

Philip Dagnall

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 30 August 2018 12:48
To: pmods22
Subject: HED DPD main modifications consultation - response comment

MM 108

Dear sirs

Comments regarding Site 24 – site at Haugh Head, Whins Lane, Simonstone (MM5)

I wish to make consultation comments regarding the proposed HED DPD modification to include the above site for development in the Strategic Plan, as follows :

My details

Name
Address
E mail
Phone

[REDACTED]

Comments

Should the site be duly included as development land in the Local Plan I (and many others) would be personally adversely affected by its development.

Whilst I would personally suffer adverse effects I make the following comments purely objectively, taking in to account my previous 40 plus years practice as a qualified Chartered Surveyor MRICS (I retired a few years ago from the Public Service).

My comments :

1. The site sits and would fully fit between the established Woodfields housing development and the recent Meadow View development (the latter including some low cost housing). Both those developed sites were built upon previously developed lands and hence their developments did not extend the boundaries of the Read/Simonstone Village development area as determined in the Local Plan. The site 24 land would extend the development area outside of the currently designated Village boundaries. The problem with this is that the resultant merger/linking of 3 residential sites is creating an extension of ribbon development in to the open countryside which would adversely affect the rural and open aspects of the village which the current Local Plan protects.
2. Across the site is a very important and well used public footpath which serves the footpath route/s than run along the South side of the existing Whins Lane houses. This footpath network also connects with the longer public footpath route that commences on its Eastern end on Trapp Lane, just below Law Farm. If development of the site results in a removal of the public footpath across the subject land or alternatively relocating its route to a somewhat unsatisfactory alternative then this footpath network will cease to become used on account of impracticality and a very popular walking amenity for local residents, including dog walkers, will be lost.
3. Following on from the above comment an additional footpath route crosses the site from its Whins Lane entry point to Simonstone Tennis Club. This route is regularly used by local residents going to the Club for tennis recreation, as the alternative way to get to the Club is very much "round the houses" and likely to necessitate driving there. Clearly, this would be an adverse consequence of a site development.
4. Traffic on Whins Lane – the relevant Authorities will know that Whins Lane, being a formerly quiet and narrow rural road with limited residential frontage development, already suffers from excess traffic problems which have become worse since additional housing has been allowed within the Village

boundaries. It ought to be considered whether a new development of 20 houses on the subject site is a final step too far as regards adverse traffic impact upon the Lane from the site location up to the Trapp Lane crossroads to the East of the location. The Lane is very regularly used by many walkers, cyclists, and horse riders, which should warrant an important safety consideration here.

5. Finally, although admittedly a point more appropriate a bit further down the line should the site be approved for development plan inclusion, I can echo the views of many in saying that any new development which is anything like the approved and developed Meadow View site would be very much inappropriate on Planning grounds. This is because that development is simply an eyesore on account of it not being appropriate in meeting the key principle of good Town and Country planning of being compatible with the nature, vernacular styles, etc of the other existing developments. In my view it has failed this principle on account of plot density, plot layout, ill matching building materials, and poor building design styles.

Further participation

Information as requested in the alternative proforma response form :

- I do not wish to participate at the Inspectors oral examination
- I would like to be kept informed of the HED DPD progress including being advised of the Inspectors Report following the Examination, also of when there has been a formal adoption of the HED DPD.

Yours faithfully



Date of comment completion – 30th August 2018

Note: could you please acknowledge your receipt of this response. Thank you.