

## Joanne Macholc

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 08 August 2017 12:21  
**To:** Sub22 Consultation  
**Subject:** HED DPD

To whom it may concern,

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

All the points in my original email dated 23/05/2107 objecting to '19' still stand, however I feel that the below 3 points need further emphasis;

- The Longridge boundary has been moved away from the 'Tootle Green' development further into Hothersall. Whilst this is now accurately documented in the HED DPD, I don't remember seeing any consultation on the matter from the council. A cynical person may say that this 'move' was to allow the proposed development for industrial & warehouse units at 'Higher College' to be granted, given that there has been significant objection by the people of Hothersall. A really cynical person would say that the planning was going to be passed regardless of what local people think, given that new street lighting has recently been erected adjacent to the site & national speed limit signs not reinstated (given that the council never saw the need to before).
- Traveller sites are still not defined in any way as to where these would be located therefore breaching the 'positively prepared' element. Anyone would think that the council was being secretive around the proposed sites.
- Yet more houses are proposed 'West of Preston Road'. Given that there has been a recent fatality in the area, the council & highways agency have an obligation & 'duty of care' to not make the situation worse. I know that the council will 'hide behind' the 'National Policy' argument, but building houses to fill a quota, rather the local need is unethical & foolhardy. The only 'saving grace' for myself, is that fortunately I have never been in a position to buy a property in Longridge, so as the area is ruined by overdevelopment, I can move away.

Further, with respect to the 'SA';

- No reference has been made to the significant local objection or impact to previously authorised development.
- This document defines 'Sustainable Development' as "...basic needs & enjoy a better quality of life...". Currently driving in Longridge is a pain to say the very least, with roadworks 'springing up' without warning. Whilst we are told this is 'short term pain', current residents are not the ones going to benefit – nor has any compensation been offered for the disruption. I feel the council has 'rose tinted' glasses, dreaming of the masses of council tax it can cream off these new 4/5/6 bedroom detached homes.
- No reference is made to any **boundary developments** such as those in Whittingham. These will increase demand on services with the council not benefitting from any council tax being generated.
- Apparently the economy is performing well according to this document. If you classify banks closing down, multiple charity shops & the abundance of takeaways in Longridge as performing well then maybe – I however do **not**.
- If, as this document states, Longridge has an aging population, why are retirement villages & bungalows only a **fraction** of the new builds being granted planning permission?
- There is no 'Affordable Housing' in Longridge. I've been looking for circa 10 years but nothing has ever materialised. This is the kind of development that would be welcomed, however the needs of current residents are consistently overlooked by the council.
- With respect to the proposed 'Higher College' development;

- I take umbrage with the term 'could' being used. It would increase traffic, would have a negative effect on the local landscape & would increase the scale of pollution from (but not limited to) cars & trucks.
- What businesses are likely to be based here? The terminology suggests that the industry here would keep local talent. If it's anything like the 'Enterprise Zone' at Samlesbury, the jobs on offer will not be highly paid.
- The reference to a potential increase in crime is concerning, especially given that the local police station was closed down some time ago now, causing a reduction in effective policing in the area.
- The reference to the potential for pollution is again concerning given the sites proximity to a reservoir. Again, what exact businesses are proposed to be based at the site for this to be deemed a risk?
- Traffic is currently very bad in that area due to the seemingly endless 'Tootle Green' roadworks. Any further approved development will only make the situation worse.
- Any development will increase demand on services in Longridge as a whole.
- In short, this development is not appropriate for this location, as more suitable sites are vacant around 'Bluebell Way' in Preston next to junction '31A' of the 'M6'.

Regards,

[REDACTED]

\*\*\*\*\*

This email and any attachments are confidential to the intended recipient and may also be privileged. If you are not the intended recipient please delete it from your system and notify the sender. You should not copy it or use it for any purpose nor disclose or distribute its contents to any other person.

\*\*\*\*\*