

Site SR186

Reference	Comments
24	This piece of land which was Hulmes Mill site has been empty for over 20 years and would make an ideal car park, or skate park for the youngsters. a car park would help patients attending Sandy Lane Surgery, and people visiting this part of Leyland ie. Towngate. Also, the skate park is not big enough to cater the many youngsters in Leyland and is out of sight leaving children vulnerable to bullying. These are my 2 suggestions. Thank you

Site SR187

Reference	Comments
568	This area has been constantly been retained for development, as a one/two company massive "inward flagship site" blighting all the 10 properties in Cuerden Green. How can anybody think that taking a huge piece of land, slap bang in the middle of this area for a park and ride, will assist any developer to consider using it? Further more, the Sainsburys roundabout, already nightmare for motorists, would be put to more stress. Irrespective of the new traffic lights, which were proposed by LCC at the dualling of Lostock Lane meetings, I attended these meetings even before this road was dualled/
498	I object to these areas being developed because I feel it is vital to protect any greenfield land and that any development on these sites will increase congestion in the Farington/Lostock Hall area and put more strain on local services. If these green areas are developed then Leyland and Lostock hall will become one huge urban sprawl which is detrimental to the quality of life to everyone in these areas. Building on greenland is not good for the environment.
637	Proposed park and ride - objection anyone driving in this area will be aware of the congestion and the likelihood of wanting to use a park and ride would be remote. Exiting onto the dual carriageway is impossible at times, not only from Old School Lane, but also for visitors to the hospice and no amount of traffic management would solve this problem due to the volume of traffic.
638	Proposed park and ride - I object to have a park and ride in this area would be ridiculous, the traffic is already horrendous. Exiting Old School Lane is already difficult and at times dangerous, this would also be the case for anyone using a park and ride. This area needs more traffic not more. I can't believe the people of South Ribble are bothered about a park and ride, surely education, care of the elderly and poverty are more important.
543	The HCA owns approximately 44Ha of the 65Ha of this allocated Regional Investment Site, defined as a Strategic Site in the Publication Core Strategy. The HCA is working in partnership with Lancashire County Council and, South Ribble Borough Council to bring this site forward through planning. Recent studies have been undertaken to identify constraints, set out options for high level masterplanning and phasing, and determine market viability and delivery strategy. The HCA continues to support this project and actively engage with partners on order to secure development of this site. Site Reference SR187 is in respect of Park and Ride use, which is indicated on the plan located within the Regional Investment Site. This reduces the site by approx 10Ha of the available developable land area. Although the HCA fully understands the need for sustainable travel and transportation facilities which a Park and Ride will deliver for the benefit both of this project and the locality, the loss of 10Ha of employment land to this use will remove considerable site value, and have impacts on site viability making the project harder to deliver. The HCA expresses reservations of such a potential loss of developable land and suggests that such an allocation be subject to strict viability and logistical tests and in the light of the existing facility to the north at Capitol Centre. Alternative locations should be considered.
686	Dear Sir/Madam, With ref to plan SR187 regarding a Park & Ride I strongly object to this proposal. My reasons for this is as follows ,the traffic in this area ie Lostock Lane and Stanifield Lane is horrendous and not just specific times both roads are used as a race track and I am sure god forbid there will a Fatal Accident. This park & ride has been placed in the centre of the employment plan also skirting the motorway roundabout showing no on or off I find this unbelievable plus the size of the area. Since the motorway opened the volume of traffic has just increased on a daily basis. Yours Sincerely Mr K DUNCAN.

Site SR195

Reference	Comments
59	Support the reintroduction of a railway station at Midge Hall and a park and ride facility.

Site SR206

Reference	Comments
176	Land off Liverpool Road/Jubilee Road, Walmer Bridge Nature of response:: Suggestions for changes Comments:: This land is currently allocated for mixed use and has previously had outline permissions for mixed use (inc B1,B2 and B8 uses) dating back over ten years. During that time, which was when the economic outlook was considerably brighter, it was the subject of extensive marketing but has remained undeveloped. There is no realistic prospect of this land being developed for employment use in the foreseeable future. Given the character of the surrounding area, the obvious alternative use for this land is housing. In fact, given its size and configuration, it would be difficult to develop it for any other purposes without harming visual and residential amenity. The land is controlled by two developers, including Redrow Homes, and is immediately available for development. Moreover it is not subject to any significant environmental or technical constraints and therefore is capable of making a contribution to the Council's deliverable housing land supply. The land should be allocated for housing in the Site Allocations DPD.
34	Suggestion for changes. We refer to the issues and options discussion paper (page 28 headed rural economy D10). Highlighted in appendix 1 Much Hoole and Walmer Bridge Map. It is our view that this land would be more suitable for the provision of allotments, not for housing. The Local Village Plan substantiates this view.

Site SR212

Reference	Comments
209	Object for following reasons; 1) Step 1, fig 3, of the Core Strategy is to eliminate sites not in designated areas. In the Western Parishes sites not in the rural local service centre of Longton should be eliminated. A large, 2.78 hectare, site in Hutton is in conflict with the Core Strategy. 2) The overwhelming view from residents as indicated in the Village Plan is that "further development should be limited to conversions or very small infill type plots". The Village Plan also states that there is "widespread resistance to further new development in the village, especially on green field sites". Section 1.20 of the Core Strategy makes it clear that Hutton Village Plan is an existing plan upon which the LDF can build and which will be used to identify local issues. The site proposals and size are at odds with the stated views of villagers. 3) The Core Strategy at 8.15 indicates a desire to protect agricultural land to maintain future requirements for more self-sufficiency. Land to the north and west of Hutton is mentioned as falling into that category. The fields which form site SR212 are currently used for grazing cattle and sheep and provide at least two cuts of hay/silage a year. To lose this land to development would potentially conflict with Core Strategy policies. It is also worth noting that the land and its hedges provide a wildlife habitat. 4) There are a number of site specific and technical issues which would currently prevent development of this site, such as congestion, access, transportation, services and facilities, drainage, etc. If after consideration of all representations the Borough Council decide that the site should be included to the next stage for village needs then I would ask that the following stipulations be applied to any policy: 1) The site shall be tightly defined so as to meet a fully identified and wholly justified village need. 2) In accordance with the findings of the Local Plan inspector the provision of access onto Liverpool Road with a resolution of congestion and hazardous conditions at the access point shall be a pre-requisite of any development of this site. 3) There are significant drainage problems in the village, which United Utilities, LCC and SRBC have been unable to address. Initially UU objected to the small Meadowview development because of lack of capacity. It required a disproportionately expensive and substandard system to enable the development to continue. Any development of this site will need to address drainage issues in order not to exacerbate the current situation. 4) To avoid adding to current, acknowledged congestion problems in Hutton and Penwortham no development of the whole site should take place until highway infrastructure improvements have taken place. 5) The Meadowview development required ground levels to be raised by up to 1.5 metres. Unfortunately these details were not identified or advised to affected residents until planning permission had been granted and work was underway. Any further development of the site should identify proposed ground levels at the planning application stage. 6) The nature of any development of the site should reflect the style of buildings on Meadowview Close and the Anchor estate, ie. single storey and be of a low density

Reference	Comments
205	<p>Substantial development of the site would be inappropriate as it is in excess of current foreseeable 'village needs'. Recently built 8 affordable housing units off Greenacres were not immediately taken up by Hutton residents and the Hutton Village Plan published in 2007 stated that whilst there is 'demand for a small scale sheltered housing scheme' there is a 'widespread resistance to further new development in the village' Vehicle access to the site is unsuitable for a large scale development: Anchor Drive is narrow and already congested with residential use and Liverpool Rd near to Hutton Grammar School is an existing safety and congestion black spot. Land is good agricultural and should be retained as such – currently used for grazing and hay production. Not in Local Service centre of Longton therefore should be eliminated under Core Strategy policy. Previous public enquiries have indicated that certain infrastructure conditions should be met before consideration of the development of this land</p>
422	<p>Objection It proved difficult at first to fill the affordable sheltered housing on this site. With regard to possible development in this area, development was proposed in the last two planning proposals for South Ribble areas. On both occasions the Inspector at the two planning inquiries (1980s? and 1997?) said the area should remain undeveloped. Nothing has changed.</p>
245	<p>step 1 Locating growth Nature of response:: Objection Comments:: Prefer to provide overall objections in line with your core strategies and will take each separately to keep this as clear as possible.</p> <p>Unsure how developing any open areas of Hutton will support the locating growth within this village. Also noted that Hutton is not specified within your target growth areas (unless this comes within Longton umbrella)</p> <p>Two key developments within the area are likely to have a negative impact on jobs/growth within the area, these being:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reduction in funds for public services and the likely impact on Lancashire Police HQ's over the 4 year plan 2. Rejection of the request to expand TEG within Hutton and the since withdrawal from the site. <p>Fully appreciate that private sector is predicted to replace jobs lost within the public sector but I fail to see where this private growth will be found within the small village of Hutton</p>
378	<p>Objection to Development of Site No SR212 Meadowview Close/Liverpool Road, Hutton Table 46 Local Needs in Villages – Further Affordable/Sheltered Housing</p> <p>Objection 1. There should be no access to site SR212 via Anchor Drive/Greenacres. 2. Any development of Site SR212 should be from Liverpool Road; subject to the requirements at 4.4.3.18, 4.4.3.20 of the Inspectors Report re the current South Ribble Borough Local Plan being met first. 3. The situation re adequate site drainage should first be ascertained. Supporting evidence 1. I object to the further development of the land site No SR 212, Meadowview Close/Liverpool Road, Schoolhouse Farm, Hutton, allocate din the current South Ribble Borough Plan for potential use for 'village needs'. In the proposals considered in late 1990, at the Public Inquiry conducted by Miss Rosamund Whittaker, relative to the current South Ribble Borough plan, was the development of the currently considered sites, SR 212 and SR 077, then described as School House Farm. This included some affordable/sheltered housing for the elderly. This use was supported by the Inspector in her report, subject to certain recommendations. These were accepted by, and the plan was adopted by, South Ribble Borough Council. This approval for development for local needs of the current area SR212, restricted the development of sheltered/affordable housing to a small area to the rear of Greenacres/Hall Croft/Hall Croft Head and Liverpool Road, until the requirements set out below were met. This development has taken place and now comprises the eight sheltered/affordable bungalows for the elderly of Hutton, known as 'Meadowview'. I believe that until such time that the conditions set out in the Inspectors Report into the South Ribble Borough council current Local Plan are carried out, I believe that no further development should take place on the site SR212. 2. Comments on Inspectors Report into South Ribble Borough Council 1990's Local Plan The Inspector recognised the difficulties accessing the site form Liverpool Road and Anchor Drive/Greenacres and stated: (i) Inspectors Report 4.4.3.20 'Of far greater concern is the serious congestion and hazards to road users which are daily occurrences during the school terms due to buses and cars stopping on the highway to load and off-load pupils attending the Grammar School Provision of these facilities is a pre-requisite of development of the allocation land if an unacceptable increase in congestion and hazards is to be avoided but no acceptable proposal for these facilities has been advanced'. Whilst 'no waiting' restrictions have been implemented during school arrival/departure times the situation on Liverpool Road, and surrounding streets, has worsened considerably over the intervening years. As a result of its extension building programme, and the sale of land previously used for parking, Hutton Grammar School has considerably reduced parking facilities available within the school grounds. (ii) Inspectors Report 4.4.3.23 'There is no reason to preclude the use of some of the land for a modest scale development which could include provision for affordable housing once facilities for loading and off-loading pupils at the Grammar School have been secured. The south-eastern part of the allocation land adjoining the consolidated development close to Anchor Drive would be appropriate for this purpose'. This has now bee developed as Meadow View sheltered/affordable bungalow complex. (iii) Inspectors Report 4.4.3.18 'A secondary access to the land might be formed using Anchor Drive and Greenacres, residential streets to the north-east of the</p>

Reference	Comments
	<p>allocation land; but because Anchor Drive is congested with parked cars, it would not be desirable to use this route except for emergency vehicles or to serve a much smaller development'. With the increase of vehicle ownership and the use of parents collecting pupils from the Grammar School, the parking situation on Anchor Drive has worsened. Entry from Liverpool Road, and access from Anchor Drive onto Liverpool Road, has become more difficult and hazardous. The refusal by Lancashire County Council to consider parking restrictions on the corner of the junction leaves residents, and the general public, exposed to unnecessary danger. 3. Development of Land The development of Meadow View eventually finished up totally different to that described in the planning application. The application referred to 'some infilling being required'. In reality the level of the site was raised by between 3 and 4 feet, to the detriment of existing adjacent existing properties. Further development adjacent to Meadow View would require considerable infilling and would be of further detriment to adjacent householders. 4. Drainage The drainage system installed for Meadow View is inadequate to cope with increased capacity. There is currently a recognised serious drainage problem on Liverpool Road which United Utilities and the Council have been trying unsuccessfully to remedy for a considerable time. The system is clearly overloaded and unable to cope with existing peak rainfall situations.</p>
128	<p>Support Comments:: PERFECT LOCATION FOR NEW DEVELOPMENT. PREVIOUSLY VERY LITTLE DEVELOPMENT HERE AND LITTLE PROBLEMS ARE LIKELY TO ARISE AS A RESULT OF DEVELOPMENT PROVIDING SUITABLE JUNSTION PUT IN ONTO LIVERPOOL ROAD OUTSIDE HUTTON GRAMMAR SCHOOL TO ALLOW SCHOOL AND THROUGH TRAFFIC TO FLOW WITH EASE. We are interested in YOUR comments. If you have further issues that we have not covered within the discussion paper, please give details below.: ANY DEVELOPMENTS IN LONGTON VILLAGE WOULD HAVE TO BE SUPPORTED WITH IMPROVED ROAD NETWORK, PARTICULARLY IN THE SCHOOL LANE/CHAPEL LANE AND LIVERPOOL ROAD CONFLUENCE IN VILLAGE CENTRE</p>
245	<p>Risk of flooding Nature of Response:: Objection Comments:: I understand that since the 8 bungalows have been built some properties on Greenacres have suffered from drainage issues, namely gardens flooding.</p> <p>Keen to understand what additional drainage would be built into the development site to ensure we did not suffer with any impact following any development.</p>
245	<p>Social Nature of response:: Objection Comments:: 1. We live in one of the 8 bungalows developed on Meadow View Close currently. These have been developed under the Socially Affordable Housing strategy for over 55's.</p> <p>We are delighted to live within such a superb area. The development is a quiet location, perfect for older people, with no families living within the cul de sac. Potential to have a detrimental social impact should a major development for familieis/younger people be constructed on this very quiet over 55 development site.</p> <p>2. Sustainability of local shops Only one convenience store in the village, previously expanded from newsagents to convenience store following the closure of the Post Office & Village Store during recent years. No empty premises to fill in Hutton village for any expansion of stores.</p>
406	<p>Objection Comments:: I would like to object to this area being used for development. I would like to see it be retained as valuable agricultural land which remains undeveloped and easily accessible for local dog walkers and families. I am not aware that any local needs have been identified that should give this land priority in South Ribble for development, thus loosing it as agricultural land.</p>
245	<p>Transport & access issues Nature of Response:: Objection Comments:: My husband and I live in one of the 8 bungalows within Meadow View Close.</p> <p>We have 2 cars for the property and can confirm the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Liverpool Road is highly congested currently, without building further houses off this main road. 2. Hutton Grammar School causes significant congestion during school opening and closing times. Pavements are congested whilst students wait for the buses and parents to collect them; resulting in passers by having to walk in the road to get past at key times. Anchor Drive & Liverpool Road heavily congested with parents dropping off and collecting children from the School, impacting access to these roads. We already avoid travelling at these key times; either by foot, public transport or by car. 3. Access to Meadow View Close is through Anchor Drive. This is a residential street with many cars parked on both sides of the street;(outside their own doors which is perfectly understandable as nowhere else to park). Our additional cars from the 8 bungalows has increased the passing traffic already and any further development would have a significant impact on this already very busy street. Considerations would need to be made as to another access point if development did go ahead as certainly not

Reference	Comments
	viable now.
589	This land is suitable for OAP sheltered housing and extend facility to local properties. Single storey only and centre to keep present nature of the area and would not overextend. Regular car use at peak times. Post Office Penwortham or Longton, GPs and chemists.
416	Suggestions for Changes The following site: SR212 should be allocated for extra care housing. This would represent the second phase of development in this are where bungalows for the elderly have already been built. These should be offered to local residents, it initially Hutton residents and subsequently to residents in the Western Parishes (which would release larger homes for resale). If there had to be any development on SR213 this should also be restricted to extra care housing.
245	Social Nature of response:: Objection Comments:: 1. We live in one of the 8 bungalows developed on Meadow View Close currently. These have been developed under the Socially Affordable Housing strategy for over 55's. We are delighted to live within such a superb area. The development is a quiet location, perfect for older people, with no families living within the cul de sac. Potential to have a detrimental social impact should a major development for familieis/younger people be constructed on this very quiet over 55 development site. 2. Sustainability of local shops Only one convenience store in the village, previously expanded from newsagents to convenience store following the closure of the Post Office & Village Store during recent years. No empty premises to fill in Hutton village for any expansion of stores.
245	SR212 - step 1 Locating growth Comments:: Prefer to provide overall objections in line with your core strategies and will take each separately to keep this as clear as possible. Unsure how developing any open areas of Hutton will support the locating growth within this village. Also noted that Hutton is not specified within your target growth areas (unless this comes within Longton umbrella) Two key developments within the area are likely to have a negative impact on jobs/growth within the area, these being: 1. Reduction in funds for public services and the likely impact on Lancashire Police HQ's over the 4 year plan 2. Rejection of the request to expand TEG within Hutton and the since withdrawal from the site. Fully appreciate that private sector is predicted to replace jobs lost within the public sector but I fail to see where this private growth will be found within the small village of Hutton
245	Transport & access issues Nature of Response:: Objection Comments:: My husband and I live in one of the 8 bungalows within Meadow View Close. We have 2 cars for the property and can confirm the following: 1. Liverpool Road is highly congested currently, without building further houses off this main road. 2. Hutton Grammar School causes significant congestion during school opening and closing times. Pavements are congested whilst students wait for the buses and parents to collect them; resulting in passers by having to walk in the road to get past at key times. Anchor Drive & Liverpool Road heavily congested with parents dropping off and collecting children from the School, impacting access to these roads. We already avoid travelling at these key times; either by foot, public transport or by car. 3. Access to Meadow View Close is through Anchor Drive. This is a residential street with many cars parked on both sides of the street;(outside their own doors which is perfectly understandable as nowhere else to park). Our additional cars from the 8 bungalows has increased the passing traffic already and any further development would have a significant impact on this already very busy street. Considerations would need to be made as to another access point if development did go ahead as certainly not viable now.
245	Objection Comments:: I understand that since the 8 bungalows have been built some properties on Greenacres have suffered from drainage issues, namely gardens flooding. Keen to understasnd what additional drainage would be built into the development site to ensure we did not suffer with any impact following any development.

Site SR213

Reference	Comments
529	Land off Marfield, Much Hoole I strongly oppose any building development of any nature on the above site for the following reasons:- - It would have a harmful and detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the area. - The land to the east of the site is open countryside mainly in agricultural use and any building would extend the urban encroachment into the green fields. This would form an unnatural intrusion into the adjoining open countryside. - Building development of any kind on the site would be conducive to further applications on the adjoining land which the local Council would find difficult to resist and may prejudice any decisions regarding the "filtered out" zones e.g. SR209 or SR205. - Any additional building development in this area could impact on the sewerage system resulting in the overloading of the sewerage treatment works.
65	Land off Marfield: I am opposed to any building development on the boundaries of Marfield for the following reasons:- To maintain our quality of Village life it is important to keep our current rural identity and protect the existing green belt boundaries. The fields adjacent to Marfield are full of wildlife including Bats, Owls and Woodpeckers ect. Any building development would disturb their habitats. A recent census in Hoole and Walmer Bridge showed that the majority of residents are are opposed to further

Reference	Comments
	village building development. The need for new homes should be concentrated on sites which do not impact on existing villages.
240	My husband and I are concerned that building upon the land off Marlfield has the potential to create congestion due to the size of the access road. In addition, it will also spoil the rural view we currently have, which was one of our key reasons for purchasing this house, and which we undoubtedly paid for within the value of the house. We are therefore concerned that further development has the potential to reduce the value of our home and the houses of our neighbours. In addition, we feel there are larger areas of land within the village itself rather than on its semi-rural outskirts which could be used for development. If considering 'local village need', we certainly do not feel any shops / libraries / doctors' surgeries are necessary in this location as these facilities are available only a short walking or driving distance away. The concerns listed above would remain, however, even if the proposals for development of the land were for housing, therefore we firmly object to any development in this area.
416	Suggestions for Changes Given that there are 4.63 hectares of land elsewhere in Much Hoole identified for 'village needs' and it would appear that there is no need for a GP surgery, no chance of a library being built in Much Hoole, and a significant range of shops within easy reach of the village (plus scope for further shops on the industrial etc site on the north side of the main Liverpool Road), this SR213 site should be left undeveloped, particularly in view of the very narrow and restricted access via Marlfield and the difficult exit out of Marlfield (corners to the right and left).
415	We are writing to you to express our concerns regarding the proposed land SR213 Marlfield for building. The land which our house is built on runs along side and has a joining fence line for about 40 metres with the proposed field our concerns are the field constantly floods and drains into our garden, the water can at times be upto a foot or more in depth and takes weeks for it to drain away, building on this land would only make it worse (I have enclosed some photos of this). One of our other concerns is that we already are forced to leave home upto an hour before we need to for work due to the fact of the bottle neck at Penwortham as everyone is trying to get through at the same time and more traffic if houses were built would exasperate the problem. Finally we would like to say that everyone on Longmeadow has paid a premium for the location and we strongly feel that farm land should stay as it is and that the council should be looking at neglected unused land for building.
268	The edge of Long Meadow and Old field start the run of the outer edge of the village and to encroach into the field woul destroy that and start devepoment that I Have no doubt would continue and spoil the separation between the villages either side of the A59
268	With reference to the land situated off Marlfield is accessed with a junction onto Liverpool Old Road at a point midway between two bends. The view when waiting to emerge from this junction is limited in both directions and further hazards are created by bus stops situated on either side of the road which again creates further hazards for vehicles waiting to emerge onto Liverpool Old Road and for persons wishing to cross the road after alighting from buses.
279	Re land adjacent to Long Meadow/Oldfield/Marlfield Little Hoole Firstly I am annoyed that I have not received any notification of any proposals in relation to the above site. I was informed today by a neighbour putting some info through my letter box also informing us we had until Jan 31st to respond. I strongly object to any proposals on this site mainly the extra volume of traffic of which the site would generate on an already very busy roundabout on the A59. The above field is subject to flooding which already affects my garden and I am concerned that more water will cause more flooding to my garden and those of my neighbours. I also believe local schools are full so where would the children be educated. Finally the extra volume of traffic would cause further traffic congestion in Penwortham. I hope my concerns are noted and will be notified accordingly

Site SR214

Reference	Comments
635	A major objection to this proposed development on the basis that, - The green belt needs protection - The development would be on the periphery of the village proper and far from shops, services etc. - Any persons using the site/development would need to arrive by car Long Moss Lane is already used as a shortcut to/from Gill Lane and could not cope or be dangerous with increased traffic. - Inadequate infrastructure e.g. water pressure is already inadequate at certain times of day.
349	GREENBELT LAND SHOULD NOT BE USED FOR DEVELOPMENT
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.

Reference	Comments
	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.
489	Long Moss Lane/Rear of Brookdale – Support/Suggestions for Changes 1. A proposed new surgery is needed – but access to it from this narrow, winding country lane would cause a hazard unless there are also plans to improve the road and include pavements. 2. This site is at the end of the village and there is no longer a bus service to this area, as the bus route was changed in 2009/10. 3. Proposals for sheltered accommodation on this site, although needed within the village, it is on the outskirts and elderly people would have a long walk to reach the nearest bus stop (see 2) and also the nearest shop selling general provisions, and the chemist is at the opposite end of the village.
698	(OBJECTION), GREENFIELD site for agricultural land.
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
702	Greenbelt land - agricultural land. Not for development!
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.
487	Suggestions for changes If land has to be developed, the existing residents should not suffer the consequences. Drainage, buses, doctors, dentists, this should be improved as part of the package. Every generation should be considered in the type of housing to be constructed. The accessibility to amenities without proper funds should be practically addressed.
330	I see that this land has also been allocated for houses. The land is not far from the plot SR045 and Long Moss Meadows. This will also have drainage problems. Traffic will be an increasing problems to walkers, cyclists & horses. This site like SR045 is not best for houses.
483	The above comments are also relevant to this site as well – New Longton is but a village not designed to cope with the amount of property people and cars that it has already had thrust upon it. The area floods in bad weather due to drainage which further building would only worsen and the lanes etc around this area simply cannot sustain any further vehicles in safety.
481	Objection/Suggestion for Changes You don't need any more houses. Long Moss Lane used to be a lovely quiet lane when I was a child. Safe to walk on that lane but not now. Cars speed along. Make it a recreational area for children on that side of the village. No wooded areas in this area of New Longton. Make it a habitat for wildlife.
479	The lack of adequate road capacity, drainage and public transport link make any further development on this site inappropriate until the necessary improvements are made. Road congestion in this area is already a problem, a danger to pedestrians – and to cyclists using a designated cycle route. It is essential that Green Belt is preserved.
478	The infrastructure of New Longton can not stand these suggested developments. The volume of traffic is horrendous.
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.
464	As far as I am aware this is a green field site and should not be developed. All the arguments put forward in respect of SR029 also apply to this site.
456	(OBJECTION), GREENFIELD site for agricultural land.
367	This is agricultural land in the green belt. This land must not be re-zoned for any type of development.
704	Agricultural greenbelt land - not for development use
661	As I understand it, this is agricultural land in green belt area. This land should not be developed on it is an area rich in wildlife which should not be disturbed and should certainly not be re zoned for any type of development.
667	It says in the planning leaflet that this land should be put back in greenbelt. This should be the case. The land is on moss and is very wet. Drainage in the area is a problem so is the sewer as this backs up when there is heavy rain. The road is very narrow and has traffic problems. Heavy farm machinery and through traffic- (on sat nav for

Reference	Comments
	Southport off M6) any new affordable housing should be integrated within the village- not a council estate stuck on the edge. There should be no building of any kind on this land. Reasons as above as land is in same area along long moss lane, Future developments, if possible should be on brown field sites.
590	This plot has the same problems as the above re access to Long Moss Lane or adding to the existing congestion at the cross roads at the bottom of Sheephill Lane. If the plans for this plot were for a select estate of only a few properties in keeping with adjacent area and enhancing the village, then this may have more support.
411	This site, together with SR045 is identified as set aside for village needs. I suggest these sites could be developed as allotments. Until this document was published I was unaware that these sites had been identified for village needs.
582	This area of New Longton is one of the few greenfield areas left in the village and it seems that Wainhomes will build anywhere they can to make money. Although this is at the opposite end of the village to where I live, I understand that this area is very prone to flooding due to the size of the main drainage pipes, which will not be increased, probably due to the amount of work involved. The whole thing is just a daft idea.
185	What is village needs? This is another housing development as recently achieved off Hugh Barn Lane with no enhancement to village, and in the greenbelt. We have no public transport link to the neighbouring village to speak of, our public services infrastructure must be overwhelmed and our traffic management is appalling and the roads are densely populated. We do not need further 4 bed detached housing infill developments which give no added value to the village.
632	I am not in favour of the development of this site. Long Moss Lane is hazardous, due to some motorists making full use of the de-restricted speed status (maximum 60mph) putting, horse riders and pedestrians at risk of accidents. Also can the present foul and surface water systems cope with any further development?
296	This site is shown for "local needs in villages". It is too far on the edge of the village to fulfil much of a need. The same comments apply regarding transport as for SR045. We are interested in YOUR comments. If you have further issues that we have not covered within the discussion paper, please give details below.: We have suffered a significant decrease in public transport in the New Longton area in recent years. This has actually put cars back on the road when we should be looking to taking them off so a serious fresh look at the provision of reasonably priced public transport is needed, to address the needs of present local development as well as any future one.
212	It is my understanding that the area SR214 is designated as Greenbelt and, therefore, should not be built upon. Furthermore, this farming community is already suffering from the emissions of the increasing number of vehicles that use Long Moss Lane, Sheep Hill Lane and the village of New Longton as a shortcut. Like many of the existing residents, I am concerned for my own children and the other children in the village with the amount of traffic and disregard for the speed restrictions. Adding houses would just increase the number of vehicles. The local wildlife would suffer. For example, the bats and owl which frequent the area. This is one of the attractive features of the village. The School, Doctors and very limited local amenities are already oversubscribed and simply could not accommodate more people. The existing properties within the area do not appear to be saleable so I don't see why adding more properties and more "For Sale" signs would help - whatever the value/size of the properties. To my mind, this would not be in keeping with the "local needs" of this village and alternative sites should be sought with the capacity and need for such developments.
435	The 'isolated' siting of 'Affordable Housing' in a village with few facilities to cater for the needs, is ideal if you wish to add to the already present social problems within the existing 'affordable housing' area adjacent these suggested enhanced sites.
679	I do not support any of the planning suggestions Traffic The volume of traffic going through New Longton many of them are long wagons. Our estate on the opposite side of the road to the post office, paper shop etc. We put our life in our hands when we go if for our pension etc and to catch a bus. There are three roads to look at station Road, Royalty Lane and Chapel Lane. Chapel Lane is a bend so is a bleed shot for us, avoid the speed of the traffic is horrendous. We need a zebra Crossing and police Camera. The infrastructure in New Longton is not good enough to take more houses the drains etc. The schools will be overcrowded also the doctors will be over subscribed. All in all we should not be subjected to more agro it is steadily getting worse.
636	Objection.
33	Object. Agricultural land.
327	Houses on this site are just as unsuitable as site SR045 and drainage is still a problem. Why do you think this is a field this is because it was meant to be kept that way
168	OBJECTION), GREENFIELD site for 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.

Reference	Comments
569	All my objections to more housing are traffic on narrow lanes with no speed limit. Poor drainage, we are only just above sea level. We would become a flood plain. There are not enough schools etc to support more housing.

Site SR217

Reference	Comments
273	This area already has been substantially developed with housing over the past 20 years. Any access onto Liverpool Rd would be via already heavily used junctions. creation of new outlets onto the Liverpool Rd would lead to further congestion. Further substantial housing development in the village would destroy the village community and turn Longton into an urban sprawl of housing ghettos. Destruction of land would be irreversible and wildlife and flora would be lost. There are many other sites available in South Ribble which would not lead to destruction of a community-Longton appears to have been earmarked for development. It does have facilities but only for the community it supports and the local community value the benefits of living in a village -quality of life, health and well being. Congestion through to Preston is already horrendous and any improvements to the infrastructure will only improve the present situation -there is a limit to what can be done
272	Greenbelt land should not be used for development. traffic congestion will be made worse , it currently takes my wife 30 minutes to travel 5 miles to work now. we are currently starting a family and moved to this area because of the schooling , we understand that the schools in the immediate area are fully subscribed every year , any development will make this situation worse or even impossible. We moved to longton nearly 10 years ago , we chose longton because of the village atmosphere and wanted to move from any heavily built up areas. We have worked our whole lives so far and saved up so that we could benefit from living in a semi rural area. We walk down back lane and regularly cycle down the dirt path from back lane , i use this area to run and keep fit and breath in fresh air and enjoy the environment. All this will be undermined if any development takes place. I want to bring my children into an area where they can be encouraged to play in fields where they can enjoy the wildlife and just muck about, without the dangers of heavily populated roads. This is why i chose the area we did 10 years ago. >Back lane and marsh lane cannot carry any more traffic than it already does without serious detriment to the surrounding houses and pedestrians.