

CHAPTER D-POLICY D1-SITE N, LIVERPOOL ROAD, HUTTON

1) I am now unfortunately unable to attend the hearing. I am therefore submitting a written amplification and expansion of my previous representation to substantiate why I consider the above policy to be unsound as currently proposed.

2) Para 3.6 of the Site Allocations document makes it clear that Hutton falls into the category of "Other Places" where "development will be confined to small scale infill, conversion of rural buildings and proposals to meet local need". The Council argue that there is a case for going back to the earlier Core Strategy and relying on the inclusion of the word "exceptional" at that stage. The exceptional features are considered to be the dubious benefits of the provision of as-yet undefined parking provision and the fact that the land is safeguarded in the current Local Plan -NB, only where there is a compelling local need justification.. Both of these facts were known to the Council when producing the Site Allocation document. If there were exceptional circumstances or a special case they should have been included and justified within the Site Allocations document. Speaking as a former senior highway engineer I would argue that the inclusion of some parking could potentially add to problems because of increased turning movements outside the school and increased hazards for vulnerable pedestrians. It is difficult to see how public parking would sit alongside and as part of a private housing development. Encouragement for parents to bring and collect pupils by car is in conflict with sustainability aims.

3) I would argue that the site is neither infill nor small scale. The site is bounded to the west and north by fields and the proposed development will represent a significant backland incursion into these green areas. Hutton has in the region of 1000 dwellings over a wide, generally rural area. What could loosely be described as the core of the village is situated on or off Liverpool Road and probably accounts for around two thirds of dwellings. The proposed development could amount to around a 7% increase in this core area, which is not what I would describe as small. It should be noted that both existing small estates off Liverpool Road are almost wholly single storey. Developer pressure and the desire to maximise profit is likely to lead to a development of executive houses creating an unsustainable car-based commuter enclave adding little to the viability of the village. It is pertinent that there is no direct bus service between Hutton and Leyland. The Hutton Post office and village store closed some years ago.

4) I am not opposed to development on the site per se. I do however consider that such development needs to be in conformity with the vision of the Site Allocations at para 3.6, which would also accord with the views of residents expressed in the Village Plan. The Borough Council could meet this objective by reducing the size of the "infill" site and by reducing the number of dwellings and ensuring that they meet identified local needs. The Borough Council is currently considering a proposal elsewhere in the village for 15 houses on a windfall, brownfield site. This could partly meet the perceived need for extra housing in the village

5) The Borough Council have identified the need to address congestion outside the school. I consider it equally important to highlight potential drainage issues at this stage. This would be consistent with advice at other sites. There are drainage problems in the village known to the Borough Council. The Highway Authority have discovered that highway drainage runs under the gardens of properties on Liverpool Road and elsewhere, and that this outfall is blocked or partly blocked in at least 3 locations. United Utilities regularly carry out camera surveys and clear their outfall pipes within Liverpool Road. United Utilities originally objected to the small development of 8 low cost bungalows at the western end of Site N because of capacity problems. In order to overcome this objection the site was raised by up to 1.5 metres at its south-eastern corner and a long surface water outfall pipe with minimal fall was put in across the fields to the north. The raising of the ground level was not part of the planning application and residents were never consulted. If potential drainage and ground level issues were highlighted now in the site description it would be consistent with the approach on other sites and provide a more sound basis for dealing with the future planning of the site.