

**From:** Parish Clerk Billington and Langho Parish Council  
<parishclerk@billingtonlanghopc.org>  
**Sent:** 01 May 2025 07:21  
**To:** Kathryn Hughes; Planning  
**Subject:** RE: 3/2025/0196 Extension Request

 **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.

Billington and Langho Parish Council strongly object to development proposal 3/2025/0196.

- **The proposal would involve an increase of over 30% in the size of Langho village** and at this date has attracted written objections from around 15% of households, the number of objections being the largest numeric figure of any planning application during the Council Year 24/25.
- **The proposal site is exclusively outside any settlement area in the Open Countryside, without any exceptional planning reason given to justify such a development.** The Landscape section of the application includes a misleading front cover showing houses built adjacent to the site, saying that any problem with the countryside would be swiftly overtaken by beautifully landscaped houses ! The front piece of the application should show a typical view of the green fields that would be obliterated by the proposal.
- **Tourism in Ribble Valley is estimated to be worth 4,000 jobs** - every time more estates are built, the area becomes less attractive to visitors. The proposal site is also very close to the Bowland A.O.N.B., whose setting it will threaten.
- **Bus transport provision in Langho** is grossly overstated in the proposal. The applicant clearly knows so little about the bus services, that he has included several student-only buses in his list. Nos. 22, 280 and 25 are the only public buses serving the proposed site, the most frequent being the 22, which is unavailable easily to disabled users, because of lack of pedestrian access to the A666. There is no bus service directly linking Langho village with this proposed development.
- **Train transport provision in Langho** The application puts a positive emphasis upon the site's closeness and access to Langho railway station. Langho Station is not accessible for those with

limited mobility. The 19 steep steps at Langho railway station effectively prevent disabled train access. In addition, the only direct access to the village of Langho and its facilities from the proposed development is via a very dark, often flooded and narrow underpass – which ends, on the southern exit with another set of several sets of steps – thus barring the route to those with limited mobility, carrying goods or pushing prams. there is no room for an alternative route

- **Whitehalgh Lane** is the most direct access to Langho village centre from the proposal site. However, it is narrow and would have serious difficulty in accommodating up to 1,000 extra trips a day from the 300 proposed homes in the site. The proposed pedestrian access to Whitehalgh Lane would be seriously dangerous for pedestrians to walk to the village centre ; there is insufficient room on the carriageway to take a pavement to allow safe walking. To travel with children/ pram / wheelchair/ along any new and narrow, due to Langholm’s walls being close to the main trunk road, is dangerous and pedestrians would really have to walk in single file. It has heavy traffic, moving at the legal speed limit of 60 mph. This is followed by a walk-up Northcote Road South which whilst being a cul-de-sac, no street lighting or pavements at its northern end.
- **Langho lacks basic infrastructure**, like a doctor's surgery and a pub or cafe in the village centre. Its one claim to fame is the 6 hair-stylist/beauty parlours in the main street, where parking is frequently difficult during the working day. The nearest GP surgery is in Whalley and has a four week wait time for an appointment and which is not taking on new patients. The nearest dentists are also in Whalley.
- **Infrastructure School Places.** Primary school places are already becoming unavailable this September ; St. Leonards is already full, whilst St. Mary's only has 10 spaces. New or existing children in the village needing places, would be obliged to go outside the village, difficult for parents without private transport. Both schools have been extended in recent years to cope with increased capacity, these extensions are at the expense of the play areas offered to the children at both schools. It would take several terms for Section 106 monies to be obtained from developers and then for classroom building to be completed again reducing the playing out space for the children.
- **Infrastructure – sewage and rain runoff provision.** The existing sewage provision is failing to cope with regular discharging of sewage and rain runoff into Bushburn Brook. There is documented evidence of United Utilities reporting itself to the Environmental Agency for sewage onto agricultural land. The remote monitors placed by United Utilities to monitor this failed due to too many reports being generated. An extra 300 homes with sewage and rain runoff would cause a more frequent discharge of sewage. The cast iron manhole covers for the sewage system are being lifted by the sheer volume of flow. Bushburn Brook is polluted and dead – this discharges into the River Calder. Residents regularly see raw sewage discharged into the river.

- **Prime agricultural land.** This land has been farmed for years, during the war the fields were used for allotments. Once built on this agricultural green space will disappear forever.

Finally, the Parish Council asks Ribble Valley to refuse the application, as it did 11 years' ago on an adjacent site (for only 132 houses ) under reference 3/2014/0687

On 01/04/2025 18:07 BST [REDACTED]  
wrote:

Yes that's fine, not a problem Rachel.

Regards

*Kathryn Hughes*

Kathryn Hughes

Principal Planning Officer

Economic Development and Planning

Ribble Valley Borough Council

[REDACTED]

[www.ribblevalley.gov.uk](http://www.ribblevalley.gov.uk)



Ribble Valley  
Borough Council

[www.ribblevalley.gov.uk](http://www.ribblevalley.gov.uk)

Further information and additional advice on permitted development rights and submitting planning applications can be found at [www.planningportal.co.uk](http://www.planningportal.co.uk)



██████████ Parish Clerk Billington and Langho Parish Council <[parishclerk@billingtonlanghopc.org](mailto:parishclerk@billingtonlanghopc.org)>  
Sent: 01 April 2025 11:45  
To: Planning <[planning@ribblevalley.gov.uk](mailto:planning@ribblevalley.gov.uk)>  
Subject: 3/2025/0196 Extension Request

 **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 morning,

Could the Parish Council deadline for responding to 3/2025/0196 be extended until the 5th May 2025 please.

We have members of the public wishing to attend the next parish council meeting to air their views. This meeting will be the 28th April 2025

Kind regards

Rachel

**Disclaimer**

**Tops for resident satisfaction – 78% of residents are satisfied with Ribble Valley as a place to live (2023 Residents Survey - Life in Ribble Valley)**

This transmission is intended for the named addressee(s) only and may contain sensitive, protectively marked, or restricted material, and should be handled accordingly. Unless you are the named addressee (or authorised to receive it for the addressee) you may not copy, use, or disclose it to anyone else. If you have received this transmission in error, notify the sender immediately. All GCSX traffic may be subject to recording and/or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation. This e-mail is issued subject to Ribble Valley Borough Council's e-mail [disclaimer](#) which you are taken to have read and accepted.

Although the Council security checks incoming and outgoing emails (including file attachments) it cannot guarantee that the content of an email communication or any file attachment is virus free or has not been intercepted or amended as it passes over the internet. The onus is on the recipient to check the communication is virus-free. The Council accepts no responsibility for any damage caused by receiving emails from our email systems and/or hosted domains.