

Submission to planning Appeal.

Firstly, I wanted to clarify the situation regarding the matter of the Chainhouse Lane decision in Farington in South Ribble Borough Council area, which has been mentioned several times today during the course of the enquiry. My understanding is that Wainhomes challenged only one aspect of the planning inspector's decision, which was upheld by the judge when this case was heard in the high court. The site in question is actually "safeguarded land" until 2026 when the Local Plan for SRBC will be reviewed. Wainhomes submitted another planning application for the same site Greenfield site a few months ago and it was refused by the planning committee at that time. It would therefore be inaccurate to say that the planning inspector's decision was "quashed" because it is only one aspect of the original decision which was challenged.

Secondly, the importance of the question of Air Quality has recently been highlighted the successful conclusion of the campaign by Rosamond Roberts following the tragic death of her daughter Ella, who tragically died of a series of severe asthmatic attacks in 2013 linked to high levels of pollution caused by traffic emissions. Rosamond is now a world health organisation advocate for health and air quality. In my local area Authority, there are 32 equality monitoring stations across the borough, mostly in urban areas. However a parish council has requested one to be set up in a village where HGV vehicles are using roads in the village in order to take a shortcut to access the motorway. In the case of this planning application of 131 proposed dwellings, there would be a heavy burden of vehicles generated using local roads, as a result of it, irrespective of whether they would be diesel/petrol or electric. Particulate matter from electric vehicles is highly polluting with strong links to cardiopulmonary toxicity. It is clear that what is required to maintain good air quality and prevent pollution is better and more frequent public transport and fewer cars in general.

I understand that there is a limited bus service, namely one per hour, to and from Preston on Garstang Road, so public transport is inadequate.

Thirdly, light pollution caused mainly by excessive street lighting is a serious issue which contributes to climate change. The proposed development (reserved matters usually follows planning permission for access only) would generate artificial lighting within it which would have an adverse impact on Bat habitats, their flight paths and foraging routes. The proposed site is a farm in the middle of open countryside.

Fourthly, the value of trees in absorbing CO<sub>2</sub> while removing and storing carbon, whilst releasing O<sub>2</sub> back into the atmosphere cannot be underestimated. Trees also refresh the air by absorbing noxious odours and pollutant gases. Tree coverage has declined in this country overall, therefore so has shade from trees in urban areas in particular. Tree roots absorb excessive rain water, holding soil in place and preventing flooding. It is deeply regrettable that so-called 'clearance' prior to starting to build a development includes unnecessary destruction of trees, thereby depriving any development of these and other advantages which existing trees provide and creating problems related to flooding which were not there previously.

Fifthly, 'Net gain' for Nature is part of the NPPF's definition of what constitutes sustainable development, so it is difficult to ascertain how this can be achieved prior to development on any Greenfield site when hedges and trees are destroyed, which are home to many Wildlife species.

Also, the number of dwellings (131) proposed on this site is excessive and will lead to an over-intensive development which will resemble a concrete jungle. This would be quite unacceptable in a rural area and wholly out of keeping with the local area in terms of numbers of dwellings clustered so closely together. There is no indication of the type of dwellings that would be the end product of this proposed planning application for access only.

In conclusion, according to the NPPF, priority land for development is Brownfield or previously developed land, whereas this is a Greenfield site. Moreover in my opinion, the planning application does not comply with 'net gain' requirements for Biodiversity and Ecology and also Air quality and environmental pollution. The proposed development is very similar to those built in recent years and currently in the process of being built, without any innovative ideas that would include measures to combat climate change in this 21st century.

Yours sincerely  
Susan Fox (Ms)