

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 05 September 2018 21:23
To: pmods22
Subject: HED DPD Submission Regulation 22 (Haugh Head site Whins Lane)

For the attention of HED DPD submission,

Below are comments on the proposed inclusion of site 24 Haugh Head, Whins lane, Simonstone.

All comments are associated with Ribble Valley council's planning policy.

1. The site is outside the settlement boundary as defined on the proposals map (Inset 21) General policy G 3 3.2.11 cites "within the villages of Mellor Brook, Read and Simonstone planning permission will be granted only for development within the settlement boundary."

3.2.13 states "It should be stressed that any development considered must lie within the settlement boundary shown on the map (inset 21)."

2. Green belt and loss of agricultural usage.

Policy ENV 4 states that permission will not be given for the erection of new buildings other than for the purposes of agriculture forestry, essential facilities for outdoor sports etc.

The site is on Green belt agricultural land and part of the historic Huntroyde Estate.

Policy H 2 5.2 1 cites that outside the settlement boundary only development that is essential for agriculture or forestry etc.

H2 5.5.2 and 5.5.3

3. H2 5.2

Another nearby development Meadow view (within 20 feet of the proposed site but not on green belt land) has been under construction since 2014, it is still not complete and all properties including social housing are not yet sold. This indicates no demand exists for housing in this area, or no proven local need.

.Policy G8 3.4.2

C) prevent the intrusion of noise into residential areas.

Surrounding areas have already been subjected to construction noise from previous site since 2014.

5. Traffic Policy T2 8.3.1 and general policy G1 3.1.2 b.

Development on the site would lead to increased traffic volume as the site is not on a bus route, outside the range stated for access to amenities and also on a very dangerous bend. It also states that "development should be located in areas which maintain and improve choice for people to walk, cycle or use public transportation rather than drive " this would not be the case due to the reasons stated above.

Additionally, a large plant equipment transporter which was used in the Meadow View building also caused a large sinkhole on Whins Lane in 2015 which added additional cost to the highways authorities. The lane that adjoins the site is narrow and accessibility will be a huge issue, which will cause further disruption.

6. Moreover, permission for development has been refused at more accessible and sustainable sites (eg, Hammond Field) nearer to the bus routes and village which makes the choice of Site 24 less likely to fit any of the planning criteria. (Planning policy G9)

7. Policy G1 3.1.2 k) and policy G7 protection from flooding "Development should not require culverting, artificial channelling etc."

The site is susceptible to flooding and the water table rises above the field in periods of heavy rain causing the field to flood.

I hope that these comments will be forwarded to the Inspector and considered by the council as legitimate reasons why the site should not be included in the plan.

Yours sincerely,



Simonstone