describes the site as:

- “logical rounding off”;
- “contained”;
- “infill”;
- “well related to the existing settlement.”

Having lived [REDACTED] site, I do not believe that description accurately reflects its contribution to the village.

The application site is a substantial open grazing paddock that forms an important green space between existing developments.

From neighbouring properties the field provides:

- open views;
- a transition between built development and countryside;
- an important contribution to the rural character of Osbaldeston.

The attached photograph demonstrates that the site is experienced as open countryside rather than a visually enclosed infill plot.

Replacing this land with nine dwellings, roads, parking areas and domestic infrastructure would materially alter the character of this part of the village.

4. Residential Amenity

The indicative layout demonstrates that [REDACTED] will be directly affected.

Unlike many neighbouring properties, my home is positioned immediately adjacent to both the proposed estate road and several residential plots.

This would introduce:

- vehicle movements immediately [REDACTED]
- headlight glare from vehicles entering and leaving the development;
- increased domestic lighting;
- additional noise and disturbance;
- significant change from an open rural outlook to built development.

Although detailed layout will be considered later, these effects are directly relevant when deciding whether residential development is acceptable in principle.

5. Artificial Lighting

This issue is not addressed within the submitted Planning Statement.

The application site is currently a relatively dark rural environment.

The proposed development would introduce:

- domestic lighting;
- security lighting;
- vehicle headlights;
- illuminated dwellings.

This would fundamentally alter the character of the site after dark and has potential implications both for neighbouring residential amenity and nocturnal wildlife; particularly bats and the barn owl regularly observed using the site.

6. Heritage

The Planning Statement acknowledges that St Mary's Church and St Mary's RC Primary School are Grade II listed buildings but suggests that heritage matters can be addressed during the Technical Details stage.

I respectfully disagree.

The application site forms part of the wider rural setting of these listed buildings.

Whilst boundary vegetation provides screening from some viewpoints, the existing paddock contributes positively to the historic rural character surrounding these heritage assets.

It would therefore be premature to establish the principle of residential development before the effect upon the setting and significance of the listed buildings has been fully assessed.

7. Biodiversity Net Gain

The Planning Statement simply states that adjoining land under the applicant's ownership will be retained for landscaping and Biodiversity Net Gain.

However, no Biodiversity Net Gain calculations have been provided.

The application does not demonstrate:

- existing habitat value;
- habitat losses;
- replacement habitat;
- how wildlife corridors will be maintained.

This information should be available before the principle of development is established.

8. Highway Safety

The proposal would introduce additional vehicle movements onto Longsight Road and onto the new internal estate road immediately adjacent to my property.

I request that the Council carefully considers:

- traffic generation;
- highway safety;
- refuse collection;
- delivery vehicles;
- visitor parking;
- emergency vehicle access.

9. Surface Water Drainage

The application site is currently undeveloped permeable grassland.

Development would replace much of this with buildings, driveways and roads.

The Council should be satisfied that suitable drainage measures can be delivered without increasing surface water runoff or flood risk.

10. Request for Site Visit

I respectfully request that the Planning Officer undertakes a site visit [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] before determining this application.

The Planning Statement suggests the site is visually contained by mature landscaping. Whilst this may be the case from parts of Longsight Road, it does not reflect the experience of neighbouring residents.

[REDACTED] the application site is experienced as a substantial open grazing paddock forming an important part of the rural landscape.

A site visit from this location would provide a much more accurate appreciation of the site's contribution to the character of the area and the likely effect of the proposed development.

Conclusion

The applicant has not demonstrated that the principle of residential development on this site is acceptable.

In particular, I remain concerned that insufficient evidence has been provided regarding:

- the ecological value of the site;
- the regular use of the site by a protected barn owl;
- bat activity;
- wildlife connectivity;
- the impact on neighbouring residential amenity;
- the effect on the rural character of Osbaldeston; and
- the contribution the site makes to the setting of nearby listed buildings.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that Ribble Valley Borough Council refuses Permission in Principle application 3/2026/0513.

Yours faithfully,

(u)

From: Planning
Subject: FW: Planning Application Comments - 3/2026/0513 FS-Case-858358659

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 20 July 2026 11:29
To: Planning <planning@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2026/0513 FS-Case-858358659

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2026/0513

Address of Development: Land off long sight road

Comments: Dear Planning Officer,

I wish to object to planning application 3/2026/0513 for the erection of up to nine dwellings on land off Longsight Road, Osbaldeston.

My objection is based on the following planning grounds:

1. Unsustainable rural location

The proposed site is located within a rural area where future occupants would be heavily reliant on private vehicles to access everyday services, employment, schools and healthcare. This conflicts with the objective of promoting sustainable patterns of development and reducing dependence on the private car.

2. Harm to the rural character of the area

The application site forms part of the open countryside which contributes to the distinctive rural setting of Osbaldeston. Introducing residential development would urbanise this area, eroding its open character and setting an undesirable precedent for further development along Longsight Road.

3. Highway safety

Longsight Road is already a busy route with fast-moving traffic. Additional vehicle movements generated by new housing could increase risks for motorists, pedestrians and cyclists. The suitability

of access and the cumulative impact on highway safety should be carefully assessed before any principle of development is accepted.

4. Loss of countryside and environmental value

Although this is an application for Permission in Principle, the Council should consider whether the site is an appropriate location for residential development, taking into account its contribution to the local landscape, biodiversity and rural environment.

5. Pressure on local infrastructure

Additional housing would increase demand on local roads, drainage systems and public services. It is not clear that existing infrastructure has sufficient capacity to accommodate further development without adverse impacts.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that Ribble Valley Borough Council refuses Permission in Principle for this application, as the proposal would not represent appropriate or sustainable development in this rural location.

