

'Long res 1'

Philip Dagnall

From:

Sent:

To:

Subject:

publicationreg19
HED DPD

To whom it may concern,

I am taking the time to contact you today to raise objections to the 'HED DPD' specifically around housing & business development in Longridge.

Firstly, from the outset the plan has been quite difficult to find, read & digest. Although I appreciate that this plan is drawn-up to a set standard, the format would be confusing to many people reading & possibly off-putting. In particular the 'Proposals Map' is very poor, displaying 'hatching' not present on the 'Key'. The fact that the reader has to hunt for information brings into question the 'positively prepared' test for soundness.

With respect to 'consistent with national policy', the housing allocation granted is not sustainable or affordable for local people. Developments previously approved are not a viable prospect at £180,000 to £350,000 ('Tootle Green', Longridge). Building houses to fill a quota, rather the local need is unethical & foolhardy. I personally am on the 'Affordable Housing' register & am (as yet) to receive anything from the council about homes for people priced out of the market in Longridge.

Concerning traveller sites, I could not find any definition as to where these would be located therefore breaching the 'positively prepared' element.

With respect to 'justified', the roadways & impact to residents is ill-considered. The roads are in an atrocious state, totally unsuitable to those without a 4x4. To plan to increase the 'load' on what still is a small town's infrastructure is ridiculous, especially when traffic surveys have been carried out some way away from proposed developments. Further, roadwork's have been the blight of many a residents day since the mass housing-building began. There is not a week that goes by without 'Blackburn Road', 'Dilworth Lane' or 'Preston Road' being 'dug-up' by some contractor. Also, no consideration has been made to the impact to surrounding towns & villages of Longridge where the increase in traffic will make a bad situation even worse. This breaches the 'positively prepared' element.

I feel that the proposed industrial development in Hothersall was quite deceptively discounted from the Longridge 'Proposals Map' (despite being just on the boundary) given that it impacts Longridge entirely. Also, referring to the development as 'Higher College', whilst accurate, caused me to 'google' the location as I had no idea where it was. This development breaches the 'justified' element as more suitable sites are vacant around 'Bluebell Way' in Preston next to junction '31A' of the 'M6'.

Further to the point above, cross-boundary development is not referred to at all. The 2 Whittingham 'Taylor Wimpey' sites approved by PCC will utilise Longridge facilities but there impact has not been considered. Neither is a small development & as such contravenes the 'effective' element.

The plan makes reference to the building of industrial sites (3 in total). The largest of which is the 'Enterprise Zone' at Samlesbury, a development with which I am familiar. It looks to be that the plan is based around particularly this site employing a significant number of people in well paid jobs to justify the creation of £180,000+ homes. As yet only 1 unit has been built, employing a number of people on zero hours / low pay. The council is gambling on the success of the F-35 programme, which may well be reconsidered given a general election is less than a month away. As such this breaches the 'positively prepared' element.

Regards,

