

Chief Planning Officer  
Forward Planning Dept  
RVBC Council Offices  
Clitheroe  
BB7 2RA

06/06/2017

RVBC Forward Planning Re: - Site 10 Employment land at Higher College Farm, Hothersall. (Mark Hurst) EAL3  
Regulation 19. 'HED DPD PUBLICATION CONSULTATION'

I object to the proposed development of Employment Site 10. As a former resident of Hothersall temporarily residing in London I have the pleasure of returning regularly, I am keen on outdoor activities, particularly road cycling & I am still a member of the Spade Mill Angling club on the nearby designated 'Biological Heritage Reservoirs'.

*According to 'Local Plans' (LNDP); "careful consideration by planners to stipulate any development to be sensitive to the environment, encourage biodiversity & take steps to enhance the heritage & overall rural aspect is paramount to any planning decision".*

The area is surrounded by a number of 'Local Heritage Assets' & 'Biological Heritage' sites. The area is popular for locals, visitors & tourists to the Ribble Valley for recreation. Building here would diminish open views in particular from the AONB and the popular public footpath leading to the protected College Wood, Tan Yard Lane Bridleway & new 'Longridge Loop' cycle path which run alongside the boundary of the site.

Site access is located on a busy narrow minor road, as a cyclist I am unhappy at the prospect of heavier traffic including the inherent danger from HGV's, & other Goods vehicles, I could stay in London to cycle if I wanted to endure weaving in & out of heavy traffic. The site access is virtually opposite the new 'Longridge Loop' on Tan Yard. It seems a very poorly thought out location when more suitable sites are available away from more rural sensitive environments. The local 'Core Strategy' promotes the A59 corridor as THE area to be developed for industry in the Ribble Valley and

I draw your attention in particular to Policy DMG1 General Considerations-Regarding site Access:

- 1. Consider Traffic Implications.*
- 2. ENSURE SAFE ACCESS CAN BE PROVIDED Which is suitable to accommodate the scale and type of traffic likely to be generated.*
- 3. Consider the protection of Public rights of Way.*
- 4. The proposals should be well related to the existing highway network and should not generate additional Traffic movements of a scale likely to cause undue problems or disturbance.*

In essence as a former resident & now regular 'Tourist' of the area I am avidly opposed to the proposal which has no mitigation or provision for protection of protected sites and in particular the ill-advised location of the site due to inadequate road infrastructure, causing an inherent danger for cyclist, pedestrian and equestrian road users. I urge RVBC planners to think again!

Regards,

[Redacted Signature]