

Site SR015

Reference	Comments
458	<p>Central Lancashire Local Development Framework Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD Issues and Options Discussion Paper Representations on behalf of Persimmon Homes (Lancashire) By RPS Planning & Development Introduction These representations are submitted to South Ribble Borough Council on behalf of Persimmon Homes (Lancashire) Ltd in respect of land at Brindle Road, Bamber Bridge, identified as sites SR006/015/026/053/058 in the Landowners' and Developers' Site Suggestions document, and as site (c), north of Brindle Road bounded by the M6 and M61 motorways in Policy D8, Safeguarded Land, in the adopted South Ribble Local Plan. The representations add to those prepared by Savills and submitted to the Council as part of a site suggestions exercise in March 2008. Their purpose is to reaffirm that in our opinion the site is deliverable for residential development; that is, meets the specific requirements of paragraph 54 of PPS3 in being available, suitable and achievable, and should be allocated for residential development in the forthcoming Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD. It is not possible to tell how the five site reference numbers on page 50 of the 'Landowners' document precisely relate to parcels on the ground, a difficulty exacerbated by the fact that none of these site references, unlike most others, have a site area attached to them in the schedule. Nor is the extent of land identified as site UPS38 on page 64 of the Central Lancashire SHLAA 2009 clear. This entry gives a total size and net developable area which is different from (ie smaller than) that promoted in these representations. The entry also however makes it clear that the land is considered suitable, available and achievable for residential development. For the avoidance of doubt, therefore, the attached drawing indicates the precise extent of the land in which Persimmon Homes has an interest. The whole site, indicated by the blue boundary on the drawing, has an area of approximately 9.71 hectares. The provisional net developable area, indicated by the solid red boundary and whose derivation is explained below, has an area of approximately 7.26 hectares. Notwithstanding the extent of their current land interests Persimmon Homes supports the comprehensive allocation and redevelopment of the area for residential use and such supporting facilities as may be required, given the conclusions of the Savills report, summarised below, on the scale and location of services and facilities in the vicinity. We consider that paragraphs 3.40 and 3.41 of the Local Plan, which follow Policy D8, provide an accurate summary of the status and purpose of safeguarded land. It is regrettable however that the Publication Core Strategy appears not even to acknowledge the existence of safeguarded land, let alone address the extent to which more recent policy requirements for the use of previously developed land affect the need to allocate safeguarded land for development. General Policy Considerations RPS notes the proposed policy in the draft Joint Core Strategy to accommodate 70% of new housing on previously developed land, and the existence of safeguarded land. RPS considers the target to be ambitious but even if it can be achieved a significant proportion of the housing requirement will need to be accommodated on greenfield land. We recognise the role of safeguarded land as the first greenfield land that local planning authorities should turn to. However, RPS notes the change in mid 2010 to the definition of previously developed land in Annex B of PPS3. This removed garden land, a significant source of such land and one which in many parts of the country makes a considerable contribution to the total provision of housing on previously developed land. The change will in RPS's opinion make it even more difficult for the three Central Lancashire authorities to achieve what was already a demanding target, notwithstanding what appears to be an unsupported assertion in paragraph 8.15 of the Publication Core Strategy that it can still be achieved. RPS therefore considers that there will be an even greater need to resort to greenfield sites in order to meet housing requirements in South Ribble Borough. We note too the implications of paragraph 4.12 of the 'Landowners' document, which suggests that it would be better to bring forward some safeguarded sites than others to meet requirements in the present round of plan preparation. RPS nevertheless considers that the characteristics of the site are such that it is appropriate to be allocated in the present round of development plan making. Noise and Net Developable Area The Savills report of March 2008 acknowledged that noise from the nearby motorways would affect the site, without addressing the extent to which the realistically developable area might be reduced as a result. Since this time Persimmon Homes has undertaken initial investigative work and these representations seek to provide greater certainty in terms of the suitability and deliverability of the site for residential use. We anticipate that this will assist the Council in its consideration of sites eventually to be allocated in the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD. The attached drawing therefore shows not only the full extent of the land in which Persimmon Homes has an interest and the site as a whole, but also a smaller area representing the land which we believe could be developed without requiring inordinately expensive noise mitigation measures, for example, in the form of acoustic barriers adjacent to the motorways or in the construction of the dwellings themselves. It also shows, by means of the pecked red line, how the net developable area could be extended northwards and eastwards. This area is based on the categories set out in Annex 1 of PPG24: Planning and Noise and represents the area of land in category B for which the advice is: "Noise should be taken into account in when determining planning applications and, where appropriate, conditions imposed to ensure and adequate level of protection against noise". The land excluded falls into category C, for which the advice in Annex 1 begins "planning permission should not normally be granted". Although this is qualified by reference to the question of the availability of quieter sites, RPS considers that the range of choice available to the Council is not so restricted as to demand the development of the whole area in this case. This also takes into account the effect of noise on the amenity value of gardens, which do not benefit from noise mitigation measures in construction. It should however also be possible to mitigate such effects in the design of the</p>

Reference	Comments
	<p>layout of any residential scheme in respect of both houses and gardens. The need to provide for a buffer zone between the motorways and the edge of residential development has the benefit of providing land for any equipped play areas, open space and landscaping, and at the same time enabling more economical use to be made of the net developable area. Public Rights of Way RPS notes that a public right of way crosses the site. Any detailed layout would take this route into account, and to the extent that any amenity value it has might be diminished by residential development, this would be more than compensated for by the provision of additional amenity space. Residential Capacity On the basis of the provisional net developable area of 7.26 hectares, it is estimated that the site could accommodate between 218 and 290 dwellings at a range of 30 to 40 dwellings per hectare. Access Access to the site would be taken from Brindle Road. Persimmon Homes continue to hold an interest in number 215 Brindle Road, which would facilitate the provision of access of a suitable standard. Local Services and Facilities We draw to the Council's attention the material on these topics in the Savills report. This concluded that the site is sustainably located in respect of schools, shops, o:\1201b camelot theme park\reports\1201 r 110128 dc ldf repsbrindlerdfv.doc 5 health facilities and recreation areas. Bus services run along Brindle Road, and Bamber Bridge railway station is located about 1.5 km from the site. The Council's Questions These representations also address the relevant questions put in the 'Landowners' document. C2: Are you aware of any sites where it might be suitable to apply set criteria for the density of housing? RPS is aware of the removal from RPS3 of the minimum density requirement of 30 dwellings per hectare (dph). We also recognise that the more general requirement for the efficient use of land remains and indeed support this principle. In this particular case, we do not consider that there are any grounds for development at a density lower than 30 dph. We consider that the density to be achieved on any site should eventually be determined by detailed design, but that for greenfield sites, a starting point for estimating capacity involves applying a density figure to the net developable area. As indicated above, we have done this in the case of land north of Brindle Road. C3: Are you aware of any sites which would be suitable for affordable housing in South Ribble? Subject to viability, RPS would expect a policy requiring the provision of affordable housing to apply to a site such as this, at levels to be determined through the development plan process and consistent with any relevant national guidance. Conclusion It is concluded that the Brindle Road site is deliverable for residential development and meets the criteria of PPS3 paragraph 54. This part of Lancashire is densely built up, and although Preston is clearly the most important settlement in it, the lack of an otherwise clearly defined settlement hierarchy makes the task of selecting sites for housing more difficult. However it is considered that there are relatively few strategic opportunities in the vicinity owing to o:\1201b camelot theme park\reports\1201 r 110128 dc ldf repsbrindlerdfv.doc 6 the constraints of Green Belt, and flood risk, particularly on the southern bank of the River Ribble. Land at Brindle Road is not in the Green Belt and it is not at risk from flooding. It is close to local services and employment, and also within easy reach of employment opportunities in Preston and the higher order services offered by the city centre. It therefore provides a significant strategic scale opportunity for residential development in a sustainable location. Although the parts of the site closest to the motorways would have to be excluded from the developable area, they could provide amenity space. The site would constitute an appropriate rounding off of the built up area in the vicinity. No more permanent boundary could be envisaged than the motorways on the north western and north eastern sides, and so there would be no encroachment on the Green Belt to the north east of the site.</p>
306	<p>Dear South Ribble, I would like to comment upon the proposed SHLAA sites at Kellet Lane (SR136) and Brindle Road (SR 006, 015, 026, 053, 058). Kellet Lane and Brindle Road to the south of the Hospital Inn railway crossing are country lanes which currently suffer from over-use due to drivers using it as an east west rat run to avoid travelling through Bamber Bridge. The traffic queues which frequently occur because of the railway crossing are a nuisance to residents of the area and often prevent them accessing their own properties. To build more housing on Kellet Lane or this part of Brindle Road would exacerbate this problem. Kellet Lane is quite perilous as it is now, adding more traffic and residential access points would make it even more dangerous.</p>

Site SR018

Reference	Comments
90	<p>Objection. I OBJECT TO FURTHER DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE VILLAGE OF LONGTON BECAUSE 1. TRAFFIC CONGESTION AND PARKING ARE ALREADY A PROBLEM 2. THE CHARACTER OF THE VILLAGE AND VIEW OF THE SURROUNDING COUNTRYSIDE ARE ALREADY BEING LOST 3. THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT AND HABITAT OF LOCAL WILDLIFE WILL BE DESTROYED 4. LOCAL SCHOLS ARE ALREADY OVER SUBSCRIBED 5. PARKING IN THE VILLAGE IS ALREADY VERY DIFFICULT 6. GREENBELT LAND SHOULD NOT BE USED FOR DEVELOPMENT</p>

Site SR023

Reference	Comments
220	Residential building on this land must be very strongly opposed, it is the last piece of greenfield site that separates Lostock Hall/TARDY Gate with Waton Park. There is enough residential building land already available in the Lostock Hall area, ie Gasworks, Vernons, Bee Lane. Wateringpool Lane, Linden Drive and Doodstone Nook is already saturated with traffic. Browndge Rd is already a bottle neck, so further development would make it a lot worse. Air pollution is a great worry as most houses have 2 cars. This site has already been rejected by residents in the past. This small piece of greenspace must be protected against building.
532	Objection I object for building more houses in Lostock Hall. It is only a small village and every where you look there's houses. The traffic is bad and how and if you build more houses where will the traffic go? Doodstone Ave is quiet place to live and if you open it up the Ave will be to busy with the cars going down and we need some fields round for the wild life.
213	Lostock Hall is a heavily populated village with very little green land available to all of the community. I know that as a community we feel very strongly against anymore development within these areas therefore I hope the following suggestions will be much appreciated. I feel that SR042 SR120 SR083 should be open land for the community to roam with their families will the potential to develop them into nature reserves (like the surrounding area) or picnic areas for communities to use. However, SR023 i feel has the potential to benefit the whole of the Lostock Hall community. This could be developed into a car free allotment area. Allotments are very hard to come by and have a long waiting list to get a place, plus a general fee is around 10 - 12 which within this financial climate would highly benefit the South Ribble council and the local community with a popular service. Many of the people I have spoken to within the Lostock Hall community have been very excited and would fully support the scheme. With the nature of the roads not being able to cope with demand of residential traffic I feel that this allotment scheme has two possibilities. These could be a no car scheme except to transport heavy equipment (This I feel wouldn't be a problem if this service was able to only the surrounding communities) or by providing a small car park; this will allow to kept the roads clear and still accessible for residents. I am very supportive in preserving the local environment and protecting the wildlife. I have lived on St Cuthberts Rd for 23 years and have seen an increasing number of wildlife move up towards my house for food and housing; this has not been helped by local residential developments. With these suggestions I feel that it is supporting the local community with services of green land to enrich their lives from walks with their dogs to having a picnic and football game with their families. If this area was to become residential not only would the local community be very objective to the developments but also put a lot of pressure on the community services. This would be mainly seen through schools as there is already a shortage problem along with local medical services as I myself have been waiting for 2 years to get an appointment to just be registered. The roads along with drains, waste and traffic capability would need to be redeveloped as they are already struggling with the demand of traffic at this moment without the extra demand of more residential developments. I feel that the suggestions that I have mad will fit into the way Britain is looking to the future and being more pro-active with the environment and providing ourselves with the right frame of mind with family, health and a sense of community.
494	I have been notified today that a meeting was held re building plans for housing near Doodstone Drive on the 26th January at the Catholic Club in Lostock Hall. I also heard that this was advertised n the local paper (which paper) and also announcement in the Conservative Club, it is strange that no one was aware of this meeting. It seems that South Ribble Council; I hell bent on approving this planning application despite the meeting held last year when a few residents turned out voice their objection and vent their anger at this planning application. Doodstone Drive / Ave is a small residential area with narrow roads and it will make more traffic. I was born in this area and we have many paces for children to play but not anymore, children form three schools use this roads with more house more children, can the schools take anymore? If some one from South Ribble Council will take time to visit and see the traffic that clogs up on Doodstone Nook and Linden Drive they will see many cars waiting for children and it can only get worse. Please make notice of the residents and say not to this application.
410	IM VERY VERY CONCERNED RE THE DEVELOPMENT OF HOUSES ON THE FIELD AT THE BOTTOM OF DOODSTONE. FIRSTLY, THE OPENING OF DOODSTONE DRIVE, THIS WOULD CAUSE TOO MUCH TRAFFIC THE ROAD IS NOT SUITABLE FOR AN EXTRA 350 CARS. NEITHER IS WATERINGPOOL LANE. THERE ARE NOT ENOUGH SCHOOLS, DOCTORS AND DENTIST FOR THE PEOPLE OF LOSTOCK AS IT IS! IT IS LOVELY TO SEE ANIMALS IN THE FIELD - LETS LEAVE IT THAT WAY. I BELIEVE HOUSES ARE BEING BUILT AT VERNONS, MORE ON THE GAS WORKS AND ON THE LAND OF AVONDALE SCHOOL. THAT SURELY IS MORE THAN ENOUGH FOR LOSTOCK HALL THAT WILL MORE THAN A QUARTER OF HOUSES RECOMMENDED BY THE GOVERNMENT.
440	I am against building houses on the field because we need a buffer zone between lostock hall and walton park, there is enough building planed for south ribble the roads are a nightmare in this area without adding more traffic.why not plant trees and put bird boxes up anything to encourage wildlife you have built enough in this area over the years lets have some GREEN SPACE,
199	Lostock Hall / South Ribble Central Area - 26th Jan 2011 First a detailed comment. The massive proposed developments in sectors around the Gas Works and Vernons

Reference	Comments
	<p>Lodge should be cut right back or stopped altogether. I.e. SR040, SR042 and SR023. This is the last remaining really nice part of this area. To build houses up against the edge of Vernons Lodge would be sacrilege. The fields in SR023 are a vital green lung for the area. The maximum development that should be permitted here are a few more new houses up against the existing new development on Leyland Road. Maybe extend that estate by 50%. The new link bridge should be scrapped. It's benefits will disappoint even it's Supporters and will be short lived. Two new bypasses have not removed the congestion south of the Ribble. Leyland Road and the A6 are as busy as ever. MORE ROADS = MORE TRAFFIC !!!!!!!!! IF THIS BRIDGE IS BUILT, CHILDREN ON TODD LANE WILL DIE !!!!!!!!!!!!!!! General comments. Local people are invited to a meeting to give their views. This is local democracy. Almost everyone has the view that the area is already far too congested and there should be no more development. The response is that You must accept 350 houses per year and that's that. If you and your Council object, you will be charged a fortune when you lose the Developers' Appeals .This sounds about as democratic as Stalinist Russia.The Planning Officer making the presentation suggested that local people might want to protect areas of open space. The layout map of 'Site Suggestions in Central Area' shows every bit of open space being filled in. The bits that don't get filled in during this round will get filled in next time.</p> <p>The Elephant in the room is population increase. When is this fundamental issue going to be addressed? The Country is already badly overcrowded. What number will the 'Powers That Be' let the population rise to before they WISE UP !!!!</p> <p>Will population rise to 70 million, or 80 million, or 100 million, or 200 million. Let them name their figure. Population increase must be stopped at some point, so do it now while the country is just about worth living in and we have a chance of countering potential problems such as climate change or sea level rises or .?</p> <p>Have our Rulers got no imagination, or are they just not bothered because they will be rich enough to escape to their own sanctuary? Maybe they only care about increasing GDP as a proxy for increasing their own prestige. Their grandchildren won't be in the FOOD RIOTS.</p>
617	<p>Objection / suggestion for changes If more houses were built in this location it would obviously result in considerably more traffic passing along Doodstone Drive and the surrounding areas. The entrance/s to such a site would have to be from watering pool lane resulting in more traffic passing close to a nearby school and nursery. Existing essential services i.e fire appliances ambulances and council refuse collection vehicles could possibly have access difficulties coping with a higher volume of moving traffic and on street parking. The increase in traffic activity would ultimately result in environmental issues such as constant noise and pollution in a location adjacent to an existing and well established nature reserve which was created by South Ribble Council to preserve and encourage the sanctuary of local wildlife.</p>
710	<p>I think that this proposed development need to take into consideration keeping a green buffer zone at both sides of the footpath from Bamber Bridge to Preston.</p>
594	<p>Should be kept as green open space as part of a "Central Park" as a buffer between Preston/South Ribble (Lostock Hall)</p>
372	<p>Objection I feel we need some green space, you have ample land that you are building on and have plans to build on this area. We also need space between Lostock Hall and Walton Park. The roads, schools, Doctors and Dentists are full. Give Wildlife a life line, leave this field green.</p>
338	<p>Query: Having lived on Doodstone Drive for 22 years I have seen vast amounts of green land around my home disappearing and I believe that this is a very sad state of affairs. With the increased awareness of the Greenhouse Effect in recent years it should be fairly obvious to all concerned that the current use of the field, for the grazing of farm animals, is its best use. Not to mention the fact that the area is beginning to look more like a messy, urban maze with houses being built on top of houses. The introduction of more houses to an already saturated population within Lostock Hall is unacceptable. The local Doctors Surgery is already full, with people often having to wait two weeks for an important appointment. There is also the question of how these new houses are going to be reached. The only plausible option would be to open up one of: Wateringpool Lane, Doodstone Avenue or Doodstone Drive. As the situation stands at the moment, Wateringpool Lane is already heavily congested with parked cars and moving traffic which is dramatically increased during school pick up and drop off hours. We also need to remember there are two schools in the immediate area and think how an increased amount of traffic would affect the movement of pedestrians to and from those schools, many of whom are young children. As for the opening up of Doodstone Drive or Doodstone Avenue, this would be both reckless and inconsiderate. These two roads have long been developed as small residential communities and are the home of many young children who like to play outside in the street in the summer. Having lived in this street all my life, I myself was one of these children not many years ago. This new development would render this past time both dangerous, unpleasant and in most cases impossible. Finally, I would like to make known my complete disgust at the lack of notice regarding the meeting held on 26th January 2011 to residents who would be immediately affected. The amount of notice was clearly</p>

Reference	Comments
	inadequate as previous meetings were so full that many people were unable to enter the hall and were required to stand outside. If this meeting were properly advertised, I can assure you, with no shadow of a doubt, that this would have been the case again. I for one demand that another meeting should be held with ALL concerned parties given the proper notice.
683	Lostock Hall is immediate surrounding areas are becoming more and more congested. We are almost at good luck now to build further residential developments would put a terrific strain on a unacceptable problem. The old infant school on Avondale Drive has been closed – why could this not be utilised for a medical practise and dental surgery-We have thousands of new residents but no increase in medical provision. Could we ask has a professional study been earned out to ensure that old sewer and drainage systems are able to cope will ever more escape. We have gone from a rural area to a town environment but no evidence that this matters has been addressed. More residential means more families- can the present schools cope with a further influse of children? We are fearful too that we are being pushed near and nearer to Preston. We do not wish to have Preston overspill and all that would bring with it. You only have to look at Ribbleton and Deepdale area to see the problems we could have. There are several properties in the area which could be modernised and utilised without the new built. Please allow us to have some “great areas” we need them to walk, relax away from all the traffic pollution and unacceptable upset that the volume of the traffic creates. Children and families need the nature walks and the area of recreation.
293	Suggestion for Changes: It is likely that all these sites, if developed for housing would fall in the geographical priority area for pupil admission to Lostock Hall High School. The school is already popular and over subscribed and has ib the last few years been the subject of appeals from parents. I would ask that when considering land for residential development that the views of the school and the LA are sought to ensure that sufficient places are available.
305	I strongly object to site SR023 being designated for residential. This site has been subject of previous planning applications and a government department review. The site had had applications rejected to protect the urban sprawl between Lostock Hall and Walton Park. Also the serious traffic problems at Tardt Gate/Wateringpool Lane.
26	A green belt strip should be included within these proposed residential sites to afford a 'green belt strip buffer' alongside the tramway nature reserve to support the proposed Central Park.
292	Agreement in already in place with the council that this area of land would remain part of a 'greenfinger' of land that separates Lostock Hall from Preston town centre to enable the passage of wildlife and the continuation of nature. In the summer of 2010 over 150 local residents unanimously voted to leave this site undeveloped. This current consultation has not in my view been pubicised sufficiently to enable more local people to be aware of its existence and have their say. If residential property was built on this site the only access is via Wateringpool Lane which is a small residential lane. The average number of cars per family now is 2.7 which means with 90 properties there would be a minimum of 180 cars (rounding down and assuming 2 cars per family)passing up and down Wateringpool Lane each day. Brownedge Road is already a bottleneck at rush hour into Preston and this additional traffic would cause further congestion and traffic jams. Not to mention the pollution. There is affordable housing available in the local area and standing empty - including new properties next to the gas works. Market conditions remain that people cannot afford to move or to buy a property. This site also enable valuable and rare wildlife to exist - foxes, butterflies, dragonflies and toads live on this site and bird species feed on this site including starlings which are in danger of becoming an endangered species. There is no additional schools in the area so where would the children from these families go to school? There is a local football club and the development of this site would mean that they would not have anywhere to park when games are played. At the moment they park on the road. This would not be possible with the traffic up and down the road to and from the properties on this site. Accidents are inevitable with limited access for emergency vehicles such as fire and ambulance.
450	If I understand correctly the proposal for this area is social housing. in the last couple of years the council has removed a playground adjacent to the old railway line due to the congregation of youths causing physical damage. Bringing social housing to this area has the potential to increase this issue. In addition the old railway line is a well used recreational area for walkers,cyclists, dog owners etc. I believe to bring this type of housing to this location would remove the element of safety that currently exists in this well used sanctuary away from the busy areas that surround it. For the above reasons and the maintenance of some green areas for recreational purposes in the area I object to the development of this land.
605	I strongly object to site SR023 being designated for residential. This site has been subject to previous planning applications and a Government department review. This site has had applications rejected to protect the urban sprawl between Lostock Hall and Walton Park. The serious traffic problems at Tardy Gate/Wateringpool Lane.
291	Suggestion for changes: As this land is being used for grazing animals, I propose an alternative to this would be the land being used for local resident for allotments as this would benefit the local community rather than more housing and congestion in the Lostock Hall area
711	As the Todd Lane area is already congested with houses and schools, the areas indicated should be left as greenspaces for the enjoyment and leisure purposes of the residents of this area we have little enough as it is. A park area could also be considered, but under no circumstances should more houses be built on this land. Todd Lane

Reference	Comments
	in particular would not take the extra traffic that building more houses would incur as flooding at the corner of Lyndale Ave is a regular occurrence along with the morning and evening traffic from the school that is very heavy on a road that has not been designed to take this use.
505	As a resident living on Doodstone Drive and having previously attended the Central Area Committee Meeting held on 15 June 2010, I wish to express my objection to the proposed residential development on land off Wateringpool Lane, Lostock Hall by Morris Homes (NW). As discussed at the meeting on 15 June 2010, there are numerous reasons for not allowing such a development – it will be detrimental to the infra-structure of a small village. This, along with high levels of traffic congestion and the destruction of the surrounding nature habitat is not acceptable. As indicated at this meeting all who attended opposed the development which should be seriously considered. I would also like to point out that any subsequent meetings were not publicised effectively as most people were not aware of them. For such an important issue residents should have been informed directly by letter.
393	Thankyou for seeing me a short notice yesterday. I would like to register my objection to the proposal of the possibility of building housing on the field adjacent to wateringpool lane, lostock hall, preston. I have lived in Doodstone drive for 17 years and overlook the field. This area of land is the last piece of green left in the area, 17 years ago, i could see as far as preston, since then walton park has encroached closer and closer, filling every other piece of land available. The only route to this piece of land is either down wateringpool lane or the doodstones, neither of which are built to take increasing amounts of traffic, the schools in the area already leave the roads choked in the morning and hometime. I feel there are better areas in the region which can provide the land necessary without destroying the last piece of green land in the area.

Site SR024

Reference	Comments
389	1. These representations relate to a site located at Dorothy Avenue/Bretherton Terrace, Leyland - see attached plan. 2. The site is situated immediately to the south and east of the defined town centre of Leyland, and part of the site is within that defined town centre boundary. Historically the southern element of the site formed part of the extensive Leyland Truck Company factory complex at Leyland. More recently the site was held by Lancashire County Council as highway authority as part of a potential new road link into/from Leyland town centre. That potential road scheme has been permanently abandoned and the County Council disposed of the site in 2006/2007. This southern part of the site was subject to a "Tender" process in July 2006 and was offered for sale as a "Town Centre Development Site". 3. The site had an interim treatment in the form of a grassed mound. The site is now fenced and is no longer managed or maintained. 4. The northern part of the site comprises a commercial yard which contains a motor vehicle repair/ servicing garage and a commercial painting and decorating business (office, training rooms, storage building and yard area). 5. The site is surrounded by urban developments and land uses, primarily residential dwellings and a care facility. The site occupies a sustainable and accessible location close to the defined centre of Leyland. 6. Allocation/development of the site for housing would be consistent with the national planning policy for housing set out in PPS 3. It would also be consistent with the objectives and spatial strategy of the Central Lancashire Publication Core Strategy as Leyland is one of the key focus points for new housing. 7. The site is ineffectively utilised currently and its redevelopment for housing is supported and encouraged by national, regional and emerging local policy. It is close to shops, local facilities, employment opportunities and public transport routes and links. 8. The site has been identified by the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment as deliverable - i.e. it is suitable for housing development, and it is available and achievable. The site will be subject to a planning application in the very near future. 9. The site was not identified by the Central Lancashire Employment Land Study as being of significance to the portfolio of existing employment sites. Re-cycling of the site for housing is wholly appropriate. 10. The site should be formally identified/allocated for housing development.
52	RE plot of land SR024. Approximately 12 months ago, a planning application was submitted for the building of dwellings on this plot. I, along with my neighbours campaigned against the application. There were many reasons for our objection, some of which were, the size of plot, the access to the plot, the safety of existing residents, the disruption to parking, which is already limited. we were, and still are 100% against any development of this land as it will create severe problems. The Highways agency also recommended refusal for similar reasons. For these reasons I ask the committee to remove this plot of land from the list of sites going through to the next stage of the consultation process.
38	Land off Dorothy Avenue Nature of response:: Objection Comments:: Comment submitted 17 January 2011 This land was previously submitted for planning permission approx 12 months ago and was recommended for refusal by the Highways Agency due to poor access and poor visibility for vehicles and pedestrians. I together with all my neighbours are very much against the idea of this very small site being developed for housing. Such a small area with very narrow access for vehicles would create severe traffic, parking and safety issues. I would urge the committee to remove this site from the list of sites going through to the next stage of the consultation process. If

Reference	Comments
	you require any further information or details of the other residents who are also in opposition of this proposal please do not hesitate to contact me either by email or phone.
113	I am against any houses been built because there are too many cars down the street and it is so difficult to get out onto the main road. You have to remember families now have more than one car nowadays, mum, dad and teenagers have a car each, we also have Harrisons Part yard and the vans coming and going. We also have Turpin Green residents parking down our street (Bretherton Terrace) as they have no parking. So you can see, we have far too many cars for one small cul-de-sac. We have small children down our street and there are 2 lines of parked cars on both sides, there is only one footpath, it is very dangerous already we don't need more cars.

Site SR025

Reference	Comments
63	We support: · The Council in identifying the 231 Brindle Road, Bamber Bridge (SR025) site as a new possible site for housing development. We submit: · That the 231 Brindle Road, Bamber Bridge (SR025) site is a suitable one for housing development, which is readily available for development and its development is readily achievable and deliverable in a manner consistent with the wider principles and objectives of the Core Strategy and national planning guidance; · That the need to identify and make provision for the delivery of sufficient housing land should be listed as a 'Key Issue' for the DPD; · The RSS housing provision levels (Policy L4) should be used to calculate the housing land requirements for the DPD plan period; and · The DPD should plan for a minimum period of 15 years housing provision from date of adoption, ie until 2030. We suggest: · That the 231 Brindle Road, Bamber Bridge (SR025) site be allocated for housing development in the forthcoming DPD, for delivery within the first five years of the DPD.

Reference	Comments
458	<p>Central Lancashire Local Development Framework Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD Issues and Options Discussion Paper Representations on behalf of Persimmon Homes (Lancashire) By RPS Planning & Development Introduction These representations are submitted to South Ribble Borough Council on behalf of Persimmon Homes (Lancashire) Ltd in respect of land at Brindle Road, Bamber Bridge, identified as sites SR006/015/026/053/058 in the Landowners' and Developers' Site Suggestions document, and as site (c), north of Brindle Road bounded by the M6 and M61 motorways in Policy D8, Safeguarded Land, in the adopted South Ribble Local Plan. The representations add to those prepared by Savills and submitted to the Council as part of a site suggestions exercise in March 2008. Their purpose is to reaffirm that in our opinion the site is deliverable for residential development; that is, meets the specific requirements of paragraph 54 of PPS3 in being available, suitable and achievable, and should be allocated for residential development in the forthcoming Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD. It is not possible to tell how the five site reference numbers on page 50 of the 'Landowners' document precisely relate to parcels on the ground, a difficulty exacerbated by the fact that none of these site references, unlike most others, have a site area attached to them in the schedule. Nor is the extent of land identified as site UPS38 on page 64 of the Central Lancashire SHLAA 2009 clear. This entry gives a total size and net developable area which is different from (ie smaller than) that promoted in these representations. The entry also however makes it clear that the land is considered suitable, available and achievable for residential development. For the avoidance of doubt, therefore, the attached drawing indicates the precise extent of the land in which Persimmon Homes has an interest. The whole site, indicated by the blue boundary on the drawing, has an area of approximately 9.71 hectares. The provisional net developable area, indicated by the solid red boundary and whose derivation is explained below, has an area of approximately 7.26 hectares. Notwithstanding the extent of their current land interests Persimmon Homes supports the comprehensive allocation and redevelopment of the area for residential use and such supporting facilities as may be required, given the conclusions of the Savills report, summarised below, on the scale and location of services and facilities in the vicinity. We consider that paragraphs 3.40 and 3.41 of the Local Plan, which follow Policy D8, provide an accurate summary of the status and purpose of safeguarded land. It is regrettable however that the Publication Core Strategy appears not even to acknowledge the existence of safeguarded land, let alone address the extent to which more recent policy requirements for the use of previously developed land affect the need to allocate safeguarded land for development. General Policy Considerations RPS notes the proposed policy in the draft Joint Core Strategy to accommodate 70% of new housing on previously developed land, and the existence of safeguarded land. RPS considers the target to be ambitious but even if it can be achieved a significant proportion of the housing requirement will need to be accommodated on greenfield land. We recognise the role of safeguarded land as the first greenfield land that local planning authorities should turn to. However, RPS notes the change in mid 2010 to the definition of previously developed land in Annex B of PPS3. This removed garden land, a significant source of such land and one which in many parts of the country makes a considerable contribution to the total provision of housing on previously developed land. The change will in RPS's opinion make it even more difficult for the three Central Lancashire authorities to achieve what was already a demanding target, notwithstanding what appears to be an unsupported assertion in paragraph 8.15 of the Publication Core Strategy that it can still be achieved. RPS therefore considers that there will be an even greater need to resort to greenfield sites in order to meet housing requirements in South Ribble BoroughWe note too the implications of paragraph 4.12 of the 'Landowners' document, which suggests that it would be better to bring forward some safeguarded sites than others to meet requirements in the present round of plan preparation. RPS nevertheless considers that the characteristics of the site are such that it is appropriate to be allocated in the present round of development plan making. Noise and Net Developable Area The Savills report of March 2008 acknowledged that noise from the nearby motorways would affect the site, without addressing the extent to which the realistically developable area might be reduced as a result. Since this time Persimmon Homes has undertaken initial investigative work and these representations seek to provide greater certainty in terms of the suitability and deliverability of the site for residential use. We anticipate that this will assist the Council in its consideration of sites eventually to be allocated in the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD. The attached drawing therefore shows not only the full extent of the land in which Persimmon Homes has an interest and the site as a whole, but also a smaller area representing the land which we believe could be developed without requiring inordinately expensive noise mitigation measures, for example, in the form of acoustic barriers adjacent to the motorways or in the construction of the dwellings themselves. It also shows, by means of the pecked red line, how the net developable area could be extended northwards and eastwards. This area is based on the categories set out in Annex 1 of PPG24: Planning and Noise and represents the area of land in category B for which the advice is: "Noise should be taken into account in when determining planning applications and, where appropriate, conditions imposed to ensure an adequate level of protection against noise". The land excluded falls into category C, for which the advice in Annex 1 begins "planning permission should not normally be granted". Although this is qualified by reference to the question of the availability of quieter sites, RPS considers that the range of choice available to the Council is not so restricted as to demand the development of the whole area in this case. This also takes into account the effect of noise on the amenity value of gardens, which do not benefit from noise mitigation measures in construction. It should however also be possible to mitigate such effects in the design of the layout of any residential scheme in respect of both houses and</p>

Reference	Comments
	<p>gardens. The need to provide for a buffer zone between the motorways and the edge of residential development has the benefit of providing land for any equipped play areas, open space and landscaping, and at the same time enabling more economical use to be made of the net developable area. Public Rights of Way RPS notes that a public right of way crosses the site. Any detailed layout would take this route into account, and to the extent that any amenity value it has might be diminished by residential development, this would be more than compensated for by the provision of additional amenity space. Residential Capacity On the basis of the provisional net developable area of 7.26 hectares, it is estimated that the site could accommodate between 218 and 290 dwellings at a range of 30 to 40 dwellings per hectare. Access Access to the site would be taken from Brindle Road. Persimmon Homes continue to hold an interest in number 215 Brindle Road, which would facilitate the provision of access of a suitable standard. Local Services and Facilities We draw to the Council's attention the material on these topics in the Savills report. This concluded that the site is sustainably located in respect of schools, shops, health facilities and recreation areas. Bus services run along Brindle Road, and Bamber Bridge railway station is located about 1.5 km from the site. The Council's Questions These representations also address the relevant questions put in the 'Landowners' document. C2: Are you aware of any sites where it might be suitable to apply set criteria for the density of housing? RPS is aware of the removal from RPS3 of the minimum density requirement of 30 dwellings per hectare (dph). We also recognise that the more general requirement for the efficient use of land remains and indeed support this principle. In this particular case, we do not consider that there are any grounds for development at a density lower than 30 dph. We consider that the density to be achieved on any site should eventually be determined by detailed design, but that for greenfield sites, a starting point for estimating capacity involves applying a density figure to the net developable area. As indicated above, we have done this in the case of land north of Brindle Road. C3: Are you aware of any sites which would be suitable for affordable housing in South Ribble? Subject to viability, RPS would expect a policy requiring the provision of affordable housing to apply to a site such as this, at levels to be determined through the development plan process and consistent with any relevant national guidance. Conclusion It is concluded that the Brindle Road site is deliverable for residential development and meets the criteria of PPS3 paragraph 54. This part of Lancashire is densely built up, and although Preston is clearly the most important settlement in it, the lack of an otherwise clearly defined settlement hierarchy makes the task of selecting sites for housing more difficult. However it is considered that there are relatively few strategic opportunities in the vicinity owing to the constraints of Green Belt, and flood risk, particularly on the southern bank of the River Ribble. Land at Brindle Road is not in the Green Belt and it is not at risk from flooding. It is close to local services and employment, and also within easy reach of employment opportunities in Preston and the higher order services offered by the city centre. It therefore provides a significant strategic scale opportunity for residential development in a sustainable location. Although the parts of the site closest to the motorways would have to be excluded from the developable area, they could provide amenity space. The site would constitute an appropriate rounding off of the built up area in the vicinity. No more permanent boundary could be envisaged than the motorways on the north western and north eastern sides, and so there would be no encroachment on the Green Belt to the north east of the site.</p>
306	<p>Dear South Ribble, I would like to comment upon the proposed SHLAA sites at Kellet Lane (SR136) and Brindle Road (SR006, 015, 026, 053, 058). Kellet Lane and Brindle Road to the south of the Hospital Inn railway crossing are country lanes which currently suffer from over-use due to drivers using it as an east west rat run to avoid travelling through Bamber Bridge. The traffic queues which frequently occur because of the railway crossing are a nuisance to residents of the area and often prevent them accessing their own properties. To build more housing on Kellet Lane or this part of Brindle Road would exacerbate this problem. Kellet Lane is quite perilous as it is now, adding more traffic and residential access points would make it even more dangerous.</p>
29	<p>Against building on this land. Should be kept a green area. too built up around this area</p>

Site SR029

Reference	Comments
386	<p>FOR THE ATTENTION OF THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT. It has come to my notice that there is a Local Development Framework consultation in process which commenced on 8th December 2010 and which is due to complete on 31st January 2011. That the process has been brought to my attention I can thank my neighbours in New Longton. I received a photo copy of Appendix 11 - Consultation Response Form informally through my letterbox last Saturday 22nd January 2011. It had been left by a neighbour and until then I was completely oblivious to the process. During the last week I have had an opportunity to view the LDF document on the South Ribble website. Clearly the Council has expended a great deal of time and money in producing this document. The document states 'Our hope is for as many individuals and organisations as possible to participate in the production of the Central Lancashire Core Strategy'. Hope being the operative word. In my humble opinion as a council tax</p>

Reference	Comments
	payer helping to fund this project, the advertising of the consultation has been abysmal and the consultation period far too short. I feel that a great opportunity to include the community has been lost. Having viewed the LDF document I wish to strongly object to the proposed development reference number SR029. Given that the area proposed for development is clearly within Green Belt and is used for agricultural purpose, to release the site would be contrary to established Green Belt policy, particularly in such an unsustainable and open location. I attach a full schedule of my objections together with supporting documents for your attention; a signed and dated hard copy of which will be delivered by hand to your offices at West Paddock on Monday 31st January 2011. Unfortunately given the time remaining I will struggle to provide you with structured answers to the 50 questions raised in Appendix 10 of the LDF document.
106	I object for the following reasons within the village of Longton:Greenbelt land should not be used for development.Traffic congestion and parking will be made worse.Local schools are over subscribed.We are losing the character of the village and the view from the village to open countryside.This will destroy and affect the natural environment and habitat of wildlife.Parking in the village is already very difficult. This will also reduce opportunities for exercise and leisure within the village.
700	Objection on grounds of; - too much increase in traffic - concreting over green land will worsen flooding issues - more houses will result in extra load on already very dated sewage and rainwater drainage system
286	Greenbelt land should not be used for development Traffic congestion and parking will be made worse. Local schools are over subscribed. We are rapidly losing the character of the village and the view of open countryside This will destroy and effect the natural environment and habitat of wildlife. Parking in the village is already very difficult.
243	I object to these Planning applications and the building of so many houses. The village cannot sustain any more development on the grounds of mains sewerage, road traffic increase, schools, doctors, already over subscribed. I also object on environmental grounds. Loss of habitat for mammals and birds, particularly owls. We have already lost a significant number of farmland birds (yellow hammers, lapwings, skylarks and ground nesting birds, and I feel these developments will just add to the decline of important British Birds.
658	I do not feel that this is a suitable plan for any type of industrial or residential use. Access to local roads is poor in this junction of Moss Lane and Chapel Lane already suffer from a lot of traffic.
109	Objection Comments:: I object for the following reasons within the village of Longton:- < Greenbelt land should not be used for development Traffic congestion and parking will be made worse Local schools are oversubscribed We will lose the character of the village and the view from the village to open countryside This development will destroy the natural environment and habitat for wildlife Parking in the village is already very difficult
661	Yet again I object to development on this land. There are Ecological issues to consider- loss of wildlife habitat for example Bats, Barn Owls, great crested, newts and numerous bird species. This agriculture land should be left alone for all to enjoy!!!
342	This application would have irreversible implications for the environment and natural habitat of wildlife, particularly on migrating birds which come to visit this area. Pollution is another worry that such a development would have on the area. The application is a no-brainer and would be heavily resisted through legal action.
219	With reference to South Ribble Borough Council's proposals to use greenbelt land for residential development, I wish to object for the following reasons: 1. I believe that greenbelt land should not be used for development 2. traffic congestion and parking will be made worse 3. local schools are already oversubscribed 4. the character of the village is being lost and views of the open countryside will also be lost 5 the habitat of wildlife and the natural environment will be destroyed 6. as many households in Longton have 2 cars (some even have 3) parking problems will obviously become more difficult.
295	Given that the area is clearly within designated as Green Belt and used for agricultural purpose, to release the site would be contrary to established Green Belt policy, particularly in such an unsustainable and open location. The current land is for pasture/grazing. Is it counter-intuitive that the removal of farm land would be supportive of the rural economy (cf Policy Guidance Clause 1.6). The habitat in this area would be threatened by any substantial development taking place on site reference SR029.
280	. I object to the re-zoning of Green Belt land for any type of development. All land in the green belt should be excluded from this consultation and not carried forward. 2. Longton already contains undeveloped land outside of the Green Belt which must be used for development before any consideration is given to the destruction of Green Belt land. This non green belt land should provide development potential for the next 30+ years. South Ribble as a whole has thousands of acres of land capable of development, without the need to destroy the Green Belt and villages like ours. 3. Leyland, Lostock Hall and Buckshaw village have a lot of areas not in the Green Belt or being used for agriculture which could be developed. These places have better communications than Longton e.g. close to motorway junctions and rail links at Leyland and Lostock Hall with the possibility of opening the old Royal Ordnance station at Buckshaw Village. Leyland has good shopping and parking facilities which can cope with additional residents. Both Leyland and Lostock Hall have primary and secondary schools and Leyland has Runshaw College obviating the need for children to travel to

Reference	Comments
	<p>surrounding towns for education. 4. I object to the loss of agricultural land. The population is growing and there is a move to local sourcing. Many acres of agricultural land has been lost to building in South Ribble in the past few years. We must keep what agricultural land that we have for the production of food, the maintenance of the varied wildlife in the area, the separation of the villages and the pleasure of the residents. 5. Ecological issues - loss of habitat. Local species include bats, barn owls, tawny owls, buzzards, greater crested newts, pheasants and many other birds, animals, amphibians, reptiles and insects. 6. Congestion/highways. Junctions with Liverpool Road throughout Longton and road such as Chapel Lane, Marsh Lane and Shirley Lane are already heavily used. Intensification of development would create dangerous road conditions. The A59 is at a standstill going in and out of Penwortham at busy times. This congestion is added to by the secondary school and college children having to travel from Longton and other villages to Penwortham, Preston etc. as there are no secondary schools or colleges in the Longton area. 7. Existing Longton sewers are already at capacity. 8. Development of Dobson's farm would provide a continuous link of the 2 settlements of Longton/Walmer Bridge providing urban sprawl. 9. There is a history of flooding on parts of Dobson's Farm and other areas in Longton. 10. Longton is limited in the room it has for shops, services, parking etc. and serves as a shopping and services centre for the surrounding area. The traffic in Longton is already heavy and the current parking in the village centre, including the Booths car park, is already well used. As any additional development in the area will be some distance from the shops and services, the current facilities are unlikely to be sufficient and I cannot see there being any suitable areas to extend.</p>
262	<p>1. I object to the re-zoning of Green Belt land for any type of development. All land in the green belt should be excluded from this consultation and not carried forward. 2. Longton already contains undeveloped land outside of the Green Belt which must be used for development before any consideration is given to the destruction of Green Belt land. This non green belt land should provide development potential for the next 30+ years. South Ribble as a whole has thousands of acres of land capable of development, without the need to destroy the Green Belt and villages like ours. 3. Leyland, Lostock Hall and Buckshaw village have a lot of areas not in the Green Belt or being used for agriculture which could be developed. These places have better communications than Longton e.g. close to motorway junctions and rail links at Leyland and Lostock Hall with the possibility of opening the old Royal Ordnance station at Buckshaw Village. Leyland has good shopping and parking facilities which can cope with additional residents. Both Leyland and Lostock Hall have primary and secondary schools and Leyland has Runshaw College obviating the need for children to travel to surrounding towns for education. 4. I object to the loss of agricultural land. The population is growing and there is a move to local sourcing. Many acres of agricultural land has been lost to building in South Ribble in the past few years. We must keep what agricultural land that we have for the production of food, the maintenance of the varied wildlife in the area, the separation of the villages and the pleasure of the residents. 5. Ecological issues - loss of habitat. Local species include bats, barn owls, tawny owls, buzzards, greater crested newts, pheasants and many other birds, animals, amphibians, reptiles and insects. 6. Congestion/highways. Junctions with Liverpool Road throughout Longton and road such as Chapel Lane, Marsh Lane and Shirley Lane are already heavily used. Intensification of development would create dangerous road conditions. The A59 is at a standstill going in and out of Penwortham at busy times. This congestion is added to by the secondary school and college children having to travel from Longton and other villages to Penwortham, Preston etc. as there are no secondary schools or colleges in the Longton area. 7. Existing Longton sewers are already at capacity. 8. Development of Dobson's farm would provide a continuous link of the 2 settlements of Longton/Walmer Bridge providing urban sprawl. 9. There is a history of flooding on parts of Dobson's Farm and other areas in Longton. 10. Longton is limited in the room it has for shops, services, parking etc. and serves as a shopping and services centre for the surrounding area. The traffic in Longton is already heavy and the current parking in the village centre, including the Booths car park, is already well used. As any additional development in the area will be some distance from the shops and services, the current facilities are unlikely to be sufficient and I cannot see there being any suitable areas to extend.</p>
328	<p>Any further development in Longton will cause significant problems with schooling in the village. The current schools will not be able to cope with the increased demands for places meaning some children having to travel to schools out of the village. There will also be issues with increased traffic and lack of parking in the village centre itself. At busy times Liverpool Road already suffers from significant congestion and parking spills over to the roads around Franklands and school lane. The proposed development will add further to this problem. In addition the proposed homes will no doubt be purchased by commuters further adding to the daily bottle necks heading to the motorway network and Preston. Without substantial investment in the roads in the area, including the building of a Penwortham bypass, further development in areas around Longton should be avoided. The land proposed to be used for development is greenbelt and should be protected from development to protect the village character.</p>
267	<p>I object for the following reasons within the village of Longton: Greenbelt land should not be used for development Traffic congestion and parking will be made worse Local Schools are oversubscribed Waste water and sewage capacity is insufficient Back Lane has insufficient capacity to give access to a number of new developments We are losing the character of the village and the view from the village to open countryside This will destroy the natural environment and wildlife habitats Brownsite land should be developed before greenbelt land</p>
264	<p>I object for the following reasons within the village of Longton: 1. Greenbelt land should not be used for development. 2. Traffic congestion and parking is already difficult</p>

Reference	Comments
	and will be made worse 3. Local schools are already over subscribed. 4. We are losing the character of the village and the view from the village to the open countryside. 5. This will destroy and significantly effect the natural environment and habitat of the wildlife. 6. Public footpaths and rights of way will be destroyed. 7. Parking in Longton village is already difficult. 8. Most residents live in Longton Village because it still retains the village atmosphere and these proposals will destroy this
274	The Council and residents should be working to protect the Green Belt around this area, and not to expand the residential areas as has happened in Longton. The lanes in this area are narrow and very busy, as they are used by local residents, and also by many others, who use Long Moss Lane as a shortcut through to Leyland. The lane is also used extensively by the farming community, and many of their vehicles are, by necessity, much wider than the average car. Would the drainage/school/doctor etc be able to cope with another influx of people? Only last year, there were extensive drainage works in the village, and this caused disruption to the flow of traffic for several weeks. This was to alleviate an already existing long standing problem for some residents of the village. In my view it is not sensible to continue overloading a system which appears to be already operating to its full capacity. I understand this site reference does not yet have a specific planning application at this time, I would be obliged if you would advise me of Council policy in situations such as this. Does the Council actively seek contractors to develop the site, or has it merely been earmarked as a potential development site for consideration, in the event that any builder/developer should make a planning application?
163	I object for the following reasons within the already over crowded village of Longton: Greenbelt land shouldn't be used for development. The drainage and sewage systems are already overstretched. Traffic congestion and parking will be made worse than it already is. Local schools are already over subscribed. We are losing the character of the village and the views from the village to open countryside. This will destroy or effect the natural environment and habitat of wildlife.
266	1. I object to the re-zoning of Green Belt land for any type of development. All land in the green belt should excluded from this consultation and not carried forward. 2. Longton already contains undeveloped land outside of the Green Belt which must be used for development before any consideration is given to the destruction of Green Belt land. This non green belt land should provide development potential for the next 30+ years. South Ribble as a whole has thousands of acres of land capable of development, without the need to destroy the Green Belt and villages like ours. 3. Leyland, Lostock Hall and Buckshaw village have a lot of areas not in the Green Belt or being used for agriculture which could be developed. These places have better communications than Longton e.g. close to motorway junctions and rail links at Leyland and Lostock Hall with the possibility of opening the old Royal Ordnance station at Buckshaw Village. Leyland has good shopping and parking facilities which can cope with additional residents. Both Leyland and Lostock Hall have primary and secondary schools and Leyland has Runshaw College obviating the need for children to travel to surrounding towns for education. 4. I object to the loss of agricultural land. The population is growing and there is a move to local sourcing. Many acres of agricultural land has been lost to building in South Ribble in the past few years. We must keep what agricultural land that we have for the production of food, the maintenance of the varied wildlife in the area, the separation of the villages and the pleasure of the residents. 5. Ecological issues - loss of habitat. Local species include bats, barn owls, tawny owls, buzzards, greater crested newts, pheasants and many other birds, animals, amphibians, reptiles and insects. 6. Congestion/highways. Junctions with Liverpool Road throughout Longton and road such as Chapel Lane, Marsh Lane and Shirley Lane are already heavily used. Intensification of development would create dangerous road conditions. The A59 is at a standstill going in and out of Penwortham at busy times. This congestion is added to by the secondary school and college children having to travel from Longton and other villages to Penwortham, Preston etc. as there are no secondary schools or colleges in the Longton area. 7. Existing Longton sewers are already at capacity. 8. Development of Dobson's farm would provide a continuous link of the 2 settlements of Longton/Walmer Bridge providing urban sprawl. 9. There is a history of flooding on parts of Dobson's Farm and other areas in Longton. 10. Longton is limited in the room it has for shops, services, parking etc. and serves as a shopping and services centre for the surrounding area. The traffic in Longton is already heavy and the current parking in the village centre, including the Booths car park, is already well used. As any additional development in the area will be some distance from the shops and services, the current facilities are unlikely to be sufficient and I cannot see there being any suitable areas to extend.
129	I object to the development of the above sites because:- * This is all greenbelt land and should not be used for development * It will considerably add to traffic congestion & parking problems in the village. The present roads through the village cannot cope with the existing volumes of traffic. * Back Lane in particular is "an accident waiting to happen" with the volume of cars using the lane since the development of new housing (particularly around Aspendale Close). This lane is not equipped to cope with this amount of through traffic. Cars already "scream" up and down, with little consideration for other residents. It is becoming unsafe & further development will compound the problems. * The infrastructure of the village cannot sustain this amount of development:- schools, doctors, dentists etc * This amount of development, especially on Back Lane, will destroy the natural environment & habitat of the abundant wildlife that lives around this area
168	(OBJECTION), GREEN BELT. Outside settlement area, agricultural land.
166	I object for the followign reasons within the village of longton: - Traffic congestion and parking will be made worse - Local schools oevr subscribed - we are losing the character of the village and the view to open countryside - destruction of habitat and natural environment - parking already limited in the village

Reference	Comments
341	Objection Comments:: I object for the following reasons within the village of Longton 1) Greenbelt land should not be used for development 2) Traffic congestion and parking will be made worse 3) Local schools are over subscribed 4) We are losing the character of the village and the view from the village to the open countryside 5) This will destroy effect the natural environment and habitat of wildlife 6) Parking in the village is already very difficult
118	I object on these grounds: 1 Green belt land is sacrosant and should NOT be developed. 2 We need more agricultural land not less for future needs. 3 We should not destroy wildlife habitat and the natural environment. 4 This village is already overcrowded and parking is becoming more difficult. 5 Local schools are over subscribed. 6 The medical centre is over subscribed. 7 Traffic congestion will be much worse [Marsh Lane and Back Lane are already problem areas.] 8 The village will lose it's character and the very things which make it a pleasant place to live.
276	1. I object to the re-zoning of Green Belt land for any type of development. All land in the green belt should excluded from this consultation and not carried forward. 2. Longton already contains undeveloped land outside of the Green Belt which must be used for development before any consideration is given to the destruction of Green Belt land. This non green belt land should provide development potential for the next 30+ years. South Ribble as a whole has thousands of acres of land capable of development, without the need to destroy the Green Belt and villages like ours. 3. Leyland, Lostock Hall and Buckshaw village have a lot of areas not in the Green Belt or being used for agriculture which could be developed. These places have better communications than Longton e.g. close to motorway junctions and rail links at Leyland and Lostock Hall with the possibility of opening the old Royal Ordnance station at Buckshaw Village. Leyland has good shopping and parking facilities which can cope with additional residents. Both Leyland and Lostock Hall have primary and secondary schools and Leyland has Runshaw College obviating the need for children to travel to surrounding towns for education. 4. I object to the loss of agricultural land. The population is growing and there is a move to local sourcing. Many acres of agricultural land has been lost to building in South Ribble in the past few years. We must keep what agricultural land that we have for the production of food, the maintenance of the varied wildlife in the area, the separation of the villages and the pleasure of the residents. 5. Ecological issues - loss of habitat. Local species include bats, barn owls, tawny owls, buzzards, greater crested newts, pheasants and many other birds, animals, amphibians, reptiles and insects. 6. Congestion/highways. Junctions with Liverpool Road throughout Longton and road such as Chapel Lane, Marsh Lane and Shirley Lane are already heavily used. Intensification of development would create dangerous road conditions. The A59 is at a standstill going in and out of Penwortham at busy times. This congestion is added to by the secondary school and college children having to travel from Longton and other villages to Penwortham, Preston etc. as there are no secondary schools or colleges in the Longton area. 7. Existing Longton sewers are already at capacity. 8. Development of Dobson's farm would provide a continuous link of the 2 settlements of Longton/Walmer Bridge providing urban sprawl. 9. There is a history of flooding on parts of Dobson's Farm and other areas in Longton. 10. Longton is limited in the room it has for shops, services, parking etc. and serves as a shopping and services centre for the surrounding area. The traffic in Longton is already heavy and the current parking in the village centre, including the Booths car park, is already well used. As any additional development in the area will be some distance from the shops and services, the current facilities are unlikely to be sufficient and I cannot see there being any suitable areas to extend.
125	I object for the following reasons within Longton Village GREENBELT LAND SHOULD NOT BE USED FOR DEVELOPMENT TRAFFIC CONGESTION ALONG BACK LANE AND SHIRLEY LANE IS ALREADY BAD AND WILL ONLY BE MADE WORSE IF THIS DEVELOPMENT GOES AHEAD. THESE FIELDS ARE A HAVEN FOR WILDLIFE AND BUILDING ON THEM WILL DESTROY THEIR HABITAT. THE LOCAL SCHOOLS WILL BE UNABLE TO COPE WITH THE INEVITABLE INCREASE IN CHILDREN REQUIRING PLACES. PARKING AROUND THE VILLAGE IS ALREADY DIFFICULT AND WILL BE MADE WORSE.
698	(OBJECTION), GREEN BELT. Outside settlement area, agricultural land.
263	I have never before objected about a planning proposal. I previously lived at 14 chapel lane, longton and was directly affected by the school lane development 10 years ago but did not raise any objections as I could see no necessary grounds, however in relation to the proposed development affecting the back lane area of Longton I have concerns regarding the level of traffic. Back lane has many small bends in the road which can affect visibility. There is already a high level of kerbside residential parking on back lane which again impairs visibility. I am concerned that to increase the volume of traffic would impact the safety of road users and pedestrians, many of which are young children crossing back lane at school times when the existing volume of traffic it also at its busiest. My concerns regarding this planning application are solely based on road safety issues. I feel that Back lane cannot support an increse in traffic volume.
142	Suggestions for Changes Comments:: Green belt Land should not be used for development as there is significant Brownfield sites in surrounding areas, these should be used instead. the impact of using green belt land would be detrimental to the wide variety of flora and forna in the area including an extensive resident and visiting bird population.
124	I Have lived in longton all my life and seen so many developments new to the village,it is so much busyier and it isent the village it used to be.I feel the greenbelt land

Reference	Comments
	should be left alone.
353	Dear Sir/Madam I have tried to complete the consultation response form online but there seems to be a problem with it and it will not let me past the first page. I am objecting to the proposals to build properties on sites numbered SR045 and SR029. Sr045 nature of response is OBJECTION COMMENTS. The reasons I am objecting to this is site are 1. This is a proposed plan to build I believe 45 houses, we do not have any room at our local school for any more children 2. We do not have any room in our doctors we find it extremely difficult to get an appointment 3. The structure of the village cannot take any more houses we are already liable for flooding and more concrete foundations will make this situation considerably worse. 4. We already have at least 38 houses for sale in New Longton therefore there is not a need to build anymore. 5. We are a small village, Wain homes are trying to take over the village they have already "garden grabbed" on Hugh Barn Lane and built several houses, we do not want and we cannot cope as a village with any more.
288	where do i start - how does this fit into the councils long term strategy, is there an economic requirement for the area to build more houses, particularly when the housing market is in a depressed state, loss of greenbelt which the council in its mismanagement has managed to massively erode over successive decades, >capacity of sewerage system that struggles to cope, lack of village infrastructure (old school knocked down in previous development for example) lack of jobs in the area, >environmental impact (wildlife, traffic).
144	I object for the following reasons within the village of longton: Greenbelt land should not be used for development, Traffic congestion and parking will be made worse, Local schools are over subscribed,We are losing the character of the village and the view from the village to open countryside, This will destroy effect the natural enviroment and habitat of wildlife,Parking in the village is already very difficult.
214	Objection I object for the following reasons within the village of Longton: Greenbelt land should not be used for development. Traffic congestion and parking will be made worse. Local schools are over subscribed. We are losing the character of the village and the wiew from the village to open countryside. This will destroy/effect the natural environment and habitat of wildlife. Parking in the village is already very difficult.
309	The proposed site developemnt is located in Greenbelt and is currently used for agriculture (grazing of sheep and cows). The discussion paper para 8.15 refers to agriclutre being an important part of the rural economy. This lands forms part of the land required to support the needs of agriculture The propasl is not in accordance with the councils own policy, ref 6.16 of the discussion paper on the protection of Greenbelt. There is no exceptional circumstance under Planning Policy Guidance 2 that can justify a change of land use and the encroachment onto Greenbelt. This would also set a president for future in that landowers can successfully agrue for planning permission to develop Greenbelt land. As in this case nodoubt the landowner will profit millions from this proposal. the site development proposal is outside village boundaries, refer to plan on page 79. There is no logical reason to develop the site, all other previous proposals, page 82 were rejected due to being located in Greenbelt. This priciple should apply in this case. The proposed use is unclear. Employment is not a consideration since there is no demand in this location for commercial use, there are many other sites that can be developed for commercial that are not in Grennbelt
119	Objection Comments:: I would like to object to the Developers site suggestions for Longton. I have several concerns in relation to Highways, environment and infrastructure.The strategy states that the housing is needed to take account of the ageing population yet in the last five years South Ribble BC have allowed the demolition of an old people's home on Liverpool road to enable the building of a small estate with limited affordable housing!!! With regard to my objections I have a concern in relation to the increase in residential property and lack of consultation with other key stakeholders. At this present time LCC, Education and Lancashire constabulary are all reducing staff and services in order to deal with the current budgetary difficulties. How will they then deal with the increased demand that will result from increased residential properties? In particular there will be increases in crime and disorder, more congested highways and oversubscribed schools which will cause problems and which aren't being taken into account in plans for other key agencies.In relation to environmental factors the greenbelt is home to many different species of animals,birds and vegetation. The plans submitted will have a significant impact on the local habitat for numerous species.
233	greenbelt land should not be used for development. traffic congestion will be made worse we are losing the character of the village. losing the country side. it will destroy the wildlife. local schools are already over subscribed. parking in the village is already difficult.
388	Catering for Sustainable Travel – Reducing Reliance on the Car Item 3.2 of the LDF Discussion Paper states 'At the moment most journeys in South Ribble are taken by car which causes traffic congestion and pollution, so we need to create opportunities and choices for people to use their car less'. The proposed development site SR029 is isolated. It is one mile form the site to the nearest grocer, doctor, school or medical centre. Local buses run to limited routes and are infrequent. The local bus to Preston runs at one hour intervals during the day. The nearest supermarket is one mile away. Local residents use their cars to visit the supermarket or take their children to school. The local population comprises mainly of elderly people, so if the site were to be used for business purpose it is unlikely that any potential workforce would be drawn from the local population. Therefore the use of the site for business purposes would be likely to increase the amount of local traffic with the consequential increased congestion

Reference	Comments
	<p>and pollution. The existing small trading estate which lies between Brownhill Lane and the A59 is largely unoccupied with many of the premises displaying 'To Let' signs. This is hardly evidence of an exceptional need for further industrial/business premises in the immediate area (cf Policy Guidance Clause 2.6). As use for potential housing the site is small at 2.90 hectares. A core strategy of the council is to make efficient use of land whilst respecting the local character in terms of housing density. The existing immediate local housing density is approximately less than 20/hectare. Given a potential 25 houses per hectare to respect the local character, the site is likely to offer no more than 75 houses or an additional 180 population at an average household size of 2.37 (Your Lancashire pdf – attached). An increase in the local population of 180 is hardly likely to have a positive effect on the quality of the local bus service provided' but 75 additional households would be likely to add a further 150 vehicles using local roads. Thus adding to congestion and pollution. There is already significant congestion at all local junctions at peak times. Any additional vehicle movement would be a further detriment and one which the local road and more importantly the junction networks could not accommodate. This emphasises the site unsustainable and unsuitable location for residential or employment or as a mixed use site. It shows how distant local facilities are and how additional population would not support these distant facilities. Additional land if it is required, should be located close to and support existing facilities and be in a sustainable and appropriate location. This speculative and inappropriate site should be immediately discounted.</p>
428	<p>Green Belt Item 6.16 of the LDF Discussion Paper states 'The Council is committed to protecting the Green Belt within South Ribble. Green Belt will not be released within the plan period (except in exceptional circumstances as defined by planning Policy Guidance 2: Green Belts) up until 2026. Clause 1.5 of the above policy guidance states 'purposes of including land in Green Belts – to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment'. Clause 1.6 states 'Once Green Belts have been defined, the use of land in them has a positive role to play in the following circumstances – to retain land in agricultural, forestry and related uses'. Clause 2.6 states 'Once the general extent of Green Belt has been approved it should be altered only in exceptional circumstances. If such an alteration is proposed the Secretary of State will wish to be satisfied that the authority has considered opportunities for development within the urban areas contained by and beyond the Green Belt. Similarly, detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans or earlier approved development plans should be altered only exceptionally. Detailed boundaries should not be altered or development allowed merely because the land has become derelict'. Clause 3.2 states 'Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to Green Belt. It is for the applicant to show why permission should be granted. Very special circumstances to justify inappropriate development will not exist unless the harm by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm is clearly outweighed by other considerations. In view of the presumption against inappropriate development, the Secretary of State will attach substantial weight to the harm to the Green Belt when considering any planning applications or appeal concerning such development.' The Lancashire County Council Mario map identifies the area of the proposed development SR029 lies within Green Belt (pdf copy attached). (Not attached – ZT) Letter from South Ribble Borough Council to John Kirkpatrick confirms that the railway cutting which lies between the rear gardens of 168-198 Chapel Lane and proposed development plot SR029 lies within Green Belt and is therefore inappropriate for the majority of development. (pdf copy attached). (Not attached – ZT) Given that the area is clearly within designated as Green Belt and used for agricultural purpose, to release the site would be contrary to established Green Belt Policy, particularly in such an unsustainable and open location. Within the LDF Discussion Paper, site reference SR029 is described as having more than one suggested use. There is no other overriding use or requirement to release Green Belt land and therefore an explanation of what is the nature of the alternative proposals should be given to allow for comment. Catering for Sustainable Travel – Reducing Reliance on the Car Item 3.2 of the LDF Discussion Paper states 'At the moment most journeys in South Ribble are taken by car which causes traffic congestion and pollution, so we need to create opportunities and choices for people to use their car less'. The proposed development site SR029 is isolated. It is one mile from the site to the nearest grocer, doctor, school or medical centre. Local buses run to limited routes and are infrequent. The local bus to Preston runs at one hour intervals during the day. The nearest supermarket is one mile away. Local residents use their cars to visit the supermarket or take their children to school. The local population comprises mainly of elderly people, so if the site were to be used for business purpose it is unlikely that any potential workforce would be drawn from the local population. Therefore the use of the site for business purposes would be likely to increase the amount of local traffic with the consequential increased congestion and pollution. The existing small trading estate which lies between Brownhill Lane and the A59 is largely unoccupied with many of the premises displaying 'To Let' signs. This is hardly evidence of an exceptional need for further industrial/business premises in the immediate area (cf Policy Guidance Clause 2.6). As use for potential housing the site is small at 2.90 hectares. A core strategy of the council is to make efficient use of land whilst respecting the local character in terms of housing density. The existing immediate local housing density is approximately less than 20/hectare. Given a potential 25 houses per hectare to respect the local character, the site is likely to offer no more than 75 houses or an additional 180 population at an average household size of 2.37 (Your Lancashire pdf – attached). (Not attached – ZT) An increase in the local population of 180 is hardly likely to have a positive effect on the quality of the local bus service provided' but 75 additional households would be likely to add a further 150 vehicles using local roads. Thus adding to congestion and pollution. There is already significant congestion at all local junctions at peak times. Any additional vehicle movement would be a further detriment and one which the local road and more importantly the junction networks could not accommodate. This emphasises the site unsustainable and unsuitable location for residential or employment or as a mixed use site. It shows how distant local facilities are and how additional population would not support these distant facilities. Additional land if it is required, should be located close to and support existing facilities and be in a sustainable and appropriate location.</p>

Reference	Comments
	<p>This speculative and inappropriate site should be immediately discounted. Homes for All – Respecting the Local Character As stated above, the site is isolated and small at 2.90 hectares. The existing housing density is approximately less than 20/hectare. In order to accord with the core strategy of respecting the local character in terms of housing density, the site is unlikely to yield more than 75 new homes. It is likely that local services will be inadequate given that the newest homes in the area are two detached houses constructed in 1975. The existing telephone installation to the area is pole fed. The fields which comprise the proposed development plot SR029 hold standing water during the winter months, as do the surrounding drainage ditches. The existing drainage system along Chapel Lane has been failing in recent years with homes becoming flooded in times of heavy rain. Extensive works to the drainage system were carried out during a six month period from December 2008 onwards. Excavations to a connection at the junction of Moss Lane and Chapel Lane were left open for a number of weeks whilst a solution to resolve the connection was found. It is therefore unlikely that the existing drainage system would be able to cope with any additional flow without substantial improvement. The provision of the utility services to these homes would require a substantial investment in the local infrastructure. Given that the proportion of fixed capital investment in providing utility services to 75 dwellings would be comparatively high any development could hardly be described as sustainable. Delivering Economic Prosperity – Supporting the Rural Economy The current land use is for pasture/grazing. It is counterintuitive that removal of the farmland would be supportive of the rural economy (cf Policy Guidance Clause 1.6). Protecting and Enhancing the Natural Environment – restore create and protect habitats for species The redundant railway cutting which lies between 168 to 198 Chapel Lane and Site Reference SR029 provides habitat to rabbits, jays, woodpeckers, pheasants, ducks and other native species. The County Council has installed a ‘Caution Ducks Crossing’ road sign at the junction of Moss Lane and Chapel Lane. The habitat in this area would be threatened by any substantial development taking place on site reference SR029 both during the construction phase and later by the activity of the development occupiers. Tackling climate change – protecting the best quality agricultural land As a key issue the Council is committed to protecting the best quality agricultural land. Item 8.16 of the LDF Discussion Paper states that the best and most versatile agricultural land has been identified (amongst others) at Longton Moss (cf Policy Guidance Clause 1.6). Site Reference SR029 is located at Longton Moss. The road to the East boundary of the site is Moss Lane. The site is currently used for pasture/grazing.</p>
390	<p>Homes for All – Respecting the Local Character As stated above, the site is isolated and small at 2.90 hectares. The existing housing density is approximately less than 20/hectare. In order to accord with the core strategy of respecting the local character in terms of housing density, the site is unlikely to yield more than 75 new homes. It is likely that local services will be inadequate given that the newest homes in the area are two detached houses constructed in 1975. The existing telephone installation to the area is pole fed. The fields which comprise the proposed development plot SR029 hold standing water during the winter months, as do the surrounding drainage ditches. The existing drainage system along Chapel Lane has been failing in recent years with homes becoming flooded in times of heavy rain. Extensive works to the drainage system were carried out during a six month period from December 2008 onwards. Excavations to a connection at the junction of Moss Lane and Chapel Lane were left open for a number of weeks whilst a solution to resolve the connection was found. It is therefore unlikely that the existing drainage system would be able to cope with any additional flow without substantial improvement. The provision of the utility services to these homes would require a substantial investment in the local infrastructure. Given that the proportion of fixed capital investment in providing utility services to 75 dwellings would be comparatively high any development could hardly be described as sustainable.</p>
390	<p>Catering for Sustainable Travel – Reducing Reliance on the Car Item 3.2 of the LDF Discussion Paper states ‘At the moment most journeys in South Ribble are taken by car which causes traffic congestion and pollution, so we need to create opportunities and choices for people to use their car less’. The proposed development site SR029 is isolated. It is one mile from the site to the nearest grocer, doctor, school or medical centre. Local buses run to limited routes and are infrequent. The local bus to Preston runs at one hour intervals during the day. The nearest supermarket is one mile away. Local residents use their cars to visit the supermarket or take their children to school. The local population comprises mainly of elderly people, so if the site were to be used for business purpose it is unlikely that any potential workforce would be drawn from the local population. Therefore the use of the site for business purposes would be likely to increase the amount of local traffic with the consequential increased congestion and pollution. The existing small trading estate which lies between Brownhill Lane and the A59 is largely unoccupied with many of the premises displaying ‘To Let’ signs. This is hardly evidence of an exceptional need for further industrial/business premises in the immediate area (cf Policy Guidance Clause 2.6). As use for potential housing the site is small at 2.90 hectares. A core strategy of the council is to make efficient use of land whilst respecting the local character in terms of housing density. The existing immediate local housing density is approximately less than 20/hectare. Given a potential 25 houses per hectare to respect the local character, the site is likely to offer no more than 75 houses or an additional 180 population at an average household size of 2.37 (Your Lancashire pdf – attached). An increase in the local population of 180 is hardly likely to have a positive effect on the quality of the local bus service provided’ but 75 additional households would be likely to add a further 150 vehicles using local roads. Thus adding to congestion and pollution. There is already significant congestion at all local junctions at peak times. Any additional vehicle movement would be a further detriment and one which the local road and more importantly the junction networks could not accommodate. This emphasises the site unsustainable and unsuitable location for residential or employment or as a mixed use site. It shows how distant local facilities are and how additional population would not support these distant facilities. Additional land if it is required, should be located close to and support existing facilities and be in a sustainable and appropriate location. This speculative</p>

Reference	Comments
	and inappropriate site should be immediately discounted.
388	Tackling climate change – protecting the best quality agricultural land As a key issue the Council is committed to protecting the best quality agricultural land. Item 8.16 of the LDF Discussion Paper states that the best and most versatile agricultural land has been identified (amongst others) at Longton Moss (cf Policy Guidance Clause 1.6). Site Reference SR029 is located at Longton Moss. The road to the East boundary of the site is Moss Lane. The site is currently used for pature/grazing.
388	Protecting and Enhancing the Natural Environment – restore create and protect habitats for species The redundant railway cutting which lies between 168 to 198 Chapel Lane and Site Reference SR029 provides habitat to rabbits, jays, woodpeckers, pheasants, ducks and other native species. The County Council has installed a 'Caution Ducks Crossing' road sign at the junction of Moss Lane and Chapel Lane. The habitat in this ear would be threatened by any substantial development taking place on site reference SR029 both during the construction phase and later by the activity of the development occupiers.
388	Delivering Economic Prosperity – Supporting the Rural Economy The current land use is for pasture/grazing. It is counterintuitive that removal of the farmland would be supportive of the rural economy (cf Policy Guidance Clause 1.6).
388	Homes for All – Respecting the Local Character As stated above, the site is isolated and small at 2.90 hectares. The existing housing density is approximately less than 20/hectare. In order to accord with the core strategy of respecting the local character in terms of housing density, the site is unlikely to yield more than 75 new homes. It is likely that local services will be inadequate given that the newest homes in the area are two detached houses constructed in 1975. The existing telephone installation to the area is pole fed. The fields which comprise the proposed development plot SR029 hold standing water during the winter months, as do the surrounding drainage ditches. The existing drainage system along Chapel Lane has been failing in recent years with homes becoming flooded in times of heavy rain. Extensive works to the drainage system were carried out during a six month period from December 2008 onwards. Excavations to a connection at the junction of Moss Lane and Chapel Lane were left open for a number of weeks whilst a solution to resolve the connection was found. It is therefore unlikely that the existing drainage system would be able to cope with any additional flow without substantial improvement. The provision of the utility services to these homes would require a substantial investment in the local infrastructure. Given that the proportion of fixed capital investment in providing utility services to 75 dwellings would be comparatively high any development could hardly be described as sustainable.
431	I object to the development of site reference number SR029 for the following reasons: Green Belt Item 6.16 of the LDF Discussion Paper states 'The Council is committed to protecting the Green Belt within South Ribble. Green Belt will not be released within the plan period (except in exceptional circumstances as defined by planning Policy Guidance 2: Green Belts) up until 2026. Clause 1.5 of the above policy guidance states 'purposes of including land in Green Belts – to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment'. Clause 1.6 states 'Once Green Belts have been defined, the use of land in them has a positive role to play in the following circumstances – to retain land in agricultural, forestry and related uses'. Clause 2.6 states 'Once the general extent of Green Belt has been approved it should be altered only in exceptional circumstances. If such an alteration is proposed the Secretary of State will wish to be satisfied that the authority has considered opportunities for development within the urban areas contained by and beyond the Green Belt. Similarly, detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans or earlier approved development plans should be altered only exceptionally. Detailed boundaries should not be altered or development allowed merely because the land has become derelict'. Clause 3.2 states 'Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to Green Belt. It is for the applicant to show why permission should be granted. Very special circumstances to justify inappropriate development will not exist unless the harm by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm is clearly outweighed by other considerations. In view of the presumption against inappropriate development, the Secretary of State will attach substantial weight to the harm to the Green Belt when considering any planning applications or appeal concerning such development.' The Lancashire County Council Mario map identifies the area of the proposed development SR029 lies within Green Belt (pdf copy attached). Letter from South Ribble Borough Council to John Kirkpatrick confirms that the railway cutting which lies between the rear gardens of 168-198 Chapel Lane and proposed development plot SR029 lies within Green Belt and is therefore inappropriate for the majority of development. (pdf copy attached). Given that the area is clearly within designated as Green Belt and used for agricultural purpose, to release the site would be contrary to established Green Belt Policy, particularly in such an unsustainable and open location. Within the LDF Discussion Paper, site reference SR029 is described as having more than one suggested use. There is no other overriding use or requirement to release Green Belt land and therefore an explanation of what is the nature of the alternative proposals should be given to allow for comment. Catering for Sustainable Travel – Reducing Reliance on the Car Item 3.2 of the LDF Discussion Paper states 'At the moment most journeys in South Ribble are taken by car which causes traffic congestion and pollution, so we need to create opportunities and choices for people to use their car less'. The proposed development site SR029 is isolated. It is one mile from the site to the nearest grocer, doctor, school or medical centre. Local buses run to limited routes and are infrequent. The local bus to Preston runs at one hour intervals during the day. The nearest supermarket is one mile away. Local residents use their cars to visit the supermarket or take their children to school. The local population comprises mainly of elderly people, so if the site were to be used for business purpose it is unlikely that any potential workforce would be drawn from the local population. Therefore the use of the site for business purposes would be likely to increase the amount of local traffic with the consequential increased

Reference	Comments
	<p>congestion and pollution. The existing small trading estate which lies between Brownhill Lane and the A59 is largely unoccupied with many of the premises displaying 'To Let' signs. This is hardly evidence of an exceptional need for further industrial/business premises in the immediate area (cf Policy Guidance Clause 2.6). As use for potential housing the site is small at 2.90 hectares. A core strategy of the council is to make efficient use of land whilst respecting the local character in terms of housing density. The existing immediate local housing density is approximately less than 20/hectare. Given a potential 25 houses per hectare to respect the local character, the site is likely to offer no more than 75 houses or an additional 180 population at an average household size of 2.37 (Your Lancashire pdf – attached). An increase in the local population of 180 is hardly likely to have a positive effect on the quality of the local bus service provided' but 75 additional households would be likely to add a further 150 vehicles using local roads. Thus adding to congestion and pollution. There is already significant congestion at all local junctions at peak times. Any additional vehicle movement would be a further detriment and one which the local road and more importantly the junction networks could not accommodate. This emphasises the site unsustainable and unsuitable location for residential or employment or as a mixed use site. It shows how distant local facilities are and how additional population would not support these distant facilities. Additional land if it is required, should be located close to and support existing facilities and be in a sustainable and appropriate location. This speculative and inappropriate site should be immediately discounted. Homes for All – Respecting the Local Character As stated above, the site is isolated and small at 2.90 hectares. The existing housing density is approximately less than 20/hectare. In order to accord with the core strategy of respecting the local character in terms of housing density, the site is unlikely to yield more than 75 new homes. It is likely that local services will be inadequate given that the newest homes in the area are two detached houses constructed in 1975. The existing telephone installation to the area is pole fed. The fields which comprise the proposed development plot SR029 hold standing water during the winter months, as do the surrounding drainage ditches. The existing drainage system along Chapel Lane has been failing in recent years with homes becoming flooded in times of heavy rain. Extensive works to the drainage system were carried out during a six month period from December 2008 onwards. Excavations to a connection at the junction of Moss Lane and Chapel Lane were left open for a number of weeks whilst a solution to resolve the connection was found. It is therefore unlikely that the existing drainage system would be able to cope with any additional flow without substantial improvement. The provision of the utility services to these homes would require a substantial investment in the local infrastructure. Given that the proportion of fixed capital investment in providing utility services to 75 dwellings would be comparatively high any development could hardly be described as sustainable. Delivering Economic Prosperity – Supporting the Rural Economy The current land use is for pasture/grazing. It is counterintuitive that removal of the farmland would be supportive of the rural economy (cf Policy Guidance Clause 1.6). Protecting and Enhancing the Natural Environment – restore create and protect habitats for species The redundant railway cutting which lies between 168 to 198 Chapel Lane and Site Reference SR029 provides habitat to rabbits, jays, woodpeckers, pheasants, ducks and other native species. The County Council has installed a 'Caution Ducks Crossing' road sign at the junction of Moss Lane and Chapel Lane. The habitat in this ear would be threatened by any substantial development taking place on site reference SR029 both during the construction phase and later by the activity of the development occupiers. Tackling climate change – protecting the best quality agricultural land As a key issue the Council is committed to protecting the best quality agricultural land. Item 8.16 of the LDF Discussion Paper states that the best and most versatile agricultural land has been identified (amongst others) at Longton Moss (cf Policy Guidance Clause 1.6). Site Reference SR029 is located at Longton Moss. The road to the East boundary of the site is Moss Lane. The site is currently used for pasture/grazing.</p>
435	<p>In response to your 15 year local development plan (which we and over 90% of our affected neighbours only became aware of just over a week ago), we wish to place on record that we oppose any development of the green belt land (SR029) to the rear of 169-198 Chapel Lane, New Longton. Only last year the South Ribble Planning Dept confirmed to us the land to be Green Belt. We have lived at the present address for 23 years and are increasingly concerned at the amount of increase in traffic on both Chapel Lane and Moss Lane and the increase in noise from 'very' large transport vehicles over what used to be the bridge on Moss Lane. Also it is still unbelievable that such a narrow winding B road as Moss Lane (interconnecting Chapel Lane and New Longton village) is still a 60mph highway after the number of recent accidents on this section. Drainage – as SR are aware, we have had major drainage problems in this are in recent years with major drainage works having to be carried out. Also: I object to the development of site reference number SR029 for the following reasons: Green Belt Item 6.16 of the LDF Discussion Paper states 'The Council is committed to protecting the Green Belt within South Ribble. Green Belt will not be released within the plan period (except in exceptional circumstances as defined by planning Policy Guidance 2: Green Belts) up until 2026. Clause 1.5 of the above policy guidance states 'purposes of including land in Green Belts – to assist in safeguarding the countryside form encroachment'. Clause 1.6 states 'Once Green Belts have been defined, the use of land in them has a positive role to play in the following circumstances – to retain land in agricultural, forestry and related uses'. Clause 2.6 states 'Once the general extent of Green Belt has been approved it should be altered only in exceptional circumstances. If such an alteration is proposed the Secretary of State will wish to be satisfied that the authority has considered opportunities for development within the urban areas contained by and beyond the Green Belt. Similarly, detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans or earlier approved development plans should be altered only exceptionally. Detailed boundaries should not be altered or development allowed merely because the land has become derelict'. Clause 3.2 states 'Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to Green Belt. It is for the applicant to show why permission should be granted. Very special circumstances to justify inappropriate development will not exist unless the harm by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm is clearly outweighed by other considerations. In view of</p>

Reference	Comments
	<p>the presumption against inappropriate development, the Secretary of State will attach substantial weight to the harm to the Green Belt when considering any planning applications or appeal concerning such development.’ The Lancashire County Council Mario map identifies the area of the proposed development SR029 lies within Green Belt (pdf copy attached). (Not attached – ZT) Letter from South Ribble Borough Council to John Kirkpatrick confirms that the railway cutting which lies between the rear gardens of 168-198 Chapel Lane and proposed development plot SR029 lies within Green Belt and is therefore inappropriate for the majority of development. (pdf copy attached). Given that the area is clearly within designated as Green Belt and used for agricultural purpose, to release the site would be contrary to established Green Belt Policy, particularly in such an unsustainable and open location. Within the LDF Discussion Paper, site reference SR029 is described as having more than one suggested use. There is no other overriding use or requirement to release Green Belt land and therefore an explanation of what is the nature of the alternative proposals should be given to allow for comment. Catering for Sustainable Travel – Reducing Reliance on the Car Item 3.2 of the LDF Discussion Paper states ‘At the moment most journeys in South Ribble are taken by car which causes traffic congestion and pollution, so we need to create opportunities and choices for people to use their car less’. The proposed development site SR029 is isolated. It is one mile from the site to the nearest grocer, doctor, school or medical centre. Local buses run to limited routes and are infrequent. The local bus to Preston runs at one hour intervals during the day. The nearest supermarket is one mile away. Local residents use their cars to visit the supermarket or take their children to school. The local population comprises mainly of elderly people, so if the site were to be used for business purpose it is unlikely that any potential workforce would be drawn from the local population. Therefore the use of the site for business purposes would be likely to increase the amount of local traffic with the consequential increased congestion and pollution. The existing small trading estate which lies between Brownhill Lane and the A59 is largely unoccupied with many of the premises displaying ‘To Let’ signs. This is hardly evidence of an exceptional need for further industrial/business premises in the immediate area (cf Policy Guidance Clause 2.6). As use for potential housing the site is small at 2.90 hectares. A core strategy of the council is to make efficient use of land whilst respecting the local character in terms of housing density. The existing immediate local housing density is approximately less than 20/hectare. Given a potential 25 houses per hectare to respect the local character, the site is likely to offer no more than 75 houses or an additional 180 population at an average household size of 2.37 (Your Lancashire pdf – attached). (Not attached – ZT) An increase in the local population of 180 is hardly likely to have a positive effect on the quality of the local bus service provided’ but 75 additional households would be likely to add a further 150 vehicles using local roads. Thus adding to congestion and pollution. There is already significant congestion at all local junctions at peak times. Any additional vehicle movement would be a further detriment and one which the local road and more importantly the junction networks could not accommodate. This emphasises the site unsustainable and unsuitable location for residential or employment or as a mixed use site. It shows how distant local facilities are and how additional population would not support these distant facilities. Additional land if it is required, should be located close to and support existing facilities and be in a sustainable and appropriate location. This speculative and inappropriate site should be immediately discounted. Homes for All – Respecting the Local Character As stated above, the site is isolated and small at 2.90 hectares. The existing housing density is approximately less than 20/hectare. In order to accord with the core strategy of respecting the local character in terms of housing density, the site is unlikely to yield more than 75 new homes. It is likely that local services will be inadequate given that the newest homes in the area are two detached houses constructed in 1975. The existing telephone installation to the area is pole fed. The fields which comprise the proposed development plot SR029 hold standing water during the winter months, as do the surrounding drainage ditches. The existing drainage system along Chapel Lane has been failing in recent years with homes becoming flooded in times of heavy rain. Extensive works to the drainage system were carried out during a six month period from December 2008 onwards. Excavations to a connection at the junction of Moss Lane and Chapel Lane were left open for a number of weeks whilst a solution to resolve the connection was found. It is therefore unlikely that the existing drainage system would be able to cope with any additional flow without substantial improvement. The provision of the utility services to these homes would require a substantial investment in the local infrastructure. Given that the proportion of fixed capital investment in providing utility services to 75 dwellings would be comparatively high any development could hardly be described as sustainable. Delivering Economic Prosperity – Supporting the Rural Economy The current land use is for pasture/grazing. It is counterintuitive that removal of the farmland would be supportive of the rural economy (cf Policy Guidance Clause 1.6). Protecting and Enhancing the Natural Environment – restore create and protect habitats for species The redundant railway cutting which lies between 168 to 198 Chapel Lane and Site Reference SR029 provides habitat to rabbits, jays, woodpeckers, pheasants, ducks and other native species. The County Council has installed a ‘Caution Ducks Crossing’ road sign at the junction of Moss Lane and Chapel Lane. The habitat in this ear would be threatened by any substantial development taking place on site reference SR029 both during the construction phase and later by the activity of the development occupiers. Tackling climate change – protecting the best quality agricultural land As a key issue the Council is committed to protecting the best quality agricultural land. Item 8.16 of the LDF Discussion Paper states that the best and most versatile agricultural land has been identified (amongst others) at Longton Moss (cf Policy Guidance Clause 1.6). Site Reference SR029 is located at Longton Moss. The road to the East boundary of the site is Moss Lane. The site is currently used for pasture/grazing.</p>
433	<p>I object to the development of site reference number SR029 for the following reasons: Green Belt Item 6.16 of the LDF Discussion Paper states ‘The Council is committed to protecting the Green Belt within South Ribble. Green Belt will not be released within the plan period (except in exceptional circumstances as defined by planning Policy Guidance 2: Green Belts) up until 2026. Clause 1.5 of the above policy guidance states ‘purposes of including land in Green Belts – to assist in safeguarding the</p>

Reference	Comments
	<p>countryside form encroachment'. Clause 1.6 states 'Once Green Belts have been defined, the use of land in them has a positive role to play in the following circumstances – to retain land in agricultural, forestry and related uses'. Clause 2.6 states 'Once the general extent of Green Belt has been approved it should be altered only in exceptional circumstances. If such an alteration is proposed the Secretary of State will wish to be satisfied that the authority has considered opportunities for development within the urban areas contained by and beyond the Green Belt. Similarly, detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans or earlier approved development plans should be altered only exceptionally. Detailed boundaries should not be altered or development allowed merely because the land has become derelict'. Clause 3.2 states 'Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to Green Belt. It is for the applicant to show why permission should be granted. Very special circumstances to justify inappropriate development will not exist unless the harm by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm is clearly outweighed by other considerations. In view of the presumption against inappropriate development, the Secretary of State will attach substantial weight to the harm to the Green Belt when considering any planning applications or appeal concerning such development.' The Lancashire County Council Mario map identifies the area of the proposed development SR029 lies within Green Belt (pdf copy attached). Letter from South Ribble Borough Council to John Kirkpatrick confirms that the railway cutting which lies between the rear gardens of 168-198 Chapel Lane and proposed development plot SR029 lies within Green Belt and is therefore inappropriate for the majority of development. (pdf copy attached). Given that the area is clearly within designated as Green Belt and used for agricultural purpose, to release the site would be contrary to established Green Belt Policy, particularly in such an unsustainable and open location. Within the LDF Discussion Paper, site reference SR029 is described as having more than one suggested use. There is no other overriding use or requirement to release Green Belt land and therefore an explanation of what is the nature of the alternative proposals should be given to allow for comment. Catering for Sustainable Travel – Reducing Reliance on the Car Item 3.2 of the LDF Discussion Paper states 'At the moment most journeys in South Ribble are taken by car which causes traffic congestion and pollution, so we need to create opportunities and choices for people to use their car less'. The proposed development site SR029 is isolated. It is one mile from the site to the nearest grocer, doctor, school or medical centre. Local buses run to limited routes and are infrequent. The local bus to Preston runs at one hour intervals during the day. The nearest supermarket is one mile away. Local residents use their cars to visit the supermarket or take their children to school. The local population comprises mainly of elderly people, so if the site were to be used for business purpose it is unlikely that any potential workforce would be drawn from the local population. Therefore the use of the site for business purposes would be likely to increase the amount of local traffic with the consequential increased congestion and pollution. The existing small trading estate which lies between Brownhill Lane and the A59 is largely unoccupied with many of the premises displaying 'To Let' signs. This is hardly evidence of an exceptional need for further industrial/business premises in the immediate area (cf Policy Guidance Clause 2.6). As use for potential housing the site is small at 2.90 hectares. A core strategy of the council is to make efficient use of land whilst respecting the local character in terms of housing density. The existing immediate local housing density is approximately less than 20/hectare. Given a potential 25 houses per hectare to respect the local character, the site is likely to offer no more than 75 houses or an additional 180 population at an average household size of 2.37 (Your Lancashire pdf – attached). (Not attached – ZT) An increase in the local population of 180 is hardly likely to have a positive effect on the quality of the local bus service provided' but 75 additional households would be likely to add a further 150 vehicles using local roads. Thus adding to congestion and pollution. There is already significant congestion at all local junctions at peak times. Any additional vehicle movement would be a further detriment and one which the local road and more importantly the junction networks could not accommodate. This emphasises the site unsustainable and unsuitable location for residential or employment or as a mixed use site. It shows how distant local facilities are and how additional population would not support these distant facilities. Additional land if it is required, should be located close to and support existing facilities and be in a sustainable and appropriate location. This speculative and inappropriate site should be immediately discounted. Homes for All – Respecting the Local Character As stated above, the site is isolated and small at 2.90 hectares. The existing housing density is approximately less than 20/hectare. In order to accord with the core strategy of respecting the local character in terms of housing density, the site is unlikely to yield more than 75 new homes. It is likely that local services will be inadequate given that the newest homes in the area are two detached houses constructed in 1975. The existing telephone installation to the area is pole fed. The fields which comprise the proposed development plot SR029 hold standing water during the winter months, as do the surrounding drainage ditches. The existing drainage system along Chapel Lane has been failing in recent years with homes becoming flooded in times of heavy rain. Extensive works to the drainage system were carried out during a six month period from December 2008 onwards. Excavations to a connection at the junction of Moss Lane and Chapel Lane were left open for a number of weeks whilst a solution to resolve the connection was found. It is therefore unlikely that the existing drainage system would be able to cope with any additional flow without substantial improvement. The provision of the utility services to these homes would require a substantial investment in the local infrastructure. Given that the proportion of fixed capital investment in providing utility services to 75 dwellings would be comparatively high any development could hardly be described as sustainable. Delivering Economic Prosperity – Supporting the Rural Economy The current land use is for pasture/grazing. It is counterintuitive that removal of the farmland would be supportive of the rural economy (cf Policy Guidance Clause 1.6). Protecting and Enhancing the Natural Environment – restore create and protect habitats for species The redundant railway cutting which lies between 168 to 198 Chapel Lane and Site Reference SR029 provides habitat to rabbits, jays, woodpeckers, pheasants, ducks and other native species. The County Council has installed a 'Caution Ducks Crossing' road sign at the junction of Moss Lane and Chapel Lane. The habitat in this ear would be threatened by any substantial development taking place on site</p>

Reference	Comments
	reference SR029 both during the construction phase and later by the activity of the development occupiers. Tackling climate change – protecting the best quality agricultural land As a key issue the Council is committed to protecting the best quality agricultural land. Item 8.16 of the LDF Discussion Paper states that the best and most versatile agricultural land has been identified (amongst others) at Longton Moss (cf Policy Guidance Clause 1.6). Site Reference SR029 is located at Longton Moss. The road to the East boundary of the site is Moss Lane. The site is currently used for pasture/grazing.
428	I object to the development of site ref SR029 and in addition to the reasons details on the attached document I would add the following: - A sequential test approach should be applied to the development of land within the borough which prioritises brownfield sites above land within the green belt. Only when the supply of brownfield sites has been exhausted should consideration be give to the release of land within the green belt. - Development at this location is outside the settlement boundaries of Longton and New Longton and would severely jeopardise the individual identities of these settlements by introducing additional development in the intermediate land between them. Currently the land between the villages comprises intermittent ribbon development providing a break between the settlements. A substantial development such as that proposed would introduce significant massing which would fundamentally alter the character of the area between the settlements. If following the sequential test approach it is determined that development in Longton or New Longton area then this should be within the boundaries of the existing settlements or immediately adjacent to those boundaries. - The road junctions adjacent to the site are below current highways standards and introducing additional traffic would be undesirable. The junction of Brownhill Lane and Chapel Park Road has poor site lines and inadequate junction spacing with Chapel Lane. The adjacent junction of Chapel Park Road, Chapel Lane and Longton by pass is above capacity and the introduction of additional traffic would impact upon highways safety. There is inadequate distance visibility on Moss Lane to safely introduce a junction due to the former railway bridge. - There is insufficient demand for light industrial or commercial use of the land in the area as is evidenced by the continued availability of land designated for this purpose at the Walmer Bridge roundabout. The development of this land is wholly inappropriate for the reasons stated above and on the attached detailed submission. I trust that you will reconsider and I request that you notify me by letter if you intend to proceed with this proposal so that I may sustain my objection at any future public inquiry.
388	I object to the development of site reference number SR029 for the following reasons: Green Belt Item 6.16 of the LDF Discussion Paper states ‘The Council is committed to protecting the Green Belt within South Ribble. Green Belt will not be released within the plan period (except in exceptional circumstances as defined by planning Policy Guidance 2: Green Belts) up until 2026. Clause 1.5 of the above policy guidance states ‘purposes of including land in Green Belts – to assist in safeguarding the countryside form encroachment’. Clause 1.6 states ‘Once Green Belts have been defined, the use of land in them has a positive role to play in the following circumstances – to retain land in agricultural, forestry and related uses’. Clause 2.6 states ‘Once the general extent of Green Belt has been approved it should be altered only in exceptional circumstances. If such an alteration is proposed the Secretary of State will wish to be satisfied that the authority has considered opportunities for development within the urban areas contained by and beyond the Green Belt. Similarly, detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans or earlier approved development plans should be altered only exceptionally. Detailed boundaries should not be altered or development allowed merely because the land has become derelict’. Clause 3.2 states ‘Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to Green Belt. It is for the applicant to show why permission should be granted. Very special circumstances to justify inappropriate development will not exist unless the harm by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm is clearly outweighed by other considerations. In view of the presumption against inappropriate development, the Secretary of State will attach substantial weight to the harm to the Green Belt when considering any planning applications or appeal concerning such development.’ The Lancashire County Council Mario map identifies the area of the proposed development SR029 lies within Green Belt (pdf copy attached). Letter from South Ribble Borough Council to John Kirkpatrick confirms that the railway cutting which lies between the rear gardens of 168-198 Chapel Lane and proposed development plot SR029 lies within Green Belt and is therefore inappropriate for the majority of development. (pdf copy attached). Given that the area is clearly within designated as Green Belt and used for agricultural purpose, to release the site would be contrary to established Green Belt Policy, particularly in such an unsustainable and open location. Within the LDF Discussion Paper, site reference SR029 is described as having more than one suggested use. There is no other overriding use or requirement to release Green Belt land and therefore an explanation of what is the nature of the alternative proposals should be given to allow for comment.
387	Protecting and Enhancing the Natural Environment – restore create and protect habitats for species The redundant railway cutting which lies between 168 to 198 Chapel Lane and Site Reference SR029 provides habitat to rabbits, jays, woodpeckers, pheasants, ducks and other native species. The County Council has installed a ‘Caution Ducks Crossing’ road sign at the junction of Moss Lane and Chapel Lane. The habitat in this ear would be threatened by any substantial development taking place on site reference SR029 both during the construction phase and later by the activity of the development occupiers.
387	Delivering Economic Prosperity – Supporting the Rural Economy The current land use is for pasture/grazing. It is counterintuitive that removal of the farmland would be supportive of the rural economy (cf Policy Guidance Clause 1.6).
387	Homes for All – Respecting the Local Character As stated above, the site is isolated and small at 2.90 hectares. The existing housing density is approximately less than

Reference	Comments
	<p>20/hectare. In order to accord with the core strategy of respecting the local character in terms of housing density, the site is unlikely to yield more than 75 new homes. It is likely that local services will be inadequate given that the newest homes in the area are two detached houses constructed in 1975. The existing telephone installation to the area is pole fed. The fields which comprise the proposed development plot SR029 hold standing water during the winter months, as do the surrounding drainage ditches. The existing drainage system along Chapel Lane has been failing in recent years with homes becoming flooded in times of heavy rain. Extensive works to the drainage system were carried out during a six month period from December 2008 onwards. Excavations to a connection at the junction of Moss Lane and Chapel Lane were left open for a number of weeks whilst a solution to resolve the connection was found. It is therefore unlikely that the existing drainage system would be able to cope with any additional flow without substantial improvement. The provision of the utility services to these homes would require a substantial investment in the local infrastructure. Given that the proportion of fixed capital investment in providing utility services to 75 dwellings would be comparatively high any development could hardly be described as sustainable.</p>
387	<p>Catering for Sustainable Travel – Reducing Reliance on the Car Item 3.2 of the LDF Discussion Paper states ‘At the moment most journeys in South Ribble are taken by car which causes traffic congestion and pollution, so we need to create opportunities and choices for people to use their car less’. The proposed development site SR029 is isolated. It is one mile from the site to the nearest grocer, doctor, school or medical centre. Local buses run to limited routes and are infrequent. The local bus to Preston runs at one hour intervals during the day. The nearest supermarket is one mile away. Local residents use their cars to visit the supermarket or take their children to school. The local population comprises mainly of elderly people, so if the site were to be used for business purpose it is unlikely that any potential workforce would be drawn from the local population. Therefore the use of the site for business purposes would be likely to increase the amount of local traffic with the consequential increased congestion and pollution. The existing small trading estate which lies between Brownhill Lane and the A59 is largely unoccupied with many of the premises displaying ‘To Let’ signs. This is hardly evidence of an exceptional need for further industrial/business premises in the immediate area (cf Policy Guidance Clause 2.6). As use for potential housing the site is small at 2.90 hectares. A core strategy of the council is to make efficient use of land whilst respecting the local character in terms of housing density. The existing immediate local housing density is approximately less than 20/hectare. Given a potential 25 houses per hectare to respect the local character, the site is likely to offer no more than 75 houses or an additional 180 population at an average household size of 2.37 (Your Lancashire pdf – attached). An increase in the local population of 180 is hardly likely to have a positive effect on the quality of the local bus service provided’ but 75 additional households would be likely to add a further 150 vehicles using local roads. Thus adding to congestion and pollution. There is already significant congestion at all local junctions at peak times. Any additional vehicle movement would be a further detriment and one which the local road and more importantly the junction networks could not accommodate. This emphasises the site unsustainable and unsuitable location for residential or employment or as a mixed use site. It shows how distant local facilities are and how additional population would not support these distant facilities. Additional land if it is required, should be located close to and support existing facilities and be in a sustainable and appropriate location. This speculative and inappropriate site should be immediately discounted.</p>
387	<p>I object to the development of site reference number SR029 for the following reasons: Green Belt Item 6.16 of the LDF Discussion Paper states ‘The Council is committed to protecting the Green Belt within South Ribble. Green Belt will not be released within the plan period (except in exceptional circumstances as defined by planning Policy Guidance 2: Green Belts) up until 2026. Clause 1.5 of the above policy guidance states ‘purposes of including land in Green Belts – to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment’. Clause 1.6 states ‘Once Green Belts have been defined, the use of land in them has a positive role to play in the following circumstances – to retain land in agricultural, forestry and related uses’. Clause 2.6 states ‘Once the general extent of Green Belt has been approved it should be altered only in exceptional circumstances. If such an alteration is proposed the Secretary of State will wish to be satisfied that the authority has considered opportunities for development within the urban areas contained by and beyond the Green Belt. Similarly, detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans or earlier approved development plans should be altered only exceptionally. Detailed boundaries should not be altered or development allowed merely because the land has become derelict’. Clause 3.2 states ‘Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to Green Belt. It is for the applicant to show why permission should be granted. Very special circumstances to justify inappropriate development will not exist unless the harm by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm is clearly outweighed by other considerations. In view of the presumption against inappropriate development, the Secretary of State will attach substantial weight to the harm to the Green Belt when considering any planning applications or appeal concerning such development.’ The Lancashire County Council Mario map identifies the area of the proposed development SR029 lies within Green Belt (pdf copy attached). Letter from South Ribble Borough Council to John Kirkpatrick confirms that the railway cutting which lies between the rear gardens of 168-198 Chapel Lane and proposed development plot SR029 lies within Green Belt and is therefore inappropriate for the majority of development. (pdf copy attached). Given that the area is clearly within designated as Green Belt and used for agricultural purpose, to release the site would be contrary to established Green Belt Policy, particularly in such an unsustainable and open location. Within the LDF Discussion Paper, site reference SR029 is described as having more than one suggested use. There is no other overriding use or requirement to release Green Belt land and therefore an explanation of what is the nature of the alternative proposals should be given to allow for comment.</p>

Reference	Comments
386	Tackling climate change – protecting the best quality agricultural land As a key issue the Council is committed to protecting the best quality agricultural land. Item 8.16 of the LDF Discussion Paper states that the best and most versatile agricultural land has been identified (amongst others) at Longton Moss (cf Policy Guidance Clause 1.6). Site Reference SR029 is located at Longton Moss. The road to the East boundary of the site is Moss Lane. The site is currently used for pature/grazing.
434	<p>I wish to strongly object to proposed development of land opposite my house (Ref SR029). I bought my property in April 2005 because of the lovely views and the wildlife etc. There are sheep and cattle all year round and this is why we live here. There are far too many developments springing up all over Longton, New Longton, Hutton, etc and it's ruining this lovely area. I wish to be contacted to explain what is going on. I object to the development of site reference number SR029 for the following reasons:</p> <p>Green Belt Item 6.16 of the LDF Discussion Paper states 'The Council is committed to protecting the Green Belt within South Ribble. Green Belt will not be released within the plan period (except in exceptional circumstances as defined by planning Policy Guidance 2: Green Belts) up until 2026. Clause 1.5 of the above policy guidance states 'purposes of including land in Green Belts – to assist in safeguarding the countryside form encroachment'. Clause 1.6 states 'Once Green Belts have been defined, the use of land in them has a positive role to play in the following circumstances – to retain land in agricultural, forestry and related uses'. Clause 2.6 states 'Once the general extent of Green Belt has been approved it should be altered only in exceptional circumstances. If such an alteration is proposed the Secretary of State will wish to be satisfied that the authority has considered opportunities for development within the urban areas contained by and beyond the Green Belt. Similarly, detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans or earlier approved development plans should be altered only exceptionally. Detailed boundaries should not be altered or development allowed merely because the land has become derelict'. Clause 3.2 states 'Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to Green Belt. It is for the applicant to show why permission should be granted. Very special circumstances to justify inappropriate development will not exist unless the harm by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm is clearly outweighed by other considerations. In view of the presumption against inappropriate development, the Secretary of State will attach substantial weight to the harm to the Green Belt when considering any planning applications or appeal concerning such development.' The Lancashire County Council Mario map identifies the area of the proposed development SR029 lies within Green Belt (pdf copy attached). (Not attached – ZT) Letter from South Ribble Borough Council to John Kirkpatrick confirms that the railway cutting which lies between the rear gardens of 168-198 Chapel Lane and proposed development plot SR029 lies within Green Belt and is therefore inappropriate for the majority of development. (pdf copy attached). (Not attached – ZT) Given that the area is clearly within designated as Green Belt and used for agricultural purpose, to release the site would be contrary to established Green Belt Policy, particularly in such an unsustainable and open location. Within the LDF Discussion Paper, site reference SR029 is described as having more than one suggested use. There is no other overriding use or requirement to release Green Belt land and therefore an explanation of what is the nature of the alternative proposals should be given to allow for comment. Catering for Sustainable Travel – Reducing Reliance on the Car Item 3.2 of the LDF Discussion Paper states 'At the moment most journeys in South Ribble are taken by car which causes traffic congestion and pollution, so we need to create opportunities and choices for people to use their car less'. The proposed development site SR029 is isolated. It is one mile from the site to the nearest grocer, doctor, school or medical centre. Local buses run to limited routes and are infrequent. The local bus to Preston runs at one hour intervals during the day. The nearest supermarket is one mile away. Local residents use their cars to visit the supermarket or take their children to school. The local population comprises mainly of elderly people, so if the site were to be used for business purpose it is unlikely that any potential workforce would be drawn from the local population. Therefore the use of the site for business purposes would be likely to increase the amount of local traffic with the consequential increased congestion and pollution. The existing small trading estate which lies between Brownhill Lane and the A59 is largely unoccupied with many of the premises displaying 'To Let' signs. This is hardly evidence of an exceptional need for further industrial/business premises in the immediate area (cf Policy Guidance Clause 2.6). As use for potential housing the site is small at 2.90 hectares. A core strategy of the council is to make efficient use of land whilst respecting the local character in terms of housing density. The existing immediate local housing density is approximately less than 20/hectare. Given a potential 25 houses per hectare to respect the local character, the site is likely to offer no more than 75 houses or an additional 180 population at an average household size of 2.37 (Your Lancashire pdf – attached). (Not attached – ZT) An increase in the local population of 180 is hardly likely to have a positive effect on the quality of the local bus service provided' but 75 additional households would be likely to add a further 150 vehicles using local roads. Thus adding to congestion and pollution. There is already significant congestion at all local junctions at peak times. Any additional vehicle movement would be a further detriment and one which the local road and more importantly the junction networks could not accommodate. This emphasises the site unsustainable and unsuitable location for residential or employment or as a mixed use site. It shows how distant local facilities are and how additional population would not support these distant facilities. Additional land if it is required, should be located close to and support existing facilities and be in a sustainable and appropriate location. This speculative and inappropriate site should be immediately discounted. Homes for All – Respecting the Local Character As stated above, the site is isolated and small at 2.90 hectares. The existing housing density is approximately less than 20/hectare. In order to accord with the core strategy of respecting the local character in terms of housing density, the site is unlikely to yield more than 75 new homes. It is likely that local services will be inadequate given that the newest homes in the area are two detached houses constructed in 1975. The existing telephone installation to the area is pole fed. The fields which comprise the proposed development plot SR029 hold standing water during the winter months, as do the surrounding drainage ditches. The existing drainage system along Chapel Lane has been failing in recent years with</p>

Reference	Comments
	<p>homes becoming flooded in times of heavy rain. Extensive works to the drainage system were carried out during a six month period from December 2008 onwards. Excavations to a connection at the junction of Moss Lane and Chapel Lane were left open for a number of weeks whilst a solution to resolve the connection was found. It is therefore unlikely that the existing drainage system would be able to cope with any additional flow without substantial improvement. The provision of the utility services to these homes would require a substantial investment in the local infrastructure. Given that the proportion of fixed capital investment in providing utility services to 75 dwellings would be comparatively high any development could hardly be described as sustainable. Delivering Economic Prosperity – Supporting the Rural Economy The current land use is for pasture/grazing. It is counterintuitive that removal of the farmland would be supportive of the rural economy (cf Policy Guidance Clause 1.6). Protecting and Enhancing the Natural Environment – restore create and protect habitats for species The redundant railway cutting which lies between 168 to 198 Chapel Lane and Site Reference SR029 provides habitat to rabbits, jays, woodpeckers, pheasants, ducks and other native species. The County Council has installed a ‘Caution Ducks Crossing’ road sign at the junction of Moss Lane and Chapel Lane. The habitat in this ear would be threatened by any substantial development taking place on site reference SR029 both during the construction phase and later by the activity of the development occupiers. Tackling climate change – protecting the best quality agricultural land As a key issue the Council is committed to protecting the best quality agricultural land. Item 8.16 of the LDF Discussion Paper states that the best and most versatile agricultural land has been identified (amongst others) at Longton Moss (cf Policy Guidance Clause 1.6). Site Reference SR029 is located at Longton Moss. The road to the East boundary of the site is Moss Lane. The site is currently used for pasture/grazing.</p>
432	<p>I object to the development of site reference number SR029 for the following reasons: Green Belt Item 6.16 of the LDF Discussion Paper states ‘The Council is committed to protecting the Green Belt within South Ribble. Green Belt will not be released within the plan period (except in exceptional circumstances as defined by planning Policy Guidance 2: Green Belts) up until 2026. Clause 1.5 of the above policy guidance states ‘purposes of including land in Green Belts – to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment’. Clause 1.6 states ‘Once Green Belts have been defined, the use of land in them has a positive role to play in the following circumstances – to retain land in agricultural, forestry and related uses’. Clause 2.6 states ‘Once the general extent of Green Belt has been approved it should be altered only in exceptional circumstances. If such an alteration is proposed the Secretary of State will wish to be satisfied that the authority has considered opportunities for development within the urban areas contained by and beyond the Green Belt. Similarly, detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans or earlier approved development plans should be altered only exceptionally. Detailed boundaries should not be altered or development allowed merely because the land has become derelict’. Clause 3.2 states ‘Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to Green Belt. It is for the applicant to show why permission should be granted. Very special circumstances to justify inappropriate development will not exist unless the harm by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm is clearly outweighed by other considerations. In view of the presumption against inappropriate development, the Secretary of State will attach substantial weight to the harm to the Green Belt when considering any planning applications or appeal concerning such development.’ The Lancashire County Council Mario map identifies the area of the proposed development SR029 lies within Green Belt (pdf copy attached). (Not attached – ZT) Letter from South Ribble Borough Council to John Kirkpatrick confirms that the railway cutting which lies between the rear gardens of 168-198 Chapel Lane and proposed development plot SR029 lies within Green Belt and is therefore inappropriate for the majority of development. (pdf copy attached). (Not attached – ZT) Given that the area is clearly within designated as Green Belt and used for agricultural purpose, to release the site would be contrary to established Green Belt Policy, particularly in such an unsustainable and open location. Within the LDF Discussion Paper, site reference SR029 is described as having more than one suggested use. There is no other overriding use or requirement to release Green Belt land and therefore an explanation of what is the nature of the alternative proposals should be given to allow for comment. Catering for Sustainable Travel – Reducing Reliance on the Car Item 3.2 of the LDF Discussion Paper states ‘At the moment most journeys in South Ribble are taken by car which causes traffic congestion and pollution, so we need to create opportunities and choices for people to use their car less’. The proposed development site SR029 is isolated. It is one mile from the site to the nearest grocer, doctor, school or medical centre. Local buses run to limited routes and are infrequent. The local bus to Preston runs at one hour intervals during the day. The nearest supermarket is one mile away. Local residents use their cars to visit the supermarket or take their children to school. The local population comprises mainly of elderly people, so if the site were to be used for business purpose it is unlikely that any potential workforce would be drawn from the local population. Therefore the use of the site for business purposes would be likely to increase the amount of local traffic with the consequential increased congestion and pollution. The existing small trading estate which lies between Brownhill Lane and the A59 is largely unoccupied with many of the premises displaying ‘To Let’ signs. This is hardly evidence of an exceptional need for further industrial/business premises in the immediate area (cf Policy Guidance Clause 2.6). As use for potential housing the site is small at 2.90 hectares. A core strategy of the council is to make efficient use of land whilst respecting the local character in terms of housing density. The existing immediate local housing density is approximately less than 20/hectare. Given a potential 25 houses per hectare to respect the local character, the site is likely to offer no more than 75 houses or an additional 180 population at an average household size of 2.37 (Your Lancashire pdf – attached). (Not attached – ZT) An increase in the local population of 180 is hardly likely to have a positive effect on the quality of the local bus service provided’ but 75 additional households would be likely to add a further 150 vehicles using local roads. Thus adding to congestion and pollution. There is already significant congestion at all local junctions at peak times. Any additional vehicle movement would be a further detriment and one which the local road and more importantly the</p>

Reference	Comments
	<p>junction networks could not accommodate. This emphasises the site unsustainable and unsuitable location for residential or employment or as a mixed use site. It shows how distant local facilities are and how additional population would not support these distant facilities. Additional land if it is required, should be located close to and support existing facilities and be in a sustainable and appropriate location. This speculative and inappropriate site should be immediately discounted. Homes for All – Respecting the Local Character As stated above, the site is isolated and small at 2.90 hectares. The existing housing density is approximately less than 20/hectare. In order to accord with the core strategy of respecting the local character in terms of housing density, the site is unlikely to yield more than 75 new homes. It is likely that local services will be inadequate given that the newest homes in the area are two detached houses constructed in 1975. The existing telephone installation to the area is pole fed. The fields which comprise the proposed development plot SR029 hold standing water during the winter months, as do the surrounding drainage ditches. The existing drainage system along Chapel Lane has been failing in recent years with homes becoming flooded in times of heavy rain. Extensive works to the drainage system were carried out during a six month period from December 2008 onwards. Excavations to a connection at the junction of Moss Lane and Chapel Lane were left open for a number of weeks whilst a solution to resolve the connection was found. It is therefore unlikely that the existing drainage system would be able to cope with any additional flow without substantial improvement. The provision of the utility services to these homes would require a substantial investment in the local infrastructure. Given that the proportion of fixed capital investment in providing utility services to 75 dwellings would be comparatively high any development could hardly be described as sustainable. Delivering Economic Prosperity – Supporting the Rural Economy The current land use is for pasture/grazing. It is counterintuitive that removal of the farmland would be supportive of the rural economy (cf Policy Guidance Clause 1.6). Protecting and Enhancing the Natural Environment – restore create and protect habitats for species The redundant railway cutting which lies between 168 to 198 Chapel Lane and Site Reference SR029 provides habitat to rabbits, jays, woodpeckers, pheasants, ducks and other native species. The County Council has installed a ‘Caution Ducks Crossing’ road sign at the junction of Moss Lane and Chapel Lane. The habitat in this ear would be threatened by any substantial development taking place on site reference SR029 both during the construction phase and later by the activity of the development occupiers. Tackling climate change – protecting the best quality agricultural land As a key issue the Council is committed to protecting the best quality agricultural land. Item 8.16 of the LDF Discussion Paper states that the best and most versatile agricultural land has been identified (amongst others) at Longton Moss (cf Policy Guidance Clause 1.6). Site Reference SR029 is located at Longton Moss. The road to the East boundary of the site is Moss Lane. The site is currently used for pasture/grazing.</p>
94	<p>I would like to object to the proposed development proposals in Longton for the following reasons: Longton is a village with both charm and character. Any further development in the village will only serve to destroy both. Why would anyone propose to build on greenbelt land when there are numerous brown field sites that could be developed. Traffic through the village is at present tolerable. Any additional traffic would be both unwelcome and unsafe. Parking in the village is already inadequate and could not support any further development. There are no places at the local schools to accommodate any additional children coming into the village. Part of the charm of the village and one of the main reasons for living there is the open aspect to the countryside. This would be lost and would destroy the whole feeling of the village. The proposals would destroy the natural habitats of many types of wildlife including birds, pheasants, bats etc. There is no demand for any further development in the village. The infrastructure of the village i.e. drainage, electrical supply etc. simply cannot support any further development. This proposal can only have been conceived by somebody with little or no knowledge of the village or the lives of the residents within it. To press ahead with this proposal, when other more suitable sites exist, would be completely unjustified and would adversely affect the lives of every resident in the village.</p>
100	<p>Greenbelt land should not be used for development. Traffic in Longton is already congested and any development will mean parking and traffic congestion far worse. Back Lane is a small secondary road with cars parked making it difficult for traffic to pass if this traffic was to increase this would make this road extremely unsafe. The Village schools in Longton are already over subscribed and development of Longton would increase this problem. I have lived in Longton from being a small girl and enjoy the village life it has offered for me and my family. The character of the village would change dramatically with any development of all are green areas. Places to walk and for children to play. I have continued to live in the village and would not like to see the village change. The wildlife in Longton is wonderful to see. The recent planning on Marsh Lane has already affected this. The trees that once were home to owls and bats have now been chopped down to enable building of houses this is a great shame. The pond behind is home to many unusual birds and wildlife that all combine to create the village of Longton. The parking issues are also a major concern all the houses being built for families with two or more cars adding to the already problematic parking issues we have to deal with. We need our Green belt areas for the future of Wildlife and Village life and when this land is no longer protected from building on by the profit driven development of housing we will lose this forever.</p>
506	<p>I object to the development of site reference number SR029 for the following reasons: Green Belt Item 6.16 of the LDF Discussion Paper states ‘The Council is committed to protecting the Green Belt within South Ribble. Green Belt will not be released within the plan period (except in exceptional circumstances as defined by planning Policy Guidance 2: Green Belts) up until 2026. Clause 1.5 of the above policy guidance states ‘purposes of including land in Green Belts – to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment’. Clause 1.6 states ‘Once Green Belts have been defined, the use of land in them has a positive role to play in the following circumstances – to retain land in agricultural, forestry and related uses’. Clause 2.6 states ‘Once the general extent of Green Belt has been approved it should be altered only in</p>

Reference	Comments
	<p>exceptional circumstances. If such an alteration is proposed the Secretary of State will wish to be satisfied that the authority has considered opportunities for development within the urban areas contained by and beyond the Green Belt. Similarly, detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans or earlier approved development plans should be altered only exceptionally. Detailed boundaries should not be altered or development allowed merely because the land has become derelict'. Clause 3.2 states 'Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to Green Belt. It is for the applicant to show why permission should be granted. Very special circumstances to justify inappropriate development will not exist unless the harm by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm is clearly outweighed by other considerations. In view of the presumption against inappropriate development, the Secretary of State will attach substantial weight to the harm to the Green Belt when considering any planning applications or appeal concerning such development.' The Lancashire County Council Mario map identifies the area of the proposed development SR029 lies within Green Belt. Letter from South Ribble Borough Council to John Kirkpatrick confirms that the railway cutting which lies between the rear gardens of 168-198 Chapel Lane and proposed development plot SR029 lies within Green Belt and is therefore inappropriate for the majority of development. Given that the area is clearly within designated as Green Belt and used for agricultural purpose, to release the site would be contrary to established Green Belt Policy, particularly in such an unsustainable and open location. Within the LDF Discussion Paper, site reference SR029 is described as having more than one suggested use. There is no other overriding use or requirement to release Green Belt land and therefore an explanation of what is the nature of the alternative proposals should be given to allow for comment. Catering for Sustainable Travel – Reducing Reliance on the Car Item 3.2 of the LDF Discussion Paper states 'At the moment most journeys in South Ribble are taken by car which causes traffic congestion and pollution, so we need to create opportunities and choices for people to use their car less'. The proposed development site SR029 is isolated. It is one mile from the site to the nearest grocer, doctor, school or medical centre. Local buses run to limited routes and are infrequent. The local bus to Preston runs at one hour intervals during the day. The nearest supermarket is one mile away. Local residents use their cars to visit the supermarket or take their children to school. The local population comprises mainly of elderly people, so if the site were to be used for business purpose it is unlikely that any potential workforce would be drawn from the local population. Therefore the use of the site for business purposes would be likely to increase the amount of local traffic with the consequential increased congestion and pollution. The existing small trading estate which lies between Brownhill Lane and the A59 is largely unoccupied with many of the premises displaying 'To Let' signs. This is hardly evidence of an exceptional need for further industrial/business premises in the immediate area (cf Policy Guidance Clause 2.6). As use for potential housing the site is small at 2.90 hectares. A core strategy of the council is to make efficient use of land whilst respecting the local character in terms of housing density. The existing immediate local housing density is approximately less than 20/hectare. Given a potential 25 houses per hectare to respect the local character, the site is likely to offer no more than 75 houses or an additional 180 population at an average household size of 2.37. An increase in the local population of 180 is hardly likely to have a positive effect on the quality of the local bus service provided' but 75 additional households would be likely to add a further 150 vehicles using local roads. Thus adding to congestion and pollution. There is already significant congestion at all local junctions at peak times. Any additional vehicle movement would be a further detriment and one which the local road and more importantly the junction networks could not accommodate. This emphasises the site unsustainable and unsuitable location for residential or employment or as a mixed use site. It shows how distant local facilities are and how additional population would not support these distant facilities. Additional land if it is required, should be located close to and support existing facilities and be in a sustainable and appropriate location. This speculative and inappropriate site should be immediately discounted. Homes for All – Respecting the Local Character As stated above, the site is isolated and small at 2.90 hectares. The existing housing density is approximately less than 20/hectare. In order to accord with the core strategy of respecting the local character in terms of housing density, the site is unlikely to yield more than 75 new homes. It is likely that local services will be inadequate given that the newest homes in the area are two detached houses constructed in 1975. The existing telephone installation to the area is pole fed. The fields which comprise the proposed development plot SR029 hold standing water during the winter months, as do the surrounding drainage ditches. The existing drainage system along Chapel Lane has been failing in recent years with homes becoming flooded in times of heavy rain. Extensive works to the drainage system were carried out during a six month period from December 2008 onwards. Excavations to a connection at the junction of Moss Lane and Chapel Lane were left open for a number of weeks whilst a solution to resolve the connection was found. It is therefore unlikely that the existing drainage system would be able to cope with any additional flow without substantial improvement. The provision of the utility services to these homes would require a substantial investment in the local infrastructure. Given that the proportion of fixed capital investment in providing utility services to 75 dwellings would be comparatively high any development could hardly be described as sustainable. Delivering Economic Prosperity – Supporting the Rural Economy The current land use is for pasture/grazing. It is counterintuitive that removal of the farmland would be supportive of the rural economy (cf Policy Guidance Clause 1.6). Protecting and Enhancing the Natural Environment – restore create and protect habitats for species The redundant railway cutting which lies between 168 to 198 Chapel Lane and Site Reference SR029 provides habitat to rabbits, jays, woodpeckers, pheasants, ducks and other native species. The County Council has installed a 'Caution Ducks Crossing' road sign at the junction of Moss Lane and Chapel Lane. The habitat in this ear would be threatened by any substantial development taking place on site reference SR029 both during the construction phase and later by the activity of the development occupiers. Tackling climate change – protecting the best quality agricultural land As a key issue the Council is committed to protecting the best quality agricultural land. Item 8.16 of the LDF Discussion Paper states that the best and most versatile agricultural land has been identified (amongst others) at Longton</p>

Reference	Comments
	Moss (cf Policy Guidance Clause 1.6). Site Reference SR029 is located at Longton Moss. The road to the East boundary of the site is Moss Lane. The site is currently used for pasture/grazing.
98	Objection Comments:: I object for the following reasons within the village of Longton. Greenbelt land should not be used for development. Traffic conjection and parking will be made worse. Local schools are over subscribed. We are losing the character of the village and the view from the village to open countryside. This will destroy the natural environment and habitat of wildlife. Parking in the village is already very difficult.
501	Housing on the land marked would spoil the countryside, it should stay as greenbelt. The value of our property would fall, their would be more noise and vandalism. More traffic on eoads between Longton and New Longton. Its bad enough now we don't want anymore. Noise. It would probably overload the sewage and drainage system and electric and water supplies. Drainage in particular and flooding has be a problem in this area for many years.
414	Concern 15 yr development plan , particularly SR029 I would like to make 'shot across the bows' enquiries with regard to plot SR029 and the private land adjacent to the plot which was the track bed of the form Preston and Southport railway line. >Should plot SR029 have its usage changed from agricultural land to either land for domestic dwellings or for light industrial use, then the value of the field would be considerably increased - especially if it were the former. The first question I would like to raise is who is the current owner of the land. It may be Lancashire County Council. On the other hand it may be a private individual or company. Should there be any connection between the owner and any councillor or officer of South Ribble or the Lancashire County Council then questions will be raised as to whether any impropriety has taken place in the decision to pluck an isolated field in the green belt and redesignate it as suitable for non agricultural development. The land is seen (rightly or wrongly) as Hesketh's Farm and certainly a Hesketh has been a councillor for the area. Secondly, the sale of the railway cutting land adjacent to plot SR029 was subject to investigation by the Ombudsman and he was not completely satisfied by the records of the decision making process which culminated in the land being sold unadvertised to a private individual. The decision making audit tr en at more than one point. The suspicion of effectively 'insider trading' had been raised and was not fully allayed because of the deficient audit trail. It would be a very stran ce if the owner of the former railway land (a brown field site) were to benefit financially should the land adjacent (Plot SR029) were to have a change of usage, for the former railway site could provide additi to Brownhill Lane, or with suitable infill would also be suitable for development with the adjacent land no longer being green belt. As the land is substantially undeveloped, one assumes it was bought as a long term speculative investment. What a coincidence it would be if the adjacent land has a change of use and the railway land appreciated in value from the 10 000 paid to the County Council! One would be tempted to think that the purchaser at the time of purchase had some inside knowledge as to (informal) long term plans for the redesignation of SR029 These considerations are worth holding in mind when decisions are taken as to the future use of plot SR029.
197	I understand this land is classed as Green Belt and am therefore concerned at the possible suggestion of it being considered for the development of housing, commercial use or any other apart from agricultural. I have grave reservation regarding the drainage of the area, having lived at the other side of the old railway cutting for over 40 years I recall it flooding at the time the County Council took over the cutting and extra drainage having to be installed, the area still struggles to cope, the recent filling in of the cutting near Moss Lane caused flooding which resulted in new drainage pipes being installed around two years ago in Chapel Lane. It must also be noted the underpass in Chapel Park Road still fs of heavy rain. I am convinced developing this field in any way would result in further problems which would not easily be overcome without replacing miles of drainage pipes. Presently I experience problems in entering and exiting my drive in Chapel Lane, this is due to high volumes of traffic. The junction with Brown Hill Lane and Chapel Park Road is already congested, along with an over crowded Chapel Lane, to add further private of business properties will increase the problem to an unacceptable level, also making it unsafe for children to walk to should not be considered for further development.
103	Objection Comments:: greenbelt land should not be used for development. traffic congestion & parking will be made worse. local schools are oversubscribed. we are loosing the character of the village & the view from the village to open countryside.This will destroy and affect the natural environment and habitat of wildlife.parking in the village is already difficult.
97	Objection Comments:: I object for the following reasons within the village of Longton. Greenbelt land should not be used for development. Traffic conjection and parking will be made worse. Local schools are over subscribed. We are losing the character of the village and the view from the village to open countryside. This will destroy the natural environment and habitat of wildlife. Parking in the village is already very difficult.
390	Delivering Economic Prosperity – Supporting the Rural Economy The current land use is for pasture/grazing. It is counterintuitive that removal of the farmland would be supportive of the rural economy (cf Policy Guidance Clause 1.6).
95	
390	Protecting and Enhancing the Natural Environment – restore create and protect habitats for species The redundant railway cutting which lies between 168 to 198 Chapel Lane and Site Reference SR029 provides habitat to rabbits, jays, woodpeckers, pheasants, ducks and other native species. The County Council has installed a 'Caution

Reference	Comments
	Ducks Crossing' road sign at the junction of Moss Lane and Chapel Lane. The habitat in this ear would be threatened by any substantial development taking place on site reference SR029 both during the construction phase and later by the activity of the development occupiers.
33	Object. Greenbelt. Outside settlement area. Agricultural land.
397	Development is on green belt land and don't believe that further development is necessary. Local school is currently over subscribed and the infrastructure within the village cannot support such a large development. Within south ribble, there must be brown field alternatives.
396	Development is on green belt land and don't believe that further development is necessary. Local school is currently over subscribed and the infrastructure within the village cannot support such a large development. Within south ribble, there must be brown field alternatives.
196	Objection: I wish to object to the proposed re-designation of the land on Brownhill Lane New Longton. The reasons being. 1. This is greenbelt land in a rural setting and any development would change the character of the area. 2. The land in question, is at the rear of ribbon development on Chapel Lane and would fragment activity from the centre of the village. 3. I have also great concerns regarding the drainage of this area especially the railway cutting, which has in the past experienced severe flooding. 4. Access to the area is by very minor roads and any development would increase congestion and traffic use on the junctions of Chapel Lane and Brownhill Lane and Chapel Lane and Moss Lane. 5. Traffic noise from the dual carriage way is at present significant, any more development is bound to increase this.
425	I object to the development of site reference number SR029 for the following reasons: Green Belt Item 6.16 of the LDF Discussion Paper states 'The Council is committed to protecting the Green Belt within South Ribble. Green Belt will not be released within the plan period (except in exceptional circumstances as defined by planning Policy Guidance 2: Green Belts) up until 2026. Clause 1.5 of the above policy guidance states 'purposes of including land in Green Belts – to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment'. Clause 1.6 states 'Once Green Belts have been defined, the use of land in them has a positive role to play in the following circumstances – to retain land in agricultural, forestry and related uses'. Clause 2.6 states 'Once the general extent of Green Belt has been approved it should be altered only in exceptional circumstances. If such an alteration is proposed the Secretary of State will wish to be satisfied that the authority has considered opportunities for development within the urban areas contained by and beyond the Green Belt. Similarly, detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans or earlier approved development plans should be altered only exceptionally. Detailed boundaries should not be altered or development allowed merely because the land has become derelict'. Clause 3.2 states 'Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to Green Belt. It is for the applicant to show why permission should be granted. Very special circumstances to justify inappropriate development will not exist unless the harm by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm is clearly outweighed by other considerations. In view of the presumption against inappropriate development, the Secretary of State will attach substantial weight to the harm to the Green Belt when considering any planning applications or appeal concerning such development.' The Lancashire County Council Mario map identifies the area of the proposed development SR029 lies within Green Belt (pdf copy attached). (Not attached – ZT) Letter from South Ribble Borough Council to John Kirkpatrick confirms that the railway cutting which lies between the rear gardens of 168-198 Chapel Lane and proposed development plot SR029 lies within Green Belt and is therefore inappropriate for the majority of development. (pdf copy attached). (Not attached – ZT) Given that the area is clearly within designated as Green Belt and used for agricultural purpose, to release the site would be contrary to established Green Belt Policy, particularly in such an unsustainable and open location. Within the LDF Discussion Paper, site reference SR029 is described as having more than one suggested use. There is no other overriding use or requirement to release Green Belt land and therefore an explanation of what is the nature of the alternative proposals should be given to allow for comment. Catering for Sustainable Travel – Reducing Reliance on the Car Item 3.2 of the LDF Discussion Paper states 'At the moment most journeys in South Ribble are taken by car which causes traffic congestion and pollution, so we need to create opportunities and choices for people to use their car less'. The proposed development site SR029 is isolated. It is one mile from the site to the nearest grocer, doctor, school or medical centre. Local buses run to limited routes and are infrequent. The local bus to Preston runs at one hour intervals during the day. The nearest supermarket is one mile away. Local residents use their cars to visit the supermarket or take their children to school. The local population comprises mainly of elderly people, so if the site were to be used for business purpose it is unlikely that any potential workforce would be drawn from the local population. Therefore the use of the site for business purposes would be likely to increase the amount of local traffic with the consequential increased congestion and pollution. The existing small trading estate which lies between Brownhill Lane and the A59 is largely unoccupied with many of the premises displaying 'To Let' signs. This is hardly evidence of an exceptional need for further industrial/business premises in the immediate area (cf Policy Guidance Clause 2.6). As use for potential housing the site is small at 2.90 hectares. A core strategy of the council is to make efficient use of land whilst respecting the local character in terms of housing density. The existing immediate local housing density is approximately less than 20/hectare. Given a potential 25 houses per hectare to respect the local character, the site is likely to offer no more than 75 houses or an additional 180 population at an average household size of 2.37 (Your Lancashire pdf – attached). (Not attached – ZT) An increase in the local population of 180 is hardly likely to have a positive effect on the quality of the local bus service provided' but 75 additional households would be likely to add a further 150 vehicles using local roads. Thus adding to congestion and pollution. There is already significant congestion at all local junctions at peak times. Any additional vehicle movement would be a further detriment and one which the local road and more importantly the

Reference	Comments
	<p>junction networks could not accommodate. This emphasises the site unsustainable and unsuitable location for residential or employment or as a mixed use site. It shows how distant local facilities are and how additional population would not support these distant facilities. Additional land if it is required, should be located close to and support existing facilities and be in a sustainable and appropriate location. This speculative and inappropriate site should be immediately discounted. Homes for All – Respecting the Local Character As stated above, the site is isolated and small at 2.90 hectares. The existing housing density is approximately less than 20/hectare. In order to accord with the core strategy of respecting the local character in terms of housing density, the site is unlikely to yield more than 75 new homes. It is likely that local services will be inadequate given that the newest homes in the area are two detached houses constructed in 1975. The existing telephone installation to the area is pole fed. The fields which comprise the proposed development plot SR029 hold standing water during the winter months, as do the surrounding drainage ditches. The existing drainage system along Chapel Lane has been failing in recent years with homes becoming flooded in times of heavy rain. Extensive works to the drainage system were carried out during a six month period from December 2008 onwards. Excavations to a connection at the junction of Moss Lane and Chapel Lane were left open for a number of weeks whilst a solution to resolve the connection was found. It is therefore unlikely that the existing drainage system would be able to cope with any additional flow without substantial improvement. The provision of the utility services to these homes would require a substantial investment in the local infrastructure. Given that the proportion of fixed capital investment in providing utility services to 75 dwellings would be comparatively high any development could hardly be described as sustainable. Delivering Economic Prosperity – Supporting the Rural Economy The current land use is for pasture/grazing. It is counterintuitive that removal of the farmland would be supportive of the rural economy (cf Policy Guidance Clause 1.6). Protecting and Enhancing the Natural Environment – restore create and protect habitats for species The redundant railway cutting which lies between 168 to 198 Chapel Lane and Site Reference SR029 provides habitat to rabbits, jays, woodpeckers, pheasants, ducks and other native species. The County Council has installed a ‘Caution Ducks Crossing’ road sign at the junction of Moss Lane and Chapel Lane. The habitat in this ear would be threatened by any substantial development taking place on site reference SR029 both during the construction phase and later by the activity of the development occupiers. Tackling climate change – protecting the best quality agricultural land As a key issue the Council is committed to protecting the best quality agricultural land. Item 8.16 of the LDF Discussion Paper states that the best and most versatile agricultural land has been identified (amongst others) at Longton Moss (cf Policy Guidance Clause 1.6). Site Reference SR029 is located at Longton Moss. The road to the East boundary of the site is Moss Lane. The site is currently used for pasture/grazing.</p>
426	<p>SR029 – Objection This site is totally unsuitable for development See accompanying Local Development Framework document which set out the reasons for that assertion, as well as supporting documenting. Other The manner of notification of residents that this process was operating was totally inadequate. Very late on in the period and by chance I became aware of it. None of my neighbours were aware of it. A better way to bring these matters to attention MUST be identified. I object to the development of site reference number SR029 for the following reasons: Green Belt Item 6.16 of the LDF Discussion Paper states ‘The Council is committed to protecting the Green Belt within South Ribble. Green Belt will not be released within the plan period (except in exceptional circumstances as defined by planning Policy Guidance 2: Green Belts) up until 2026. Clause 1.5 of the above policy guidance states ‘purposes of including land in Green Belts – to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment’. Clause 1.6 states ‘Once Green Belts have been defined, the use of land in them has a positive role to play in the following circumstances – to retain land in agricultural, forestry and related uses’. Clause 2.6 states ‘Once the general extent of Green Belt has been approved it should be altered only in exceptional circumstances. If such an alteration is proposed the Secretary of State will wish to be satisfied that the authority has considered opportunities for development within the urban areas contained by and beyond the Green Belt. Similarly, detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans or earlier approved development plans should be altered only exceptionally. Detailed boundaries should not be altered or development allowed merely because the land has become derelict’. Clause 3.2 states ‘Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to Green Belt. It is for the applicant to show why permission should be granted. Very special circumstances to justify inappropriate development will not exist unless the harm by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm is clearly outweighed by other considerations. In view of the presumption against inappropriate development, the Secretary of State will attach substantial weight to the harm to the Green Belt when considering any planning applications or appeal concerning such development.’ The Lancashire County Council Mario map identifies the area of the proposed development SR029 lies within Green Belt (pdf copy attached). Letter from South Ribble Borough Council to John Kirkpatrick confirms that the railway cutting which lies between the rear gardens of 168-198 Chapel Lane and proposed development plot SR029 lies within Green Belt and is therefore inappropriate for the majority of development. (pdf copy attached). Given that the area is clearly within designated as Green Belt and used for agricultural purpose, to release the site would be contrary to established Green Belt Policy, particularly in such an unsustainable and open location. Within the LDF Discussion Paper, site reference SR029 is described as having more than one suggested use. There is no other overriding use or requirement to release Green Belt land and therefore an explanation of what is the nature of the alternative proposals should be given to allow for comment. Catering for Sustainable Travel – Reducing Reliance on the Car Item 3.2 of the LDF Discussion Paper states ‘At the moment most journeys in South Ribble are taken by car which causes traffic congestion and pollution, so we need to create opportunities and choices for people to use their car less’. The proposed development site SR029 is isolated. It is one mile from the site to the nearest grocer, doctor, school or medical centre. Local buses run to limited routes and are infrequent. The local bus to Preston runs at one hour intervals during the day. The nearest supermarket is one mile away. Local residents use their cars to visit the supermarket or take their children to</p>

Reference	Comments
	<p>school. The local population comprises mainly of elderly people, so if the site were to be used for business purpose it is unlikely that any potential workforce would be drawn from the local population. Therefore the use of the site for business purposes would be likely to increase the amount of local traffic with the consequential increased congestion and pollution. The existing small trading estate which lies between Brownhill Lane and the A59 is largely unoccupied with many of the premises displaying 'To Let' signs. This is hardly evidence of an exceptional need for further industrial/business premises in the immediate area (cf Policy Guidance Clause 2.6). As use for potential housing the site is small at 2.90 hectares. A core strategy of the council is to make efficient use of land whilst respecting the local character in terms of housing density. The existing immediate local housing density is approximately less than 20/hectare. Given a potential 25 houses per hectare to respect the local character, the site is likely to offer no more than 75 houses or an additional 180 population at an average household size of 2.37 (Your Lancashire pdf – attached). An increase in the local population of 180 is hardly likely to have a positive effect on the quality of the local bus service provided' but 75 additional households would be likely to add a further 150 vehicles using local roads. Thus adding to congestion and pollution. There is already significant congestion at all local junctions at peak times. Any additional vehicle movement would be a further detriment and one which the local road and more importantly the junction networks could not accommodate. This emphasises the site unsustainable and unsuitable location for residential or employment or as a mixed use site. It shows how distant local facilities are and how additional population would not support these distant facilities. Additional land if it is required, should be located close to and support existing facilities and be in a sustainable and appropriate location. This speculative and inappropriate site should be immediately discounted. Homes for All – Respecting the Local Character As stated above, the site is isolated and small at 2.90 hectares. The existing housing density is approximately less than 20/hectare. In order to accord with the core strategy of respecting the local character in terms of housing density, the site is unlikely to yield more than 75 new homes. It is likely that local services will be inadequate given that the newest homes in the area are two detached houses constructed in 1975. The existing telephone installation to the area is pole fed. The fields which comprise the proposed development plot SR029 hold standing water during the winter months, as do the surrounding drainage ditches. The existing drainage system along Chapel Lane has been failing in recent years with homes becoming flooded in times of heavy rain. Extensive works to the drainage system were carried out during a six month period from December 2008 onwards. Excavations to a connection at the junction of Moss Lane and Chapel Lane were left open for a number of weeks whilst a solution to resolve the connection was found. It is therefore unlikely that the existing drainage system would be able to cope with any additional flow without substantial improvement. The provision of the utility services to these homes would require a substantial investment in the local infrastructure. Given that the proportion of fixed capital investment in providing utility services to 75 dwellings would be comparatively high any development could hardly be described as sustainable. Delivering Economic Prosperity – Supporting the Rural Economy The current land use is for pasture/grazing. It is counterintuitive that removal of the farmland would be supportive of the rural economy (cf Policy Guidance Clause 1.6). Protecting and Enhancing the Natural Environment – restore create and protect habitats for species The redundant railway cutting which lies between 168 to 198 Chapel Lane and Site Reference SR029 provides habitat to rabbits, jays, woodpeckers, pheasants, ducks and other native species. The County Council has installed a 'Caution Ducks Crossing' road sign at the junction of Moss Lane and Chapel Lane. The habitat in this ear would be threatened by any substantial development taking place on site reference SR029 both during the construction phase and later by the activity of the development occupiers. Tackling climate change – protecting the best quality agricultural land As a key issue the Council is committed to protecting the best quality agricultural land. Item 8.16 of the LDF Discussion Paper states that the best and most versatile agricultural land has been identified (amongst others) at Longton Moss (cf Policy Guidance Clause 1.6). Site Reference SR029 is located at Longton Moss. The road to the East boundary of the site is Moss Lane. The site is currently used for pasture/grazing.</p>
427	<p>I object to the above proposal on the following grounds and would like this to be taken into consideration at the consultation: - Loss of privacy and significant overlooking. - Loss of rural open aspect to the front of my property. - Loss of conservation and wildlife. - Loss of tranquillity, living standards and quality of countryside. - Industrial use already on Brownhill Lane causing noise, disturbance and congestion and regular breach of current planning use. - Scale of the development site would have a detrimental impact on the surrounding area and road structure. - Additional reasons on attached sheets. Insufficient services surrounding Brownhill Lane: - No gas supply - No main drains - Overhead cable and wire supply - Overcrowded schools and facilities - Public transport and links - Hazardous road junctions already causes significant problems with highway safety caused by overdevelopment in surrounding villages with no upgrading of infrastructure to accommodate excess traffic. Other: - Brownhill Lane is one of the few remaining original country lanes that has so far been unaffected by development. - It is enjoyed and used by families, bikers, walkers, children and horse riders for their pleasure and leisure. - This green belt area should be safeguarded countryside from encroachment and should be retained for the enjoyment of residents and should not be allowed to be developed. - The land is of agricultural grazing pasture and always used in this way. The land has never been ploughed or grown crops. - Whilst a small corner of the land was used during the construction of Longton Moss over 40 years ago, the land has been returned to grazing with no detriment to the farmer (Hesketh), his family or livelihood. - I do not feel this to be a significant reason for green belt land to be changed into brownfield site for future development.</p>
427	<p>I object to the development of site reference number SR029 for the following reasons: Green Belt Item 6.16 of the LDF Discussion Paper states 'The Council is committed to protecting the Green Belt within South Ribble. Green Belt will not be released within the plan period (except in exceptional circumstances as defined by planning Policy Guidance 2: Green Belts) up until 2026. Clause 1.5 of the above policy guidance states 'purposes of including land in Green Belts – to assist in safeguarding the</p>

Reference	Comments
	<p>countryside form encroachment'. Clause 1.6 states 'Once Green Belts have been defined, the use of land in them has a positive role to play in the following circumstances – to retain land in agricultural, forestry and related uses'. Clause 2.6 states 'Once the general extent of Green Belt has been approved it should be altered only in exceptional circumstances. If such an alteration is proposed the Secretary of State will wish to be satisfied that the authority has considered opportunities for development within the urban areas contained by and beyond the Green Belt. Similarly, detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans or earlier approved development plans should be altered only exceptionally. Detailed boundaries should not be altered or development allowed merely because the land has become derelict'. Clause 3.2 states 'Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to Green Belt. It is for the applicant to show why permission should be granted. Very special circumstances to justify inappropriate development will not exist unless the harm by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm is clearly outweighed by other considerations. In view of the presumption against inappropriate development, the Secretary of State will attach substantial weight to the harm to the Green Belt when considering any planning applications or appeal concerning such development.' The Lancashire County Council Mario map identifies the area of the proposed development SR029 lies within Green Belt (pdf copy attached). (Not attached – ZT) Letter from South Ribble Borough Council to John Kirkpatrick confirms that the railway cutting which lies between the rear gardens of 168-198 Chapel Lane and proposed development plot SR029 lies within Green Belt and is therefore inappropriate for the majority of development. (pdf copy attached). (Not attached – ZT) Given that the area is clearly within designated as Green Belt and used for agricultural purpose, to release the site would be contrary to established Green Belt Policy, particularly in such an unsustainable and open location. Within the LDF Discussion Paper, site reference SR029 is described as having more than one suggested use. There is no other overriding use or requirement to release Green Belt land and therefore an explanation of what is the nature of the alternative proposals should be given to allow for comment. Catering for Sustainable Travel – Reducing Reliance on the Car Item 3.2 of the LDF Discussion Paper states 'At the moment most journeys in South Ribble are taken by car which causes traffic congestion and pollution, so we need to create opportunities and choices for people to use their car less'. The proposed development site SR029 is isolated. It is one mile from the site to the nearest grocer, doctor, school or medical centre. Local buses run to limited routes and are infrequent. The local bus to Preston runs at one hour intervals during the day. The nearest supermarket is one mile away. Local residents use their cars to visit the supermarket or take their children to school. The local population comprises mainly of elderly people, so if the site were to be used for business purpose it is unlikely that any potential workforce would be drawn from the local population. Therefore the use of the site for business purposes would be likely to increase the amount of local traffic with the consequential increased congestion and pollution. The existing small trading estate which lies between Brownhill Lane and the A59 is largely unoccupied with many of the premises displaying 'To Let' signs. This is hardly evidence of an exceptional need for further industrial/business premises in the immediate area (cf Policy Guidance Clause 2.6). As use for potential housing the site is small at 2.90 hectares. A core strategy of the council is to make efficient use of land whilst respecting the local character in terms of housing density. The existing immediate local housing density is approximately less than 20/hectare. Given a potential 25 houses per hectare to respect the local character, the site is likely to offer no more than 75 houses or an additional 180 population at an average household size of 2.37 (Your Lancashire pdf – attached). (Not attached – ZT) An increase in the local population of 180 is hardly likely to have a positive effect on the quality of the local bus service provided' but 75 additional households would be likely to add a further 150 vehicles using local roads. Thus adding to congestion and pollution. There is already significant congestion at all local junctions at peak times. Any additional vehicle movement would be a further detriment and one which the local road and more importantly the junction networks could not accommodate. This emphasises the site unsustainable and unsuitable location for residential or employment or as a mixed use site. It shows how distant local facilities are and how additional population would not support these distant facilities. Additional land if it is required, should be located close to and support existing facilities and be in a sustainable and appropriate location. This speculative and inappropriate site should be immediately discounted. Homes for All – Respecting the Local Character As stated above, the site is isolated and small at 2.90 hectares. The existing housing density is approximately less than 20/hectare. In order to accord with the core strategy of respecting the local character in terms of housing density, the site is unlikely to yield more than 75 new homes. It is likely that local services will be inadequate given that the newest homes in the area are two detached houses constructed in 1975. The existing telephone installation to the area is pole fed. The fields which comprise the proposed development plot SR029 hold standing water during the winter months, as do the surrounding drainage ditches. The existing drainage system along Chapel Lane has been failing in recent years with homes becoming flooded in times of heavy rain. Extensive works to the drainage system were carried out during a six month period from December 2008 onwards. Excavations to a connection at the junction of Moss Lane and Chapel Lane were left open for a number of weeks whilst a solution to resolve the connection was found. It is therefore unlikely that the existing drainage system would be able to cope with any additional flow without substantial improvement. The provision of the utility services to these homes would require a substantial investment in the local infrastructure. Given that the proportion of fixed capital investment in providing utility services to 75 dwellings would be comparatively high any development could hardly be described as sustainable. Delivering Economic Prosperity – Supporting the Rural Economy The current land use is for pasture/grazing. It is counterintuitive that removal of the farmland would be supportive of the rural economy (cf Policy Guidance Clause 1.6). Protecting and Enhancing the Natural Environment – restore create and protect habitats for species The redundant railway cutting which lies between 168 to 198 Chapel Lane and Site Reference SR029 provides habitat to rabbits, jays, woodpeckers, pheasants, ducks and other native species. The County Council has installed a 'Caution Ducks Crossing' road sign at the junction of Moss Lane and Chapel Lane. The habitat in this ear would</p>

Reference	Comments
	<p>be threatened by any substantial development taking place on site reference SR029 both during the construction phase and later by the activity of the development occupiers. Tackling climate change – protecting the best quality agricultural land As a key issue the Council is committed to protecting the best quality agricultural land. Item 8.16 of the LDF Discussion Paper states that the best and most versatile agricultural land has been identified (amongst others) at Longton Moss (cf Policy Guidance Clause 1.6). Site Reference SR029 is located at Longton Moss. The road to the East boundary of the site is Moss Lane. The site is currently used for pasture/grazing.</p>
430	<p>I object to the development of site reference number SR029 for the following reasons: Green Belt Item 6.16 of the LDF Discussion Paper states ‘The Council is committed to protecting the Green Belt within South Ribble. Green Belt will not be released within the plan period (except in exceptional circumstances as defined by planning Policy Guidance 2: Green Belts) up until 2026. Clause 1.5 of the above policy guidance states ‘purposes of including land in Green Belts – to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment’. Clause 1.6 states ‘Once Green Belts have been defined, the use of land in them has a positive role to play in the following circumstances – to retain land in agricultural, forestry and related uses’. Clause 2.6 states ‘Once the general extent of Green Belt has been approved it should be altered only in exceptional circumstances. If such an alteration is proposed the Secretary of State will wish to be satisfied that the authority has considered opportunities for development within the urban areas contained by and beyond the Green Belt. Similarly, detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans or earlier approved development plans should be altered only exceptionally. Detailed boundaries should not be altered or development allowed merely because the land has become derelict’. Clause 3.2 states ‘Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to Green Belt. It is for the applicant to show why permission should be granted. Very special circumstances to justify inappropriate development will not exist unless the harm by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm is clearly outweighed by other considerations. In view of the presumption against inappropriate development, the Secretary of State will attach substantial weight to the harm to the Green Belt when considering any planning applications or appeal concerning such development.’ The Lancashire County Council Mario map identifies the area of the proposed development SR029 lies within Green Belt (pdf copy attached). (Not attached – ZT) Letter from South Ribble Borough Council to John Kirkpatrick confirms that the railway cutting which lies between the rear gardens of 168-198 Chapel Lane and proposed development plot SR029 lies within Green Belt and is therefore inappropriate for the majority of development. (pdf copy attached). (Not attached – ZT) Given that the area is clearly within designated as Green Belt and used for agricultural purpose, to release the site would be contrary to established Green Belt Policy, particularly in such an unsustainable and open location. Within the LDF Discussion Paper, site reference SR029 is described as having more than one suggested use. There is no other overriding use or requirement to release Green Belt land and therefore an explanation of what is the nature of the alternative proposals should be given to allow for comment. Catering for Sustainable Travel – Reducing Reliance on the Car Item 3.2 of the LDF Discussion Paper states ‘At the moment most journeys in South Ribble are taken by car which causes traffic congestion and pollution, so we need to create opportunities and choices for people to use their car less’. The proposed development site SR029 is isolated. It is one mile from the site to the nearest grocer, doctor, school or medical centre. Local buses run to limited routes and are infrequent. The local bus to Preston runs at one hour intervals during the day. The nearest supermarket is one mile away. Local residents use their cars to visit the supermarket or take their children to school. The local population comprises mainly of elderly people, so if the site were to be used for business purpose it is unlikely that any potential workforce would be drawn from the local population. Therefore the use of the site for business purposes would be likely to increase the amount of local traffic with the consequential increased congestion and pollution. The existing small trading estate which lies between Brownhill Lane and the A59 is largely unoccupied with many of the premises displaying ‘To Let’ signs. This is hardly evidence of an exceptional need for further industrial/business premises in the immediate area (cf Policy Guidance Clause 2.6). As use for potential housing the site is small at 2.90 hectares. A core strategy of the council is to make efficient use of land whilst respecting the local character in terms of housing density. The existing immediate local housing density is approximately less than 20/hectare. Given a potential 25 houses per hectare to respect the local character, the site is likely to offer no more than 75 houses or an additional 180 population at an average household size of 2.37 (Your Lancashire pdf – attached). (Not attached – ZT) An increase in the local population of 180 is hardly likely to have a positive effect on the quality of the local bus service provided’ but 75 additional households would be likely to add a further 150 vehicles using local roads. Thus adding to congestion and pollution. There is already significant congestion at all local junctions at peak times. Any additional vehicle movement would be a further detriment and one which the local road and more importantly the junction networks could not accommodate. This emphasises the site unsustainable and unsuitable location for residential or employment or as a mixed use site. It shows how distant local facilities are and how additional population would not support these distant facilities. Additional land if it is required, should be located close to and support existing facilities and be in a sustainable and appropriate location. This speculative and inappropriate site should be immediately discounted. Homes for All – Respecting the Local Character As stated above, the site is isolated and small at 2.90 hectares. The existing housing density is approximately less than 20/hectare. In order to accord with the core strategy of respecting the local character in terms of housing density, the site is unlikely to yield more than 75 new homes. It is likely that local services will be inadequate given that the newest homes in the area are two detached houses constructed in 1975. The existing telephone installation to the area is pole fed. The fields which comprise the proposed development plot SR029 hold standing water during the winter months, as do the surrounding drainage ditches. The existing drainage system along Chapel Lane has been failing in recent years with homes becoming flooded in times of heavy rain. Extensive works to the drainage system were carried out during a six month period from December 2008 onwards. Excavations to a connection at the junction of Moss Lane and Chapel Lane were left open for a</p>

Reference	Comments
	<p>number of weeks whilst a solution to resolve the connection was found. It is therefore unlikely that the existing drainage system would be able to cope with any additional flow without substantial improvement. The provision of the utility services to these homes would require a substantial investment in the local infrastructure. Given that the proportion of fixed capital investment in providing utility services to 75 dwellings would be comparatively high any development could hardly be described as sustainable. Delivering Economic Prosperity – Supporting the Rural Economy The current land use is for pasture/grazing. It is counterintuitive that removal of the farmland would be supportive of the rural economy (cf Policy Guidance Clause 1.6). Protecting and Enhancing the Natural Environment – restore create and protect habitats for species The redundant railway cutting which lies between 168 to 198 Chapel Lane and Site Reference SR029 provides habitat to rabbits, jays, woodpeckers, pheasants, ducks and other native species. The County Council has installed a 'Caution Ducks Crossing' road sign at the junction of Moss Lane and Chapel Lane. The habitat in this ear would be threatened by any substantial development taking place on site reference SR029 both during the construction phase and later by the activity of the development occupiers. Tackling climate change – protecting the best quality agricultural land As a key issue the Council is committed to protecting the best quality agricultural land. Item 8.16 of the LDF Discussion Paper states that the best and most versatile agricultural land has been identified (amongst others) at Longton Moss (cf Policy Guidance Clause 1.6). Site Reference SR029 is located at Longton Moss. The road to the East boundary of the site is Moss Lane. The site is currently used for pasture/grazing.</p>
582	<p>I do not agree with the proposal to use this land for possible light industrial use, if it were allowed it could become a transport depot or timber merchants or virtually any use. It would not be a very nice outlook for the houses along Chapel Lane, which back onto this land.</p>
461	<p>SR029 – Objection My property is adjacent to the site in plan reference SR029. I have attached a three page summary of my objection to the development of the site. I have condensed my objections here as follows: a) Development of Green Belt land. b) Increased traffic in the area to junctions that are often saturated at peak times. c) Adverse effect on existing poor drainage of any development if the site. d) Adverse effect on natural environment; wild life etc. I object to the development of site reference number SR029 for the following reasons: Green Belt Item 6.16 of the LDF Discussion Paper states 'The Council is committed to protecting the Green Belt within South Ribble. Green Belt will not be released within the plan period (except in exceptional circumstances as defined by planning Policy Guidance 2: Green Belts) up until 2026. Clause 1.5 of the above policy guidance states 'purposes of including land in Green Belts – to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment'. Clause 1.6 states 'Once Green Belts have been defined, the use of land in them has a positive role to play in the following circumstances – to retain land in agricultural, forestry and related uses'. Clause 2.6 states 'Once the general extent of Green Belt has been approved it should be altered only in exceptional circumstances. If such an alteration is proposed the Secretary of State will wish to be satisfied that the authority has considered opportunities for development within the urban areas contained by and beyond the Green Belt. Similarly, detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans or earlier approved development plans should be altered only exceptionally. Detailed boundaries should not be altered or development allowed merely because the land has become derelict'. Clause 3.2 states 'Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to Green Belt. It is for the applicant to show why permission should be granted. Very special circumstances to justify inappropriate development will not exist unless the harm by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm is clearly outweighed by other considerations. In view of the presumption against inappropriate development, the Secretary of State will attach substantial weight to the harm to the Green Belt when considering any planning applications or appeal concerning such development.' The Lancashire County Council Mario map identifies the area of the proposed development SR029 lies within Green Belt (pdf copy attached). (Not attached – ZT) Letter from South Ribble Borough Council to John Kirkpatrick confirms that the railway cutting which lies between the rear gardens of 168-198 Chapel Lane and proposed development plot SR029 lies within Green Belt and is therefore inappropriate for the majority of development. (pdf copy attached). (Not attached – ZT) Given that the area is clearly within designated as Green Belt and used for agricultural purpose, to release the site would be contrary to established Green Belt Policy, particularly in such an unsustainable and open location. Within the LDF Discussion Paper, site reference SR029 is described as having more than one suggested use. There is no other overriding use or requirement to release Green Belt land and therefore an explanation of what is the nature of the alternative proposals should be given to allow for comment. Catering for Sustainable Travel – Reducing Reliance on the Car Item 3.2 of the LDF Discussion Paper states 'At the moment most journeys in South Ribble are taken by car which causes traffic congestion and pollution, so we need to create opportunities and choices for people to use their car less'. The proposed development site SR029 is isolated. It is one mile from the site to the nearest grocer, doctor, school or medical centre. Local buses run to limited routes and are infrequent. The local bus to Preston runs at one hour intervals during the day. The nearest supermarket is one mile away. Local residents use their cars to visit the supermarket or take their children to school. The local population comprises mainly of elderly people, so if the site were to be used for business purpose it is unlikely that any potential workforce would be drawn from the local population. Therefore the use of the site for business purposes would be likely to increase the amount of local traffic with the consequential increased congestion and pollution. The existing small trading estate which lies between Brownhill Lane and the A59 is largely unoccupied with many of the premises displaying 'To Let' signs. This is hardly evidence of an exceptional need for further industrial/business premises in the immediate area (cf Policy Guidance Clause 2.6). As use for potential housing the site is small at 2.90 hectares. A core strategy of the council is to make efficient use of land whilst respecting the local character in terms of housing density. The existing immediate local housing density is approximately less than 20/hectare. Given a potential 25 houses per hectare to respect the local character, the site is likely to offer no more than 75 houses or an additional 180 population at an average household size of 2.37 (Your Lancashire pdf – attached). (Not attached – ZT) An</p>

Reference	Comments
	<p>increase in the local population of 180 is hardly likely to have a positive effect on the quality of the local bus service provided' but 75 additional households would be likely to add a further 150 vehicles using local roads. Thus adding to congestion and pollution. There is already significant congestion at all local junctions at peak times. Any additional vehicle movement would be a further detriment and one which the local road and more importantly the junction networks could not accommodate. This emphasises the site unsustainable and unsuitable location for residential or employment or as a mixed use site. It shows how distant local facilities are and how additional population would not support these distant facilities. Additional land if it is required, should be located close to and support existing facilities and be in a sustainable and appropriate location. This speculative and inappropriate site should be immediately discounted. Homes for All – Respecting the Local Character As stated above, the site is isolated and small at 2.90 hectares. The existing housing density is approximately less than 20/hectare. In order to accord with the core strategy of respecting the local character in terms of housing density, the site is unlikely to yield more than 75 new homes. It is likely that local services will be inadequate given that the newest homes in the area are two detached houses constructed in 1975. The existing telephone installation to the area is pole fed. The fields which comprise the proposed development plot SR029 hold standing water during the winter months, as do the surrounding drainage ditches. The existing drainage system along Chapel Lane has been failing in recent years with homes becoming flooded in times of heavy rain. Extensive works to the drainage system were carried out during a six month period from December 2008 onwards. Excavations to a connection at the junction of Moss Lane and Chapel Lane were left open for a number of weeks whilst a solution to resolve the connection was found. It is therefore unlikely that the existing drainage system would be able to cope with any additional flow without substantial improvement. The provision of the utility services to these homes would require a substantial investment in the local infrastructure. Given that the proportion of fixed capital investment in providing utility services to 75 dwellings would be comparatively high any development could hardly be described as sustainable. Delivering Economic Prosperity – Supporting the Rural Economy The current land use is for pasture/grazing. It is counterintuitive that removal of the farmland would be supportive of the rural economy (cf Policy Guidance Clause 1.6). Protecting and Enhancing the Natural Environment – restore create and protect habitats for species The redundant railway cutting which lies between 168 to 198 Chapel Lane and Site Reference SR029 provides habitat to rabbits, jays, woodpeckers, pheasants, ducks and other native species. The County Council has installed a 'Caution Ducks Crossing' road sign at the junction of Moss Lane and Chapel Lane. The habitat in this ear would be threatened by any substantial development taking place on site reference SR029 both during the construction phase and later by the activity of the development occupiers. Tackling climate change – protecting the best quality agricultural land As a key issue the Council is committed to protecting the best quality agricultural land. Item 8.16 of the LDF Discussion Paper states that the best and most versatile agricultural land has been identified (amongst others) at Longton Moss (cf Policy Guidance Clause 1.6). Site Reference SR029 is located at Longton Moss. The road to the East boundary of the site is Moss Lane. The site is currently used for pasture/grazing.</p>
462	<p>I object to the development of site reference number SR029 for the following reasons: Green Belt Item 6.16 of the LDF Discussion Paper states 'The Council is committed to protecting the Green Belt within South Ribble. Green Belt will not be released within the plan period (except in exceptional circumstances as defined by planning Policy Guidance 2: Green Belts) up until 2026. Clause 1.5 of the above policy guidance states 'purposes of including land in Green Belts – to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment'. Clause 1.6 states 'Once Green Belts have been defined, the use of land in them has a positive role to play in the following circumstances – to retain land in agricultural, forestry and related uses'. Clause 2.6 states 'Once the general extent of Green Belt has been approved it should be altered only in exceptional circumstances. If such an alteration is proposed the Secretary of State will wish to be satisfied that the authority has considered opportunities for development within the urban areas contained by and beyond the Green Belt. Similarly, detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans or earlier approved development plans should be altered only exceptionally. Detailed boundaries should not be altered or development allowed merely because the land has become derelict'. Clause 3.2 states 'Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to Green Belt. It is for the applicant to show why permission should be granted. Very special circumstances to justify inappropriate development will not exist unless the harm by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm is clearly outweighed by other considerations. In view of the presumption against inappropriate development, the Secretary of State will attach substantial weight to the harm to the Green Belt when considering any planning applications or appeal concerning such development.' The Lancashire County Council Mario map identifies the area of the proposed development SR029 lies within Green Belt (pdf copy attached). (Not attached – ZT) Letter from South Ribble Borough Council to John Kirkpatrick confirms that the railway cutting which lies between the rear gardens of 168-198 Chapel Lane and proposed development plot SR029 lies within Green Belt and is therefore inappropriate for the majority of development. (pdf copy attached). (Not attached – ZT) Given that the area is clearly within designated as Green Belt and used for agricultural purpose, to release the site would be contrary to established Green Belt Policy, particularly in such an unsustainable and open location. Within the LDF Discussion Paper, site reference SR029 is described as having more than one suggested use. There is no other overriding use or requirement to release Green Belt land and therefore an explanation of what is the nature of the alternative proposals should be given to allow for comment. Catering for Sustainable Travel – Reducing Reliance on the Car Item 3.2 of the LDF Discussion Paper states 'At the moment most journeys in South Ribble are taken by car which causes traffic congestion and pollution, so we need to create opportunities and choices for people to use their car less'. The proposed development site SR029 is isolated. It is one mile from the site to the nearest grocer, doctor, school or medical centre. Local buses run to limited routes and are infrequent. The local bus to Preston runs at one hour intervals during the day. The nearest supermarket is one mile away. Local residents use their</p>

Reference	Comments
	<p>cars to visit the supermarket or take their children to school. The local population comprises mainly of elderly people, so if the site were to be used for business purpose it is unlikely that any potential workforce would be drawn from the local population. Therefore the use of the site for business purposes would be likely to increase the amount of local traffic with the consequential increased congestion and pollution. The existing small trading estate which lies between Brownhill Lane and the A59 is largely unoccupied with many of the premises displaying 'To Let' signs. This is hardly evidence of an exceptional need for further industrial/business premises in the immediate area (cf Policy Guidance Clause 2.6). As use for potential housing the site is small at 2.90 hectares. A core strategy of the council is to make efficient use of land whilst respecting the local character in terms of housing density. The existing immediate local housing density is approximately less than 20/hectare. Given a potential 25 houses per hectare to respect the local character, the site is likely to offer no more than 75 houses or an additional 180 population at an average household size of 2.37 (Your Lancashire pdf – attached). (Not attached – ZT) An increase in the local population of 180 is hardly likely to have a positive effect on the quality of the local bus service provided' but 75 additional households would be likely to add a further 150 vehicles using local roads. Thus adding to congestion and pollution. There is already significant congestion at all local junctions at peak times. Any additional vehicle movement would be a further detriment and one which the local road and more importantly the junction networks could not accommodate. This emphasises the site unsustainable and unsuitable location for residential or employment or as a mixed use site. It shows how distant local facilities are and how additional population would not support these distant facilities. Additional land if it is required, should be located close to and support existing facilities and be in a sustainable and appropriate location. This speculative and inappropriate site should be immediately discounted. Homes for All – Respecting the Local Character As stated above, the site is isolated and small at 2.90 hectares. The existing housing density is approximately less than 20/hectare. In order to accord with the core strategy of respecting the local character in terms of housing density, the site is unlikely to yield more than 75 new homes. It is likely that local services will be inadequate given that the newest homes in the area are two detached houses constructed in 1975. The existing telephone installation to the area is pole fed. The fields which comprise the proposed development plot SR029 hold standing water during the winter months, as do the surrounding drainage ditches. The existing drainage system along Chapel Lane has been failing in recent years with homes becoming flooded in times of heavy rain. Extensive works to the drainage system were carried out during a six month period from December 2008 onwards. Excavations to a connection at the junction of Moss Lane and Chapel Lane were left open for a number of weeks whilst a solution to resolve the connection was found. It is therefore unlikely that the existing drainage system would be able to cope with any additional flow without substantial improvement. The provision of the utility services to these homes would require a substantial investment in the local infrastructure. Given that the proportion of fixed capital investment in providing utility services to 75 dwellings would be comparatively high any development could hardly be described as sustainable. Delivering Economic Prosperity – Supporting the Rural Economy The current land use is for pasture/grazing. It is counterintuitive that removal of the farmland would be supportive of the rural economy (cf Policy Guidance Clause 1.6). Protecting and Enhancing the Natural Environment – restore create and protect habitats for species The redundant railway cutting which lies between 168 to 198 Chapel Lane and Site Reference SR029 provides habitat to rabbits, jays, woodpeckers, pheasants, ducks and other native species. The County Council has installed a 'Caution Ducks Crossing' road sign at the junction of Moss Lane and Chapel Lane. The habitat in this ear would be threatened by any substantial development taking place on site reference SR029 both during the construction phase and later by the activity of the development occupiers. Tackling climate change – protecting the best quality agricultural land As a key issue the Council is committed to protecting the best quality agricultural land. Item 8.16 of the LDF Discussion Paper states that the best and most versatile agricultural land has been identified (amongst others) at Longton Moss (cf Policy Guidance Clause 1.6). Site Reference SR029 is located at Longton Moss. The road to the East boundary of the site is Moss Lane. The site is currently used for pasture/grazing.</p>
83	<p>Dear Sirs, I object to the above proposed applications for the following reasons within the village of Longton: Greenbelt land should not be used for development Traffic congestion and parking will be made worse Local schools are over subscribed We are losing the character of the village and the view from the village to open countryside This will destroy\ effect the natural environment and habitat of wildlife Parking in the village is already very difficult</p>
73	<p>Objection Comments:: greenbelt land should not be used for development.traffic congestion & parking will be made worse.local schools are oversubscribed. we are loosing the character of the village & the view from the village to open countryside.This will destroy and affect the natural environment and habitat of wildlife.parking in the village is already difficult.</p>
385	<p>Tackling climate change – protecting the best quality agricultural land As a key issue the Council is committed to protecting the best quality agricultural land. Item 8.16 of the LDF Discussion Paper states that the best and most versatile agricultural land has been identified (amongst others) at Longton Moss (cf Policy Guidance Clause 1.6). Site Reference SR029 is located at Longton Moss. The road to the East boundary of the site is Moss Lane. The site is currently used for pature/grazing.</p>
342	<p>Objection Comments:: This application would have irreversable implications for the environment and natural habitat of wildlife, particularly on migrating birds which come to visit this area. Pollution is another worry that such a development would have on the area. The application is a no-brainer and would be heavily resisted through legal action.</p>
385	<p>Catering for Sustainable Travel – Reducing Reliance on the Car Item 3.2 of the LDF Discussion Paper states 'At the moment most journeys in South Ribble are taken by</p>

Reference	Comments
	<p>car which causes traffic congestion and pollution, so we need to create opportunities and choices for people to use their car less'. The proposed development site SR029 is isolated. It is one mile from the site to the nearest grocer, doctor, school or medical centre. Local buses run to limited routes and are infrequent. The local bus to Preston runs at one hour intervals during the day. The nearest supermarket is one mile away. Local residents use their cars to visit the supermarket or take their children to school. The local population comprises mainly of elderly people, so if the site were to be used for business purpose it is unlikely that any potential workforce would be drawn from the local population. Therefore the use of the site for business purposes would be likely to increase the amount of local traffic with the consequential increased congestion and pollution. The existing small trading estate which lies between Brownhill Lane and the A59 is largely unoccupied with many of the premises displaying 'To Let' signs. This is hardly evidence of an exceptional need for further industrial/business premises in the immediate area (cf Policy Guidance Clause 2.6). As use for potential housing the site is small at 2.90 hectares. A core strategy of the council is to make efficient use of land whilst respecting the local character in terms of housing density. The existing immediate local housing density is approximately less than 20/hectare. Given a potential 25 houses per hectare to respect the local character, the site is likely to offer no more than 75 houses or an additional 180 population at an average household size of 2.37 (Your Lancashire pdf – attached). An increase in the local population of 180 is hardly likely to have a positive effect on the quality of the local bus service provided' but 75 additional households would be likely to add a further 150 vehicles using local roads. Thus adding to congestion and pollution. There is already significant congestion at all local junctions at peak times. Any additional vehicle movement would be a further detriment and one which the local road and more importantly the junction networks could not accommodate. This emphasises the site unsustainable and unsuitable location for residential or employment or as a mixed use site. It shows how distant local facilities are and how additional population would not support these distant facilities. Additional land if it is required, should be located close to and support existing facilities and be in a sustainable and appropriate location. This speculative and inappropriate site should be immediately discounted.</p>
68	<p>I Object for the following reasons within the village of Longton: Greenbelt land should not be used for development. Traffic congestion and parking will be made worse, Local schools are over subscribed. We are losing the character of the village and the view from the village to open countryside. This will destroy effect the natural environment and habitat of wildlife. Parking in the village is already very difficult.</p>
309	<p>object to the development of site reference number SR029 for the following reasons: Green Belt Item 6.16 of the LDF Discussion Paper states 'The Council is committed to protecting the Green Belt within South Ribble. Green Belt will not be released within the plan period (except in exceptional circumstances as defined by planning Policy Guidance 2: Green Belts) up until 2026. Clause 1.5 of the above policy guidance states 'purposes of including land in Green Belts – to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment'. Clause 1.6 states 'Once Green Belts have been defined, the use of land in them has a positive role to play in the following circumstances – to retain land in agricultural, forestry and related uses'. Clause 2.6 states 'Once the general extent of Green Belt has been approved it should be altered only in exceptional circumstances. If such an alteration is proposed the Secretary of State will wish to be satisfied that the authority has considered opportunities for development within the urban areas contained by and beyond the Green Belt. Similarly, detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans or earlier approved development plans should be altered only exceptionally. Detailed boundaries should not be altered or development allowed merely because the land has become derelict'. Clause 3.2 states 'Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to Green Belt. It is for the applicant to show why permission should be granted. Very special circumstances to justify inappropriate development will not exist unless the harm by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm is clearly outweighed by other considerations. In view of the presumption against inappropriate development, the Secretary of State will attach substantial weight to the harm to the Green Belt when considering any planning applications or appeal concerning such development.' The Lancashire County Council Mario map identifies the area of the proposed development SR029 lies within Green Belt (pdf copy attached). (Not attached – ZT) Letter from South Ribble Borough Council to John Kirkpatrick confirms that the railway cutting which lies between the rear gardens of 168-198 Chapel Lane and proposed development plot SR029 lies within Green Belt and is therefore inappropriate for the majority of development. (pdf copy attached). (Not attached – ZT) Given that the area is clearly within designated as Green Belt and used for agricultural purpose, to release the site would be contrary to established Green Belt Policy, particularly in such an unsustainable and open location. Within the LDF Discussion Paper, site reference SR029 is described as having more than one suggested use. There is no other overriding use or requirement to release Green Belt land and therefore an explanation of what is the nature of the alternative proposals should be given to allow for comment. Catering for Sustainable Travel – Reducing Reliance on the Car Item 3.2 of the LDF Discussion Paper states 'At the moment most journeys in South Ribble are taken by car which causes traffic congestion and pollution, so we need to create opportunities and choices for people to use their car less'. The proposed development site SR029 is isolated. It is one mile from the site to the nearest grocer, doctor, school or medical centre. Local buses run to limited routes and are infrequent. The local bus to Preston runs at one hour intervals during the day. The nearest supermarket is one mile away. Local residents use their cars to visit the supermarket or take their children to school. The local population comprises mainly of elderly people, so if the site were to be used for business purpose it is unlikely that any potential workforce would be drawn from the local population. Therefore the use of the site for business purposes would be likely to increase the amount of local traffic with the consequential increased congestion and pollution. The existing small trading estate which lies between Brownhill Lane and the A59 is largely unoccupied with many of the premises displaying 'To Let' signs. This is hardly evidence of an exceptional need for further industrial/business premises in the immediate</p>

Reference	Comments
	<p>area (cf Policy Guidance Clause 2.6). As use for potential housing the site is small at 2.90 hectares. A core strategy of the council is to make efficient use of land whilst respecting the local character in terms of housing density. The existing immediate local housing density is approximately less than 20/hectare. Given a potential 25 houses per hectare to respect the local character, the site is likely to offer no more than 75 houses or an additional 180 population at an average household size of 2.37 (Your Lancashire pdf – attached). (Not attached – ZT) An increase in the local population of 180 is hardly likely to have a positive effect on the quality of the local bus service provided' but 75 additional households would be likely to add a further 150 vehicles using local roads. Thus adding to congestion and pollution. There is already significant congestion at all local junctions at peak times. Any additional vehicle movement would be a further detriment and one which the local road and more importantly the junction networks could not accommodate. This emphasises the site unsustainable and unsuitable location for residential or employment or as a mixed use site. It shows how distant local facilities are and how additional population would not support these distant facilities. Additional land if it is required, should be located close to and support existing facilities and be in a sustainable and appropriate location. This speculative and inappropriate site should be immediately discounted. Homes for All – Respecting the Local Character As stated above, the site is isolated and small at 2.90 hectares. The existing housing density is approximately less than 20/hectare. In order to accord with the core strategy of respecting the local character in terms of housing density, the site is unlikely to yield more than 75 new homes. It is likely that local services will be inadequate given that the newest homes in the area are two detached houses constructed in 1975. The existing telephone installation to the area is pole fed. The fields which comprise the proposed development plot SR029 hold standing water during the winter months, as do the surrounding drainage ditches. The existing drainage system along Chapel Lane has been failing in recent years with homes becoming flooded in times of heavy rain. Extensive works to the drainage system were carried out during a six month period from December 2008 onwards. Excavations to a connection at the junction of Moss Lane and Chapel Lane were left open for a number of weeks whilst a solution to resolve the connection was found. It is therefore unlikely that the existing drainage system would be able to cope with any additional flow without substantial improvement. The provision of the utility services to these homes would require a substantial investment in the local infrastructure. Given that the proportion of fixed capital investment in providing utility services to 75 dwellings would be comparatively high any development could hardly be described as sustainable. Delivering Economic Prosperity – Supporting the Rural Economy The current land use is for pasture/grazing. It is counterintuitive that removal of the farmland would be supportive of the rural economy (cf Policy Guidance Clause 1.6). Protecting and Enhancing the Natural Environment – restore create and protect habitats for species The redundant railway cutting which lies between 168 to 198 Chapel Lane and Site Reference SR029 provides habitat to rabbits, jays, woodpeckers, pheasants, ducks and other native species. The County Council has installed a 'Caution Ducks Crossing' road sign at the junction of Moss Lane and Chapel Lane. The habitat in this ear would be threatened by any substantial development taking place on site reference SR029 both during the construction phase and later by the activity of the development occupiers. Tackling climate change – protecting the best quality agricultural land As a key issue the Council is committed to protecting the best quality agricultural land. Item 8.16 of the LDF Discussion Paper states that the best and most versatile agricultural land has been identified (amongst others) at Longton Moss (cf Policy Guidance Clause 1.6). Site Reference SR029 is located at Longton Moss. The road to the East boundary of the site is Moss Lane. The site is currently used for pasture/grazing. Other The landowner is unaware of the future proposed use of the land – I have discussed this proposal with the landowner who objects about the land being designated for another use. There is other land closer to the village of New Longton that is more suitable for development than the site identified.</p>
385	<p>Delivering Economic Prosperity – Supporting the Rural Economy The current land use is for pasture/grazing. It is counterintuitive that removal of the farmland would be supportive of the rural economy (cf Policy Guidance Clause 1.6).</p>
85	<p>I object to the above proposed applications for the following reasons within the village of Longton: Greenbelt land should not be used for development Traffic congestion and parking will be made worse Local schools are over subscribed We are losing the character of the village and the view from the village to open countryside This will destroy\ effect the natural environment and habitat of wildlife Parking in the village is already very difficult</p>
385	<p>Homes for All – Respecting the Local Character As stated above, the site is isolated and small at 2.90 hectares. The existing housing density is approximately less than 20/hectare. In order to accord with the core strategy of respecting the local character in terms of housing density, the site is unlikely to yield more than 75 new homes. It is likely that local services will be inadequate given that the newest homes in the area are two detached houses constructed in 1975. The existing telephone installation to the area is pole fed. The fields which comprise the proposed development plot SR029 hold standing water during the winter months, as do the surrounding drainage ditches. The existing drainage system along Chapel Lane has been failing in recent years with homes becoming flooded in times of heavy rain. Extensive works to the drainage system were carried out during a six month period from December 2008 onwards. Excavations to a connection at the junction of Moss Lane and Chapel Lane were left open for a number of weeks whilst a solution to resolve the connection was found. It is therefore unlikely that the existing drainage system would be able to cope with any additional flow without substantial improvement. The provision of the utility services to these homes would require a substantial investment in the local infrastructure. Given that the proportion of fixed capital investment in providing utility services to 75 dwellings would be comparatively high any development could hardly be described as sustainable.</p>

Reference	Comments
464	<p>This field is at the rear of my property at the other side of the old railway cutting and I was always under the impression that this land was Green Belt. If it is not, then it is certainly a Green Field site with no physical connection to either New Longton or Longton. It is an isolated site in the middle of no-man's land between the two villages and it is not a logical expansion of New Longton village or indeed Longton. A development of this site would add a whole new dimension to the development of the village and could well become the first stepping-stone towards developers filling in the gap between New Longton and Longton. The whole concept of developing this site, whether it be for housing or business, should be discouraged. For any development of this site, the access route off Brownhill Lane is simply not suitable for any more traffic – the road has always been a country lane and it remains so. All roads in the New Longton area, with the sole exception of the A59, are not suited to the traffic – much of it travelling at high speed – that is already using them. At times – usually between 8.00 and 0.15 in the morning and 3.00 and 6.00 in the afternoon – it can be impossible to cross Chapel Lane to post a letter or back one's car out onto the road to go about one's business. This situation is repeated all along the route from the A59 Longton by-pass through to Coote Lane at Farington and this road was simply not designed as a major trunk road which is what it has become, ie the major rat run for all traffic between the A59 and the M6/M65/M61 at Bamber Bridge. The really big trucks – the 40 ton articulated leviathans – are not allowed to use Moss Lane/Hugh Barn Lane because the road is not suitable so they go through New Longton village instead which is, in reality, even less suitable. There have been a number of accidents recently on the Moss Lane/Hugh Barn Lane stretch but fortunately none have been fatal – yet. Until the transport infrastructure is brought up to a standard that will be able to take this weight of traffic, particularly the completion of the Penwortham by-pass, no further development that would increase traffic should be allowed. Should the site be considered for housing, there are more grounds for not permitting such a development, mainly based on the lack of facilities and poor infrastructure: 1. There is no NHS dentist in either New Longton or Longton and as far as I know, there is No NHS dentist in the surrounding area who is currently taking on NHS patients. 2. I understand that the doctor's practice at Longton Health Centre is considering closing their lists. 3. The current bus service is poor and in the current financial climate, is in grave danger of being one of the bus services cut. 4. New Longton Primary School has at present no vacancies and local children are actually having to travel past the school to attend school in Longton. 5. there is insufficient sheltered accommodation within the village. 6. I can understand that developers only want to build huge 4/5 bedroomed houses because they are bigger profits for them than in building smaller ones but there is a great demand for houses of more modest dimensions, especially small bungalows. If development of the land were to be allowed, I would suggest that the great majority of properties built should be smaller and affordable. 7. The site itself has drainage problems. The railway cutting has been flooded a number of times over the past few years and the field has standing water on it for a good part of the winter. In short, any development should not be allowed because the site, if not Green Belt, is a green field site isolated from both New Longton and Longton and the infrastructure including surrounding roads and necessary services are simply not up to any further expansion.</p>
429	<p>I object to the development of site reference number SR029 for the following reasons: Green Belt Item 6.16 of the LDF Discussion Paper states 'The Council is committed to protecting the Green Belt within South Ribble. Green Belt will not be released within the plan period (except in exceptional circumstances as defined by planning Policy Guidance 2: Green Belts) up until 2026. Clause 1.5 of the above policy guidance states 'purposes of including land in Green Belts – to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment'. Clause 1.6 states 'Once Green Belts have been defined, the use of land in them has a positive role to play in the following circumstances – to retain land in agricultural, forestry and related uses'. Clause 2.6 states 'Once the general extent of Green Belt has been approved it should be altered only in exceptional circumstances. If such an alteration is proposed the Secretary of State will wish to be satisfied that the authority has considered opportunities for development within the urban areas contained by and beyond the Green Belt. Similarly, detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans or earlier approved development plans should be altered only exceptionally. Detailed boundaries should not be altered or development allowed merely because the land has become derelict'. Clause 3.2 states 'Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to Green Belt. It is for the applicant to show why permission should be granted. Very special circumstances to justify inappropriate development will not exist unless the harm by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm is clearly outweighed by other considerations. In view of the presumption against inappropriate development, the Secretary of State will attach substantial weight to the harm to the Green Belt when considering any planning applications or appeal concerning such development.' The Lancashire County Council Mario map identifies the area of the proposed development SR029 lies within Green Belt (pdf copy attached). Letter from South Ribble Borough Council to John Kirkpatrick confirms that the railway cutting which lies between the rear gardens of 168-198 Chapel Lane and proposed development plot SR029 lies within Green Belt and is therefore inappropriate for the majority of development. (pdf copy attached). Given that the area is clearly within designated as Green Belt and used for agricultural purpose, to release the site would be contrary to established Green Belt Policy, particularly in such an unsustainable and open location. Within the LDF Discussion Paper, site reference SR029 is described as having more than one suggested use. There is no other overriding use or requirement to release Green Belt land and therefore an explanation of what is the nature of the alternative proposals should be given to allow for comment. Catering for Sustainable Travel – Reducing Reliance on the Car Item 3.2 of the LDF Discussion Paper states 'At the moment most journeys in South Ribble are taken by car which causes traffic congestion and pollution, so we need to create opportunities and choices for people to use their car less'. The proposed development site SR029 is isolated. It is one mile from the site to the nearest grocer, doctor, school or medical centre. Local buses run to limited routes and are infrequent. The local bus to Preston runs at one hour intervals during the day. The nearest supermarket is one mile away. Local residents use their cars to visit the supermarket or take their children to</p>

Reference	Comments
	<p>school. The local population comprises mainly of elderly people, so if the site were to be used for business purpose it is unlikely that any potential workforce would be drawn from the local population. Therefore the use of the site for business purposes would be likely to increase the amount of local traffic with the consequential increased congestion and pollution. The existing small trading estate which lies between Brownhill Lane and the A59 is largely unoccupied with many of the premises displaying 'To Let' signs. This is hardly evidence of an exceptional need for further industrial/business premises in the immediate area (cf Policy Guidance Clause 2.6). As use for potential housing the site is small at 2.90 hectares. A core strategy of the council is to make efficient use of land whilst respecting the local character in terms of housing density. The existing immediate local housing density is approximately less than 20/hectare. Given a potential 25 houses per hectare to respect the local character, the site is likely to offer no more than 75 houses or an additional 180 population at an average household size of 2.37 (Your Lancashire pdf – attached). (Not attached – ZT) An increase in the local population of 180 is hardly likely to have a positive effect on the quality of the local bus service provided' but 75 additional households would be likely to add a further 150 vehicles using local roads. Thus adding to congestion and pollution. There is already significant congestion at all local junctions at peak times. Any additional vehicle movement would be a further detriment and one which the local road and more importantly the junction networks could not accommodate. This emphasises the site unsustainable and unsuitable location for residential or employment or as a mixed use site. It shows how distant local facilities are and how additional population would not support these distant facilities. Additional land if it is required, should be located close to and support existing facilities and be in a sustainable and appropriate location. This speculative and inappropriate site should be immediately discounted. Homes for All – Respecting the Local Character As stated above, the site is isolated and small at 2.90 hectares. The existing housing density is approximately less than 20/hectare. In order to accord with the core strategy of respecting the local character in terms of housing density, the site is unlikely to yield more than 75 new homes. It is likely that local services will be inadequate given that the newest homes in the area are two detached houses constructed in 1975. The existing telephone installation to the area is pole fed. The fields which comprise the proposed development plot SR029 hold standing water during the winter months, as do the surrounding drainage ditches. The existing drainage system along Chapel Lane has been failing in recent years with homes becoming flooded in times of heavy rain. Extensive works to the drainage system were carried out during a six month period from December 2008 onwards. Excavations to a connection at the junction of Moss Lane and Chapel Lane were left open for a number of weeks whilst a solution to resolve the connection was found. It is therefore unlikely that the existing drainage system would be able to cope with any additional flow without substantial improvement. The provision of the utility services to these homes would require a substantial investment in the local infrastructure. Given that the proportion of fixed capital investment in providing utility services to 75 dwellings would be comparatively high any development could hardly be described as sustainable. Delivering Economic Prosperity – Supporting the Rural Economy The current land use is for pasture/grazing. It is counterintuitive that removal of the farmland would be supportive of the rural economy (cf Policy Guidance Clause 1.6). Protecting and Enhancing the Natural Environment – restore create and protect habitats for species The redundant railway cutting which lies between 168 to 198 Chapel Lane and Site Reference SR029 provides habitat to rabbits, jays, woodpeckers, pheasants, ducks and other native species. The County Council has installed a 'Caution Ducks Crossing' road sign at the junction of Moss Lane and Chapel Lane. The habitat in this ear would be threatened by any substantial development taking place on site reference SR029 both during the construction phase and later by the activity of the development occupiers. Tackling climate change – protecting the best quality agricultural land As a key issue the Council is committed to protecting the best quality agricultural land. Item 8.16 of the LDF Discussion Paper states that the best and most versatile agricultural land has been identified (amongst others) at Longton Moss (cf Policy Guidance Clause 1.6). Site Reference SR029 is located at Longton Moss. The road to the East boundary of the site is Moss Lane. The site is currently used for pasture/grazing.</p>
463	<p>My property is adjacent to the site in plan reference SR029. I have attached a three page summary of my objection to the development of the site. I have condensed my objections here as follows: Development of Green Belt land. Increased traffic in the area to junctions that are often saturated at peak times. Adverse effect on existing poor drainage of any development if the site. Adverse effect on natural environment; wild life etc. I object to the development of site reference number SR029 for the following reasons: Green Belt Item 6.16 of the LDF Discussion Paper states 'The Council is committed to protecting the Green Belt within South Ribble. Green Belt will not be released within the plan period (except in exceptional circumstances as defined by planning Policy Guidance 2: Green Belts) up until 2026. Clause 1.5 of the above policy guidance states 'purposes of including land in Green Belts – to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment'. Clause 1.6 states 'Once Green Belts have been defined, the use of land in them has a positive role to play in the following circumstances – to retain land in agricultural, forestry and related uses'. Clause 2.6 states 'Once the general extent of Green Belt has been approved it should be altered only in exceptional circumstances. If such an alteration is proposed the Secretary of State will wish to be satisfied that the authority has considered opportunities for development within the urban areas contained by and beyond the Green Belt. Similarly, detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans or earlier approved development plans should be altered only exceptionally. Detailed boundaries should not be altered or development allowed merely because the land has become derelict'. Clause 3.2 states 'Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to Green Belt. It is for the applicant to show why permission should be granted. Very special circumstances to justify inappropriate development will not exist unless the harm by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm is clearly outweighed by other considerations. In view of the presumption against inappropriate development, the Secretary of State will attach substantial weight to the harm to the Green Belt when considering any planning applications or appeal concerning such development.' The Lancashire County</p>

Reference	Comments
	<p>Council Mario map identifies the area of the proposed development SR029 lies within Green Belt (pdf copy attached). (Not attached – ZT) Letter from South Ribble Borough Council to John Kirkpatrick confirms that the railway cutting which lies between the rear gardens of 168-198 Chapel Lane and proposed development plot SR029 lies within Green Belt and is therefore inappropriate for the majority of development. (pdf copy attached). (Not attached – ZT) Given that the area is clearly within designated as Green Belt and used for agricultural purpose, to release the site would be contrary to established Green Belt Policy, particularly in such an unsustainable and open location. Within the LDF Discussion Paper, site reference SR029 is described as having more than one suggested use. There is no other overriding use or requirement to release Green Belt land and therefore an explanation of what is the nature of the alternative proposals should be given to allow for comment. Catering for Sustainable Travel – Reducing Reliance on the Car Item 3.2 of the LDF Discussion Paper states ‘At the moment most journeys in South Ribble are taken by car which causes traffic congestion and pollution, so we need to create opportunities and choices for people to use their car less’. The proposed development site SR029 is isolated. It is one mile from the site to the nearest grocer, doctor, school or medical centre. Local buses run to limited routes and are infrequent. The local bus to Preston runs at one hour intervals during the day. The nearest supermarket is one mile away. Local residents use their cars to visit the supermarket or take their children to school. The local population comprises mainly of elderly people, so if the site were to be used for business purpose it is unlikely that any potential workforce would be drawn from the local population. Therefore the use of the site for business purposes would be likely to increase the amount of local traffic with the consequential increased congestion and pollution. The existing small trading estate which lies between Brownhill Lane and the A59 is largely unoccupied with many of the premises displaying ‘To Let’ signs. This is hardly evidence of an exceptional need for further industrial/business premises in the immediate area (cf Policy Guidance Clause 2.6). As use for potential housing the site is small at 2.90 hectares. A core strategy of the council is to make efficient use of land whilst respecting the local character in terms of housing density. The existing immediate local housing density is approximately less than 20/hectare. Given a potential 25 houses per hectare to respect the local character, the site is likely to offer no more than 75 houses or an additional 180 population at an average household size of 2.37 (Your Lancashire pdf – attached). (Not attached – ZT) An increase in the local population of 180 is hardly likely to have a positive effect on the quality of the local bus service provided’ but 75 additional households would be likely to add a further 150 vehicles using local roads. Thus adding to congestion and pollution. There is already significant congestion at all local junctions at peak times. Any additional vehicle movement would be a further detriment and one which the local road and more importantly the junction networks could not accommodate. This emphasises the site unsustainable and unsuitable location for residential or employment or as a mixed use site. It shows how distant local facilities are and how additional population would not support these distant facilities. Additional land if it is required, should be located close to and support existing facilities and be in a sustainable and appropriate location. This speculative and inappropriate site should be immediately discounted. Homes for All – Respecting the Local Character As stated above, the site is isolated and small at 2.90 hectares. The existing housing density is approximately less than 20/hectare. In order to accord with the core strategy of respecting the local character in terms of housing density, the site is unlikely to yield more than 75 new homes. It is likely that local services will be inadequate given that the newest homes in the area are two detached houses constructed in 1975. The existing telephone installation to the area is pole fed. The fields which comprise the proposed development plot SR029 hold standing water during the winter months, as do the surrounding drainage ditches. The existing drainage system along Chapel Lane has been failing in recent years with homes becoming flooded in times of heavy rain. Extensive works to the drainage system were carried out during a six month period from December 2008 onwards. Excavations to a connection at the junction of Moss Lane and Chapel Lane were left open for a number of weeks whilst a solution to resolve the connection was found. It is therefore unlikely that the existing drainage system would be able to cope with any additional flow without substantial improvement. The provision of the utility services to these homes would require a substantial investment in the local infrastructure. Given that the proportion of fixed capital investment in providing utility services to 75 dwellings would be comparatively high any development could hardly be described as sustainable. Delivering Economic Prosperity – Supporting the Rural Economy The current land use is for pasture/grazing. It is counterintuitive that removal of the farmland would be supportive of the rural economy (cf Policy Guidance Clause 1.6). Protecting and Enhancing the Natural Environment – restore create and protect habitats for species The redundant railway cutting which lies between 168 to 198 Chapel Lane and Site Reference SR029 provides habitat to rabbits, jays, woodpeckers, pheasants, ducks and other native species. The County Council has installed a ‘Caution Ducks Crossing’ road sign at the junction of Moss Lane and Chapel Lane. The habitat in this ear would be threatened by any substantial development taking place on site reference SR029 both during the construction phase and later by the activity of the development occupiers. Tackling climate change – protecting the best quality agricultural land As a key issue the Council is committed to protecting the best quality agricultural land. Item 8.16 of the LDF Discussion Paper states that the best and most versatile agricultural land has been identified (amongst others) at Longton Moss (cf Policy Guidance Clause 1.6). Site Reference SR029 is located at Longton Moss. The road to the East boundary of the site is Moss Lane. The site is currently used for pasture/grazing.</p>
460	<p>I object to the development of site reference number SR029 for the following reasons: Green Belt Item 6.16 of the LDF Discussion Paper states ‘The Council is committed to protecting the Green Belt within South Ribble. Green Belt will not be released within the plan period (except in exceptional circumstances as defined by planning Policy Guidance 2: Green Belts) up until 2026. Clause 1.5 of the above policy guidance states ‘purposes of including land in Green Belts – to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment’. Clause 1.6 states ‘Once Green Belts have been defined, the use of land in them has a positive role to play in the following circumstances</p>

Reference	Comments
	<p>– to retain land in agricultural, forestry and related uses’. Clause 2.6 states ‘Once the general extent of Green Belt has been approved it should be altered only in exceptional circumstances. If such an alteration is proposed the Secretary of State will wish to be satisfied that the authority has considered opportunities for development within the urban areas contained by and beyond the Green Belt. Similarly, detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans or earlier approved development plans should be altered only exceptionally. Detailed boundaries should not be altered or development allowed merely because the land has become derelict’. Clause 3.2 states ‘Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to Green Belt. It is for the applicant to show why permission should be granted. Very special circumstances to justify inappropriate development will not exist unless the harm by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm is clearly outweighed by other considerations. In view of the presumption against inappropriate development, the Secretary of State will attach substantial weight to the harm to the Green Belt when considering any planning applications or appeal concerning such development.’ The Lancashire County Council Mario map identifies the area of the proposed development SR029 lies within Green Belt (pdf copy attached). (Not attached – ZT) Letter from South Ribble Borough Council to John Kirkpatrick confirms that the railway cutting which lies between the rear gardens of 168-198 Chapel Lane and proposed development plot SR029 lies within Green Belt and is therefore inappropriate for the majority of development. (pdf copy attached). (Not attached – ZT) Given that the area is clearly within designated as Green Belt and used for agricultural purpose, to release the site would be contrary to established Green Belt Policy, particularly in such an unsustainable and open location. Within the LDF Discussion Paper, site reference SR029 is described as having more than one suggested use. There is no other overriding use or requirement to release Green Belt land and therefore an explanation of what is the nature of the alternative proposals should be given to allow for comment. Catering for Sustainable Travel – Reducing Reliance on the Car Item 3.2 of the LDF Discussion Paper states ‘At the moment most journeys in South Ribble are taken by car which causes traffic congestion and pollution, so we need to create opportunities and choices for people to use their car less’. The proposed development site SR029 is isolated. It is one mile from the site to the nearest grocer, doctor, school or medical centre. Local buses run to limited routes and are infrequent. The local bus to Preston runs at one hour intervals during the day. The nearest supermarket is one mile away. Local residents use their cars to visit the supermarket or take their children to school. The local population comprises mainly of elderly people, so if the site were to be used for business purpose it is unlikely that any potential workforce would be drawn from the local population. Therefore the use of the site for business purposes would be likely to increase the amount of local traffic with the consequential increased congestion and pollution. The existing small trading estate which lies between Brownhill Lane and the A59 is largely unoccupied with many of the premises displaying ‘To Let’ signs. This is hardly evidence of an exceptional need for further industrial/business premises in the immediate area (cf Policy Guidance Clause 2.6). As use for potential housing the site is small at 2.90 hectares. A core strategy of the council is to make efficient use of land whilst respecting the local character in terms of housing density. The existing immediate local housing density is approximately less than 20/hectare. Given a potential 25 houses per hectare to respect the local character, the site is likely to offer no more than 75 houses or an additional 180 population at an average household size of 2.37 (Your Lancashire pdf – attached). (Not attached – ZT) An increase in the local population of 180 is hardly likely to have a positive effect on the quality of the local bus service provided’ but 75 additional households would be likely to add a further 150 vehicles using local roads. Thus adding to congestion and pollution. There is already significant congestion at all local junctions at peak times. Any additional vehicle movement would be a further detriment and one which the local road and more importantly the junction networks could not accommodate. This emphasises the site unsustainable and unsuitable location for residential or employment or as a mixed use site. It shows how distant local facilities are and how additional population would not support these distant facilities. Additional land if it is required, should be located close to and support existing facilities and be in a sustainable and appropriate location. This speculative and inappropriate site should be immediately discounted. Homes for All – Respecting the Local Character As stated above, the site is isolated and small at 2.90 hectares. The existing housing density is approximately less than 20/hectare. In order to accord with the core strategy of respecting the local character in terms of housing density, the site is unlikely to yield more than 75 new homes. It is likely that local services will be inadequate given that the newest homes in the area are two detached houses constructed in 1975. The existing telephone installation to the area is pole fed. The fields which comprise the proposed development plot SR029 hold standing water during the winter months, as do the surrounding drainage ditches. The existing drainage system along Chapel Lane has been failing in recent years with homes becoming flooded in times of heavy rain. Extensive works to the drainage system were carried out during a six month period from December 2008 onwards. Excavations to a connection at the junction of Moss Lane and Chapel Lane were left open for a number of weeks whilst a solution to resolve the connection was found. It is therefore unlikely that the existing drainage system would be able to cope with any additional flow without substantial improvement. The provision of the utility services to these homes would require a substantial investment in the local infrastructure. Given that the proportion of fixed capital investment in providing utility services to 75 dwellings would be comparatively high any development could hardly be described as sustainable. Delivering Economic Prosperity – Supporting the Rural Economy The current land use is for pasture/grazing. It is counterintuitive that removal of the farmland would be supportive of the rural economy (cf Policy Guidance Clause 1.6). Protecting and Enhancing the Natural Environment – restore create and protect habitats for species The redundant railway cutting which lies between 168 to 198 Chapel Lane and Site Reference SR029 provides habitat to rabbits, jays, woodpeckers, pheasants, ducks and other native species. The County Council has installed a ‘Caution Ducks Crossing’ road sign at the junction of Moss Lane and Chapel Lane. The habitat in this ear would be threatened by any substantial development taking place on site reference SR029 both during the construction phase and later by the activity of the development</p>

Reference	Comments
	occupiers. Tackling climate change – protecting the best quality agricultural land As a key issue the Council is committed to protecting the best quality agricultural land. Item 8.16 of the LDF Discussion Paper states that the best and most versatile agricultural land has been identified (amongst others) at Longton Moss (cf Policy Guidance Clause 1.6). Site Reference SR029 is located at Longton Moss. The road to the East boundary of the site is Moss Lane. The site is currently used for pasture/grazing.
90	Objection. I OBJECT TO FURTHER DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE VILLAGE OF LONGTON BECAUSE 1. TRAFFIC CONGESTION AND PARKING ARE ALREADY A PROBLEM 2. THE CHARACTER OF THE VILLAGE AND VIEW OF THE SURROUNDING COUNTRYSIDE ARE ALREADY BEING LOST 3. THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT AND HABITAT OF LOCAL WILDLIFE WILL BE DESTROYED 4. LOCAL SCHOLS ARE ALREADY OVER SUBSCRIBED 5. PARKING IN THE VILLAGE IS ALREADY VERY DIFFICULT 6. GREENBELT LAND SHOULD NOT BE USED FOR DEVELOPMENT
386	I object to the development of site reference number SR029 for the following reasons: Green Belt Item 6.16 of the LDF Discussion Paper states 'The Council is committed to protecting the Green Belt within South Ribble. Green Belt will not be released within the plan period (except in exceptional circumstances as defined by planning Policy Guidance 2: Green Belts) up until 2026. Clause 1.5 of the above policy guidance states 'purposes of including land in Green Belts – to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment'. Clause 1.6 states 'Once Green Belts have been defined, the use of land in them has a positive role to play in the following circumstances – to retain land in agricultural, forestry and related uses'. Clause 2.6 states 'Once the general extent of Green Belt has been approved it should be altered only in exceptional circumstances. If such an alteration is proposed the Secretary of State will wish to be satisfied that the authority has considered opportunities for development within the urban areas contained by and beyond the Green Belt. Similarly, detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans or earlier approved development plans should be altered only exceptionally. Detailed boundaries should not be altered or development allowed merely because the land has become derelict'. Clause 3.2 states 'Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to Green Belt. It is for the applicant to show why permission should be granted. Very special circumstances to justify inappropriate development will not exist unless the harm by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm is clearly outweighed by other considerations. In view of the presumption against inappropriate development, the Secretary of State will attach substantial weight to the harm to the Green Belt when considering any planning applications or appeal concerning such development.' The Lancashire County Council Mario map identifies the area of the proposed development SR029 lies within Green Belt (pdf copy attached). Letter from South Ribble Borough Council to John Kirkpatrick confirms that the railway cutting which lies between the rear gardens of 168-198 Chapel Lane and proposed development plot SR029 lies within Green Belt and is therefore inappropriate for the majority of development. (pdf copy attached). Given that the area is clearly within designated as Green Belt and used for agricultural purpose, to release the site would be contrary to established Green Belt Policy, particularly in such an unsustainable and open location. Within the LDF Discussion Paper, site reference SR029 is described as having more than one suggested use. There is no other overriding use or requirement to release Green Belt land and therefore an explanation of what is the nature of the alternative proposals should be given to allow for comment.
386	Catering for Sustainable Travel – Reducing Reliance on the Car Item 3.2 of the LDF Discussion Paper states 'At the moment most journeys in South Ribble are taken by car which causes traffic congestion and pollution, so we need to create opportunities and choices for people to use their car less'. The proposed development site SR029 is isolated. It is one mile from the site to the nearest grocer, doctor, school or medical centre. Local buses run to limited routes and are infrequent. The local bus to Preston runs at one hour intervals during the day. The nearest supermarket is one mile away. Local residents use their cars to visit the supermarket or take their children to school. The local population comprises mainly of elderly people, so if the site were to be used for business purpose it is unlikely that any potential workforce would be drawn from the local population. Therefore the use of the site for business purposes would be likely to increase the amount of local traffic with the consequential increased congestion and pollution. The existing small trading estate which lies between Brownhill Lane and the A59 is largely unoccupied with many of the premises displaying 'To Let' signs. This is hardly evidence of an exceptional need for further industrial/business premises in the immediate area (cf Policy Guidance Clause 2.6). As use for potential housing the site is small at 2.90 hectares. A core strategy of the council is to make efficient use of land whilst respecting the local character in terms of housing density. The existing immediate local housing density is approximately less than 20/hectare. Given a potential 25 houses per hectare to respect the local character, the site is likely to offer no more than 75 houses or an additional 180 population at an average household size of 2.37 (Your Lancashire pdf – attached). An increase in the local population of 180 is hardly likely to have a positive effect on the quality of the local bus service provided' but 75 additional households would be likely to add a further 150 vehicles using local roads. Thus adding to congestion and pollution. There is already significant congestion at all local junctions at peak times. Any additional vehicle movement would be a further detriment and one which the local road and more importantly the junction networks could not accommodate. This emphasises the site unsustainable and unsuitable location for residential or employment or as a mixed use site. It shows how distant local facilities are and how additional population would not support these distant facilities. Additional land if it is required, should be located close to and support existing facilities and be in a sustainable and appropriate location. This speculative and inappropriate site should be immediately discounted.
478	The infrastructure of New Longton can not stand these suggested developments. The volume of traffic is horrendous.

Reference	Comments
385	<p>Re: LDF Planning Consultation Response Please find attached with this e-mail my response to the LDF Planning Consultation. This response sets out my strong objections to the development of site reference number SR029, because in summary the suggested development: Is on Greenbelt Land Does not support sustainable travel in the local area Does not protect agricultural land or support the rural economy Does not protect or enhance the natural environment Does not respect the local character of the community I also wish to express my extreme dissatisfaction with the 'Consultation' process. I became aware of the LDF Planning Consultation on 22nd January 2011, after receiving a copy of Appendix 11 (Landowners & Developers Site Suggestions) from a neighbour. I was shocked to discover that consultation had actually opened on 8th December 2010 and was due to close on 31st January 2011. I find it astonishing that as a resident in South Ribble, I had not been directly informed by South Ribble Borough Council of this process, given the purpose of consultation and the importance of this process to the community. I feel that I have been denied the opportunity to consider and put forward suggestions for the development plan for South Ribble, with the limited time I have had to review the 134 page Discussion Paper document. This process has been made even more difficult, due to what I am presuming is a technical error on the South Ribble website, I have been unable to submit an online response form despite several attempts. When trying to submit this form I was greeted with the following message: 'ADODB.Command error '800a0d5d' Application uses a value of the wrong type for the current operation./includes/InformSiteClass.asp, line 252' I therefore attach with this e-mail my objection to the development of site SR029, complete with 3 appendices. I also intend to hand deliver a hard copy to the Council Offices before 5pm on Monday 31st January 2011. Your Faithfully, Laura Ferris</p>
386	<p>Homes for All – Respecting the Local Character As stated above, the site is isolated and small at 2.90 hectares. The existing housing density is approximately less than 20/hectare. In order to accord with the core strategy of respecting the local character in terms of housing density, the site is unlikely to yield more than 75 new homes. It is likely that local services will be inadequate given that the newest homes in the area are two detached houses constructed in 1975. The existing telephone installation to the area is pole fed. The fields which comprise the proposed development plot SR029 hold standing water during the winter months, as do the surrounding drainage ditches. The existing drainage system along Chapel Lane has been failing in recent years with homes becoming flooded in times of heavy rain. Extensive works to the drainage system were carried out during a six month period from December 2008 onwards. Excavations to a connection at the junction of Moss Lane and Chapel Lane were left open for a number of weeks whilst a solution to resolve the connection was found. It is therefore unlikely that the existing drainage system would be able to cope with any additional flow without substantial improvement. The provision of the utility services to these homes would require a substantial investment in the local infrastructure. Given that the proportion of fixed capital investment in providing utility services to 75 dwellings would be comparatively high any development could hardly be described as sustainable.</p>
386	<p>Protecting and Enhancing the Natural Environment – restore create and protect habitats for species The redundant railway cutting which lies between 168 to 198 Chapel Lane and Site Reference SR029 provides habitat to rabbits, jays, woodpeckers, pheasants, ducks and other native species. The County Council has installed a 'Caution Ducks Crossing' road sign at the junction of Moss Lane and Chapel Lane. The habitat in this ear would be threatened by any substantial development taking place on site reference SR029 both during the construction phase and later by the activity of the development occupiers.</p>
385	<p>Protecting and Enhancing the Natural Environment – restore create and protect habitats for species The redundant railway cutting which lies between 168 to 198 Chapel Lane and Site Reference SR029 provides habitat to rabbits, jays, woodpeckers, pheasants, ducks and other native species. The County Council has installed a 'Caution Ducks Crossing' road sign at the junction of Moss Lane and Chapel Lane. The habitat in this ear would be threatened by any substantial development taking place on site reference SR029 both during the construction phase and later by the activity of the development occupiers.</p>
442	<p>Suggestions for changes Comments:: Think this site should be used as retail space for the New Longton Area. Shops, cafes, maybe doctors/dentists surgeries could sit well alongside retail space here. This site whilst not an eyesore has looked underused and unappealing for years and some investment to it would be welcomed. As it is on the outskirts of both villages I don't think there could be a negative impact from upgrading what already exists as a light industrial unit. Are there any other questions/sites you wish to comment on?: Yes We are interested in YOUR comments. If you have further issues that we have not covered within the discussion paper, please give details below.: DESPARATELY needed is a zebra crossing adjacent to the childrens' playpark in New Longton. This would serve the children who use the park to cross, the elderly from the sheltered housing on Boundary Close to cross and could benefit any children who walk home from New Longton School who need to cross. The speed that cars travel along this stretch is at times quite frightening and the volume of traffic going to and from Lancashire Police Headquarters at peak times is quite heavy. Please put this idea forward !!</p>
385	<p>I object to the development of site reference number SR029 for the following reasons: Green Belt Item 6.16 of the LDF Discussion Paper states 'The Council is committed to protecting the Green Belt within South Ribble. Green Belt will not be released within the plan period (except in exceptional circumstances as defined by planning Policy Guidance 2: Green Belts) up until 2026. Clause 1.5 of the above policy guidance states 'purposes of including land in Green Belts – to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment'. Clause 1.6 states 'Once Green Belts have been defined, the use of land in them has a positive role to play in the following circumstances</p>

Reference	Comments
	<p>– to retain land in agricultural, forestry and related uses’. Clause 2.6 states ‘Once the general extent of Green Belt has been approved it should be altered only in exceptional circumstances. If such an alteration is proposed the Secretary of State will wish to be satisfied that the authority has considered opportunities for development within the urban areas contained by and beyond the Green Belt. Similarly, detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans or earlier approved development plans should be altered only exceptionally. Detailed boundaries should not be altered or development allowed merely because the land has become derelict’. Clause 3.2 states ‘Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to Green Belt. It is for the applicant to show why permission should be granted. Very special circumstances to justify inappropriate development will not exist unless the harm by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm is clearly outweighed by other considerations. In view of the presumption against inappropriate development, the Secretary of State will attach substantial weight to the harm to the Green Belt when considering any planning applications or appeal concerning such development.’ The Lancashire County Council Mario map identifies the area of the proposed development SR029 lies within Green Belt (pdf copy attached). Letter from South Ribble Borough Council to John Kirkpatrick confirms that the railway cutting which lies between the rear gardens of 168-198 Chapel Lane and proposed development plot SR029 lies within Green Belt and is therefore inappropriate for the majority of development. (pdf copy attached). Given that the area is clearly within designated as Green Belt and used for agricultural purpose, to release the site would be contrary to established Green Belt Policy, particularly in such an unsustainable and open location. Within the LDF Discussion Paper, site reference SR029 is described as having more than one suggested use. There is no other overriding use or requirement to release Green Belt land and therefore an explanation of what is the nature of the alternative proposals should be given to allow for comment.</p>
386	<p>Delivering Economic Prosperity – Supporting the Rural Economy The current land use is for pasture/grazing. It is counterintuitive that removal of the farmland would be supportive of the rural economy (cf Policy Guidance Clause 1.6).</p>
456	<p>(OBJECTION), GREEN BELT. Outside settlement area, agricultural land.</p>
507	<p>I object to the development of site reference number SR029 for the following reasons: Green Belt Item 6.16 of the LDF Discussion Paper states ‘The Council is committed to protecting the Green Belt within South Ribble. Green Belt will not be released within the plan period (except in exceptional circumstances as defined by planning Policy Guidance 2: Green Belts) up until 2026. Clause 1.5 of the above policy guidance states ‘purposes of including land in Green Belts – to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment’. Clause 1.6 states ‘Once Green Belts have been defined, the use of land in them has a positive role to play in the following circumstances – to retain land in agricultural, forestry and related uses’. Clause 2.6 states ‘Once the general extent of Green Belt has been approved it should be altered only in exceptional circumstances. If such an alteration is proposed the Secretary of State will wish to be satisfied that the authority has considered opportunities for development within the urban areas contained by and beyond the Green Belt. Similarly, detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans or earlier approved development plans should be altered only exceptionally. Detailed boundaries should not be altered or development allowed merely because the land has become derelict’. Clause 3.2 states ‘Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to Green Belt. It is for the applicant to show why permission should be granted. Very special circumstances to justify inappropriate development will not exist unless the harm by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm is clearly outweighed by other considerations. In view of the presumption against inappropriate development, the Secretary of State will attach substantial weight to the harm to the Green Belt when considering any planning applications or appeal concerning such development.’ The Lancashire County Council Mario map identifies the area of the proposed development SR029 lies within Green Belt. Letter from South Ribble Borough Council to John Kirkpatrick confirms that the railway cutting which lies between the rear gardens of 168-198 Chapel Lane and proposed development plot SR029 lies within Green Belt and is therefore inappropriate for the majority of development. Given that the area is clearly within designated as Green Belt and used for agricultural purpose, to release the site would be contrary to established Green Belt Policy, particularly in such an unsustainable and open location. Within the LDF Discussion Paper, site reference SR029 is described as having more than one suggested use. There is no other overriding use or requirement to release Green Belt land and therefore an explanation of what is the nature of the alternative proposals should be given to allow for comment. Catering for Sustainable Travel – Reducing Reliance on the Car Item 3.2 of the LDF Discussion Paper states ‘At the moment most journeys in South Ribble are taken by car which causes traffic congestion and pollution, so we need to create opportunities and choices for people to use their car less’. The proposed development site SR029 is isolated. It is one mile from the site to the nearest grocer, doctor, school or medical centre. Local buses run to limited routes and are infrequent. The local bus to Preston runs at one hour intervals during the day. The nearest supermarket is one mile away. Local residents use their cars to visit the supermarket or take their children to school. The local population comprises mainly of elderly people, so if the site were to be used for business purpose it is unlikely that any potential workforce would be drawn from the local population. Therefore the use of the site for business purposes would be likely to increase the amount of local traffic with the consequential increased congestion and pollution. The existing small trading estate which lies between Brownhill Lane and the A59 is largely unoccupied with many of the premises displaying ‘To Let’ signs. This is hardly evidence of an exceptional need for further industrial/business premises in the immediate area (cf Policy Guidance Clause 2.6). As use for potential housing the site is small at 2.90 hectares. A core strategy of the council is to make efficient use of land whilst respecting the local character in terms of housing density. The existing</p>

Reference	Comments
	<p>immediate local housing density is approximately less than 20/hectare. Given a potential 25 houses per hectare to respect the local character, the site is likely to offer no more than 75 houses or an additional 180 population at an average household size of 2.37. An increase in the local population of 180 is hardly likely to have a positive effect on the quality of the local bus service provided' but 75 additional households would be likely to add a further 150 vehicles using local roads. Thus adding to congestion and pollution. There is already significant congestion at all local junctions at peak times. Any additional vehicle movement would be a further detriment and one which the local road and more importantly the junction networks could not accommodate. This emphasises the site unsustainable and unsuitable location for residential or employment or as a mixed use site. It shows how distant local facilities are and how additional population would not support these distant facilities. Additional land if it is required, should be located close to and support existing facilities and be in a sustainable and appropriate location. This speculative and inappropriate site should be immediately discounted. Homes for All – Respecting the Local Character As stated above, the site is isolated and small at 2.90 hectares. The existing housing density is approximately less than 20/hectare. In order to accord with the core strategy of respecting the local character in terms of housing density, the site is unlikely to yield more than 75 new homes. It is likely that local services will be inadequate given that the newest homes in the area are two detached houses constructed in 1975. The existing telephone installation to the area is pole fed. The fields which comprise the proposed development plot SR029 hold standing water during the winter months, as do the surrounding drainage ditches. The existing drainage system along Chapel Lane has been failing in recent years with homes becoming flooded in times of heavy rain. Extensive works to the drainage system were carried out during a six month period from December 2008 onwards. Excavations to a connection at the junction of Moss Lane and Chapel Lane were left open for a number of weeks whilst a solution to resolve the connection was found. It is therefore unlikely that the existing drainage system would be able to cope with any additional flow without substantial improvement. The provision of the utility services to these homes would require a substantial investment in the local infrastructure. Given that the proportion of fixed capital investment in providing utility services to 75 dwellings would be comparatively high any development could hardly be described as sustainable. Delivering Economic Prosperity – Supporting the Rural Economy The current land use is for pasture/grazing. It is counterintuitive that removal of the farmland would be supportive of the rural economy (cf Policy Guidance Clause 1.6). Protecting and Enhancing the Natural Environment – restore create and protect habitats for species The redundant railway cutting which lies between 168 to 198 Chapel Lane and Site Reference SR029 provides habitat to rabbits, jays, woodpeckers, pheasants, ducks and other native species. The County Council has installed a 'Caution Ducks Crossing' road sign at the junction of Moss Lane and Chapel Lane. The habitat in this ear would be threatened by any substantial development taking place on site reference SR029 both during the construction phase and later by the activity of the development occupiers. Tackling climate change – protecting the best quality agricultural land As a key issue the Council is committed to protecting the best quality agricultural land. Item 8.16 of the LDF Discussion Paper states that the best and most versatile agricultural land has been identified (amongst others) at Longton Moss (cf Policy Guidance Clause 1.6). Site Reference SR029 is located at Longton Moss. The road to the East boundary of the site is Moss Lane. The site is currently used for pasture/grazing.</p>
387	<p>For the attention of the Planning Department Please find attached my response to the LDF Planning Consultation. I have also completed a hard copy that will be delivered in person to West Paddock before the deadline on 31-01-11. I strongly object to the suggested development to site reference SRO29 on the following grounds It is within Green Belt It will not respect the local character of the community Local infra structure will not be able to sustain this development It will not support the rural economy It will not protect local agriculture or the diverse natural wildlife Having read the document I feel strongly that any development of site reference SRO29 goes against South Ribble Core Strategy Objectives I also wish to express my concern and dissatisfaction regarding the Consultation Precess. It is obvious that a great deal of time money and expense has gone into the production of this document and yet it does not seem to be widely publicised. The front page of the document states 'Your Area, Your Choice, Your Say I along with many neighbours and work colleagues from other areas of the borough have little or no knowledge of this process. The opportunity for the people who pay for this consultation have lost the opportunity to express their views on matters that will impact on their lives in the not too distant future This process has been made even more difficult, due to what I am presuming is a technical error on the South Ribble website, I have been unable to submit an online response form despite several attempts. When trying to submit this form I was greeted with the following message: 'ADODB.Command error '800a0d5d' Application uses a value of the wrong type for the current operation./includes/InformSiteClass.asp, line 252' I have been unable to comment on other questions in the document as given the short time scale I feel I am unable to give them the time and consideration these important matters deserve.</p>

Site SR030

Reference	Comments
262	<p>1. I object to the re-zoning of Green Belt land for any type of development. All land in the green belt should be excluded from this consultation and not carried forward. 2. Longton already contains undeveloped land outside of the Green Belt which must be used for development before any consideration is given to the destruction of Green Belt land. This non green belt land should provide development potential for the next 30+ years. South Ribble as a whole has thousands of acres of land capable of development, without the need to destroy the Green Belt and villages like ours. 3. Leyland, Lostock Hall and Buckshaw village have a lot of areas not in the Green Belt or being used for agriculture which could be developed. These places have better communications than Longton e.g. close to motorway junctions and rail links at Leyland and Lostock Hall with the possibility of opening the old Royal Ordnance station at Buckshaw Village. Leyland has good shopping and parking facilities which can cope with additional residents. Both Leyland and Lostock Hall have primary and secondary schools and Leyland has Runshaw College obviating the need for children to travel to surrounding towns for education. 4. I object to the loss of agricultural land. The population is growing and there is a move to local sourcing. Many acres of agricultural land has been lost to building in South Ribble in the past few years. We must keep what agricultural land that we have for the production of food, the maintenance of the varied wildlife in the area, the separation of the villages and the pleasure of the residents. 5. Ecological issues - loss of habitat. Local species include bats, barn owls, tawny owls, buzzards, greater crested newts, pheasants and many other birds, animals, amphibians, reptiles and insects. 6. Congestion/highways. Junctions with Liverpool Road throughout Longton and road such as Chapel Lane, Marsh Lane and Shirley Lane are already heavily used. Intensification of development would create dangerous road conditions. The A59 is at a standstill going in and out of Penwortham at busy times. This congestion is added to by the secondary school and college children having to travel from Longton and other villages to Penwortham, Preston etc. as there are no secondary schools or colleges in the Longton area. 7. Existing Longton sewers are already at capacity. 8. Development of Dobson's farm would provide a continuous link of the 2 settlements of Longton/Walmer Bridge providing urban sprawl. 9. There is a history of flooding on parts of Dobson's Farm and other areas in Longton. 10. Longton is limited in the room it has for shops, services, parking etc. and serves as a shopping and services centre for the surrounding area. The traffic in Longton is already heavy and the current parking in the village centre, including the Booths car park, is already well used. As any additional development in the area will be some distance from the shops and services, the current facilities are unlikely to be sufficient and I cannot see there being any suitable areas to extend.</p>
168	<p>(OBJECTION), GREEN FIELD site for agricultural land.</p>
485	<p>I wish to object to these two sites being included in future development plans for residential development. Both require access to Chapel Lane which is already congested and dangerous. Traffic creates a serious bottleneck where Chapel Lane and School Lane lead into Liverpool Road in Longton.</p>
316	<p>1) De-valuation of existing Properties surrounding and overlooking the area. 2) Existing Infrastructure, amenities, public services and highways already insufficient and overstretched. Local Council should concentrate on upgrading local services to deal with an increase in population BEFORE increasing the residential capacity of the area. Traffic in the local area and into Preston is at Gridlock during rush hour, local health centre is overstretched. 3) LDF guidelines state: "Local authorities are meant to engage local people in preparing their Local Development Framework, and to produce policies that really reflect the views and aspirations of the community" I do not believe that the population of Longton have been adequately consulted regarding these proposals and as a result will not be fairly represented in any decisions. I have not seen any notification of these plans. They were brought to my attention by a local resident on 30/01/2011 with a deadline of 5pm 31/01/2011 for me to place any objection or response. 24hrs prior to the deadline for responses, Speaking to other residents in Longton the story is very similar. Local awareness of these plans is virtually none existent.</p>
138	<p>Having carefully read your overall strategy for South Ribble, it is difficult to imagine how you could consider these proposals would align themselves to your ambition. The village has already developed significantly over recent years, and in turn this has increased pressure on the existing infrastructure. Road development and transport has not kept pace with residential building, and the same is true of schooling, where class sizes are already excessive. The congestion at peak times in the centre of the village is at times frenetic. Parking at the village shops is in high demand, and frequently causes motorists and other road users to contravene the law in order to park. Policing of the area is remotely served, and this substantial increase in residents, traffic and associated issues will further stretch those limited resources, as will those of other emergency services. I trust you do not intend to increase those functions to match demand? There have been at least five major new developments in the area in recent years that I can recall, but none on the scale suggested here, which would adversely transform the entire nature of the village. Existing traffic calming measures would be overwhelmed, parking a free for all in the village. The schools already creaking at the seams, would undoubtedly have to expand to cope. In summary I strongly oppose the proposals, this is a significant green area of the village, and supports a strong village identity. There appears to be no logical reason to build here, housing demand is not over subscribed, with numerous properties already on the open market. It is not a coherent plan, and does not support your strategy, I know sentiment in the village is strong about this issue, and feelings running high. I only hope you have the ability to reconsider now !</p>

Reference	Comments
317	<p>1) De-valuation of existing Properties surrounding and overlooking the area. 2) Existing Infrastructure, amenities, public services and highways already insufficient and overstretched. Local Council should concentrate on upgrading local services to deal with an increase in population BEFORE increasing the residential capacity capacity of the area. Traffic in the local area and into Preston is at Gridlock during rush hour, local health centre is overstretched. 3) LDF guidelines state: "Local authorities are meant to engage local people in preparing their Local Development Framework, and to produce policies that really reflect the views and aspirations of the community" I do not believe that the population of Longton have been adequately consulted regarding these proposals and as a result will not be fairly represented in any decisions. I have not seen any notification of these plans. They were brought to my attention by a local resident on 30/01/2011 with a deadline of 5pm 31/01/2011 for me to place any objection or response. 24hrs prior to the deadline for responses, Speaking to other residents in Longton the story is very similar. Local awareness of these plans is virtually none existent.</p>
408	<p>Objection Comments:: As above: A very small site. A very small proportion of the proposed sites within the Rural Local Service Centre (Longton), which in turn represents only 6% of the total perceived needs. Given the negligible impact in terms of supposed requirements, infills such as this create a quite disproportionate impact on the character of their surroundings. The remaining gaps within and behind the roadside developments in Chapel Lane manage to retain something of the semi-rural character of the area, and help to define the separation between Longton and New Longton villages.</p>
456	<p>(OBJECTION), GREEN FIELD site for agricultural land.</p>
698	<p>(OBJECTION), GREEN FIELD site for agricultural land.</p>
356	<p>Objection: We object to the development of these sites because: - there will be erosion of the natural beauty of the area The building of a large housing estate, in these parts of Longton would destroy fields, hedgerows, wildlife etc, no matter how what criteria South Ribble Council imposed on the developer. This would begin a loss of the charm which Longton has. It is very near to the city of Preston and the seaside of Southport yet because of the existence of the fields it is an excellent place to live -there is natural beauty with little need to manufacture it - erosion of the quality of life The sites are priceless amenities which the people in Longton currently enjoy as part of the "breathing space" needed to enhance the quality of life, living in South Ribble. Apart from a small wildlife sanctuary (Longton Brickcroft) the adults (of all ages) and children of Longton, trying to maintain a healthy lifestyle, rely on being able to walk in the village safely and with pleasure - the fields designated for possible development give that pleasure, a feeling of being in the countryside, experiencing a sense of sustainable agriculture in parallel with a busy and thriving village. An increase in housing at the heart of the village, such as that proposed would lead also to increase in a number of pollution issues for example traffic. - loss of a sense of village We believe that to build houses on these sites would necessarily result in Longton village no longer being a village with a strong sense of community where for example, crime of whatever nature is extremely low and not tolerated. This is why people have chosen to live here or remained here, specifically for this reason. It adds to the variety of locations on offer in South Ribble and its attractiveness to investors in the area. In-filling the remaining green fields as proposed, if not green field sites, would surely eat away the substance of what Longton village is.</p>
326	<p>Today 30th January 2011 it has only just been brought to my attention by a neighbour concerning all the above proposals for residential building. Recognising the scale of these proposals I am extremely disappointed that all residents within nearby proximity have not been advised of personally by post of these proposals. Objections. Insufficient schools for additional children in Longton and we should not be encouraging parents to drive children further afield to school, adding more traffic to already congested roads. Insufficient amenities to cope with increased population. Booth Supermarket is at times ridiculously over stretched for parking and causes traffic jams with vehicles entering and leaving at Liverpool road. The Longton Healthcentre would be overloaded and would make it even more difficult to arrange doctors appointments. Access into Longton via Chapel lane would bring excessive traffic on a road not designed to take such loads and, might I add, presently very poorly maintained. There are already traffic calming measures which although attempt to slow traffic they cause traffic jams which I would say are getting close to impossibly to manage. Adding an access road at Longton hall would further exacerbate the situation. Chapel Lane is the main link road for traffic heading out of Longton towards the Mway and could not cope with all the addition vehicles from all these proposed residential buildings. Longton Bypass was built over 30 years ago to ease congestion of traffic on Liverpool road through Longton. These proposals defeat the object of the Bypass by increasing traffic further. There are horrendous traffic jams already every day through higher Penwortham. Increasing the population South of the Ribble at Longton, Hoole, Walmerbridge etc would exacerbate this problem further. Hugh Barn lane used at a link road toward to the motorway would have increased traffic and would become more dangerous especially around New Longton. Only a few weeks ago an mini crashed into a Landrover on Hugh Barn lane causing serious injuries to one of the drivers. Again this road is not designed for heavy amounts of traffic. You are spoiling green field which people of this area enjoy especially walking around the area. Walking around housing estates cannot be seen a pleasurable thing to do. Open spaces are good for your health! I was advised some years ago by the SRBC planning department that building a 6ft wall on the Chapel lane side of my garden on the border of my property "would not be in keeping with the village" and was only given planning permission by moving the wall approx 1.5 m inside the border with trees and bushes in between. Subsequently SRBC went ahead and built the school lane estate A little hypocritical and more so now SRBC are looking to extend that project at</p>

Reference	Comments
	SR009. Why can't you find old industrial land to build on? Or is this not conducive to the greedy construction companies? You are proposing building on green field land which many still consider "green belt". It is a disgrace that you can decide to alter the status of Green belt to Brown belt without consultation to people in the nearby residency
356	We object to the development of these sites because: - there will be erosion of the natural beauty of the area The building of a large housing estate, in these parts of Longton would destroy fields, hedgerows, wildlife etc, no matter how what criteria South Ribble Council imposed on the developer. This would begin a loss of the charm which Longton has. It is very near to the city of Preston and the seaside of Southport yet because of the existence of the fields it is an excellent place to live -there is natural beauty with little need to manufacture it - erosion of the quality of life The sites are priceless amenities which the people in Longton currently enjoy as part of the "breathing space" needed to enhance the quality of life, living in South Ribble. Apart from a small wildlife sanctuary (Longton Brickcroft) the adults (of all ages) and children of Longton, trying to maintain a healthy lifestyle, rely on being able to walk in the village safely and with pleasure - the fields designated for possible development give that pleasure, a feeling of being in the countryside, experiencing a sense of sustainable agriculture in parallel with a busy and thriving village. An increase in housing at the heart of the village, such as that proposed would lead also to increase in a number of pollution issues for example traffic. - loss of a sense of village We believe that to build houses on these sites would necessarily result in Longton village no longer being a village with a strong sense of community where for example, crime of whatever nature is extremely low and not tolerated. This is why people have chosen to live here or remained here, specifically for this reason. It adds to the variety of locations on offer in South Ribble and its attractiveness to investors in the area. In-filling the remaining green fields as proposed, if not green field sites, would surely eat away the substance of what Longton village is.
355	Objection
232	Against housing being built on LHU1 and LHU7. Traffic around this location is busy especially at peak periods and can often back up from the bypass now. This can only be made worse by any housing near this location. Chapel Lane has parking and traffic issues with the school would be exacerbated. Moved from Hutton as the land to the rear of our house in Hutton was earmarked for housing, it was a large space and would accommodate all housing requirements. (NL H1 and NL110). Now live near LHU1 and LHU7 a small area with grouse, bats, owls and kestrels which is why we purchased the property. Access would be an issue, view would be spoilt. Bought our house as indications no houses would be built. Housing would spoil this area and only a small number of houses could in fact be built on this site. Our house would lose value as the houses would have to be built near to ours due to the site being small therefore devaluing our house price. Houses near to this land up for sale for 3 years - question if more housing needed.
276	1. I object to the re-zoning of Green Belt land for any type of development. All land in the green belt should excluded from this consultation and not carried forward. 2. Longton already contains undeveloped land outside of the Green Belt which must be used for development before any consideration is given to the destruction of Green Belt land. This non green belt land should provide development potential for the next 30+ years. South Ribble as a whole has thousands of acres of land capable of development, without the need to destroy the Green Belt and villages like ours. 3. Leyland, Lostock Hall and Buckshaw village have a lot of areas not in the Green Belt or being used for agriculture which could be developed. These places have better communications than Longton e.g. close to motorway junctions and rail links at Leyland and Lostock Hall with the possibility of opening the old Royal Ordnance station at Buckshaw Village. Leyland has good shopping and parking facilities which can cope with additional residents. Both Leyland and Lostock Hall have primary and secondary schools and Leyland has Runshaw College obviating the need for children to travel to surrounding towns for education. 4. I object to the loss of agricultural land. The population is growing and there is a move to local sourcing. Many acres of agricultural land has been lost to building in South Ribble in the past few years. We must keep what agricultural land that we have for the production of food, the maintenance of the varied wildlife in the area, the separation of the villages and the pleasure of the residents. 5. Ecological issues - loss of habitat. Local species include bats, barn owls, tawny owls, buzzards, greater crested newts, pheasants and many other birds, animals, amphibians, reptiles and insects. 6. Congestion/highways. Junctions with Liverpool Road throughout Longton and road such as Chapel Lane, Marsh Lane and Shirley Lane are already heavily used. Intensification of development would create dangerous road conditions. The A59 is at a standstill going in and out of Penwortham at busy times. This congestion is added to by the secondary school and college children having to travel from Longton and other villages to Penwortham, Preston etc. as there are no secondary schools or colleges in the Longton area. 7. Existing Longton sewers are already at capacity. 8. Development of Dobson's farm would provide a continuous link of the 2 settlements of Longton/Walmer Bridge providing urban sprawl. 9. There is a history of flooding on parts of Dobson's Farm and other areas in Longton. 10. Longton is limited in the room it has for shops, services, parking etc. and serves as a shopping and services centre for the surrounding area. The traffic in Longton is already heavy and the current parking in the village centre, including the Booths car park, is already well used. As any additional development in the area will be some distance from the shops and services, the current facilities are unlikely to be sufficient and I cannot see there being any suitable areas to extend.
33	Object. Agricultural land.

Reference	Comments
266	<p>1. I object to the re-zoning of Green Belt land for any type of development. All land in the green belt should be excluded from this consultation and not carried forward. 2. Longton already contains undeveloped land outside of the Green Belt which must be used for development before any consideration is given to the destruction of Green Belt land. This non green belt land should provide development potential for the next 30+ years. South Ribble as a whole has thousands of acres of land capable of development, without the need to destroy the Green Belt and villages like ours. 3. Leyland, Lostock Hall and Buckshaw village have a lot of areas not in the Green Belt or being used for agriculture which could be developed. These places have better communications than Longton e.g. close to motorway junctions and rail links at Leyland and Lostock Hall with the possibility of opening the old Royal Ordnance station at Buckshaw Village. Leyland has good shopping and parking facilities which can cope with additional residents. Both Leyland and Lostock Hall have primary and secondary schools and Leyland has Runshaw College obviating the need for children to travel to surrounding towns for education. 4. I object to the loss of agricultural land. The population is growing and there is a move to local sourcing. Many acres of agricultural land has been lost to building in South Ribble in the past few years. We must keep what agricultural land that we have for the production of food, the maintenance of the varied wildlife in the area, the separation of the villages and the pleasure of the residents. 5. Ecological issues - loss of habitat. Local species include bats, barn owls, tawny owls, buzzards, greater crested newts, pheasants and many other birds, animals, amphibians, reptiles and insects. 6. Congestion/highways. Junctions with Liverpool Road throughout Longton and road such as Chapel Lane, Marsh Lane and Shirley Lane are already heavily used. Intensification of development would create dangerous road conditions. The A59 is at a standstill going in and out of Penwortham at busy times. This congestion is added to by the secondary school and college children having to travel from Longton and other villages to Penwortham, Preston etc. as there are no secondary schools or colleges in the Longton area. 7. Existing Longton sewers are already at capacity. 8. Development of Dobson's farm would provide a continuous link of the 2 settlements of Longton/Walmer Bridge providing urban sprawl. 9. There is a history of flooding on parts of Dobson's Farm and other areas in Longton. 10. Longton is limited in the room it has for shops, services, parking etc. and serves as a shopping and services centre for the surrounding area. The traffic in Longton is already heavy and the current parking in the village centre, including the Booths car park, is already well used. As any additional development in the area will be some distance from the shops and services, the current facilities are unlikely to be sufficient and I cannot see there being any suitable areas to extend.</p>
230	<p>Area unsuitable due to weight of traffic around Chapel Lane and Chapel Park Road. Parking issues and traffic already an issue at peak times especially near St Oswalds School and the By pass. Additional houses put more strain on local amenities/facilities. Are more houses really required? House in Chapel Meadow adjacent to LHU1/7 has been up for sale for three years. Area houses wildlife, rural aspect. Due to small area wanting to be developed and site being small, new houses would be very near to existing houses. Prices of houses would be devalued, view spoiled and wildlife disturbed. Quiet cul-de-sac nearby, more housing would spoil this. Spoil the aspects we came to Longton for. Moved in 3 yrs ago indications no houses would be built on this land. Landowners of part of this land have been continually irresponsible with fly-tipping. I suspect this is in an effort to encourage my parents not to object to housing. Enforcement involved. This type of behaviour should not be rewarded.</p>
280	<p>1. I object to the re-zoning of Green Belt land for any type of development. All land in the green belt should be excluded from this consultation and not carried forward. 2. Longton already contains undeveloped land outside of the Green Belt which must be used for development before any consideration is given to the destruction of Green Belt land. This non green belt land should provide development potential for the next 30+ years. South Ribble as a whole has thousands of acres of land capable of development, without the need to destroy the Green Belt and villages like ours. 3. Leyland, Lostock Hall and Buckshaw village have a lot of areas not in the Green Belt or being used for agriculture which could be developed. These places have better communications than Longton e.g. close to motorway junctions and rail links at Leyland and Lostock Hall with the possibility of opening the old Royal Ordnance station at Buckshaw Village. Leyland has good shopping and parking facilities which can cope with additional residents. Both Leyland and Lostock Hall have primary and secondary schools and Leyland has Runshaw College obviating the need for children to travel to surrounding towns for education. 4. I object to the loss of agricultural land. The population is growing and there is a move to local sourcing. Many acres of agricultural land has been lost to building in South Ribble in the past few years. We must keep what agricultural land that we have for the production of food, the maintenance of the varied wildlife in the area, the separation of the villages and the pleasure of the residents. 5. Ecological issues - loss of habitat. Local species include bats, barn owls, tawny owls, buzzards, greater crested newts, pheasants and many other birds, animals, amphibians, reptiles and insects. 6. Congestion/highways. Junctions with Liverpool Road throughout Longton and road such as Chapel Lane, Marsh Lane and Shirley Lane are already heavily used. Intensification of development would create dangerous road conditions. The A59 is at a standstill going in and out of Penwortham at busy times. This congestion is added to by the secondary school and college children having to travel from Longton and other villages to Penwortham, Preston etc. as there are no secondary schools or colleges in the Longton area. 7. Existing Longton sewers are already at capacity. 8. Development of Dobson's farm would provide a continuous link of the 2 settlements of Longton/Walmer Bridge providing urban sprawl. 9. There is a history of flooding on parts of Dobson's Farm and other areas in Longton. 10. Longton is limited in the room it has for shops, services, parking etc. and serves as a shopping and services centre for the surrounding area. The traffic in Longton is already heavy and the current parking in the village centre, including the Booths car park, is already well used. As any additional development in the area will be some distance from the shops and services, the current facilities are unlikely to be sufficient and I cannot see there being any suitable areas to extend.</p>

Reference	Comments
356	<p>Objection: We object to the development of these sites because: - there will be erosion of the natural beauty of the area The building of a large housing estate, in these parts of Longton would destroy fields, hedgerows, wildlife etc, no matter how what criteria South Ribble Council imposed on the developer. This would begin a loss of the charm which Longton has. It is very near to the city of Preston and the seaside of Southport yet because of the existence of the fields it is an excellent place to live -there is natural beauty with little need to manufacture it - erosion of the quality of life The sites are priceless amenities which the people in Longton currently enjoy as part of the "breathing space" needed to enhance the quality of life, living in South Ribble. Apart from a small wildlife sanctuary (Longton Brickcroft) the adults (of all ages) and children of Longton, trying to maintain a healthy lifestyle, rely on being able to walk in the village safely and with pleasure - the fields designated for possible development give that pleasure, a feeling of being in the countryside, experiencing a sense of sustainable agriculture in parallel with a busy and thriving village. An increase in housing at the heart of the village, such as that proposed would lead also to increase in a number of pollution issues for example traffic. - loss of a sense of village We believe that to build houses on these sites would necessarily result in Longton village no longer being a village with a strong sense of community where for example, crime of whatever nature is extremely low and not tolerated. This is why people have chosen to live here or remained here, specifically for this reason. It adds to the variety of locations on offer in South Ribble and its attractiveness to investors in the area. In-filling the remaining green fields as proposed, if not green field sites, would surely eat away the substance of what Longton village is.</p>

Site SR031

Reference	Comments
656	<p>Could this site be used in conjunction with the adjacent. Charmly told complex to provide care housing in view of the increasing demand for facilities to cope with the increased scale of dementive?</p>

Site SR033

Reference	Comments
473	<p>• A registered activity is in the vicinity any subsequent development will need to take this into account i.e. odour and/or noise impacts.</p>