

FAO: Mr Tony Blackburn
Local Plan Programme Officer,

25 August 2019

Dear Mr Blackburn,

I am unable to attend the hearings. However, please find below my response to the Inspectors MIQs for consideration by the Inspector's at the hearings. I have also posted three paper copies of this letter as requested.

MATTER 9 – H5 – SWINSHAW HALL, LOVECLOUGH – PAGE 14 i) to iv)

Effect of the proposed allocation on residents / site suitability:

Goodshaw Lane is a single-track lane, which is totally unsuitable for extra traffic. Site access is poor and unsafe.

Large-scale development in the area would exacerbate travel problems: As a resident who works in Manchester there are already considerable issues with commuting. The Rossendale infrastructure delivery document has no realistic options or funds to improve congestion towards Manchester with the geography of the area preventing any upgrading or expansion of the A682. There are no practical alternatives for residents to use public transport with no rail network and the X43 bus from Loveclough gets caught in the same traffic.

The timing of the traffic assessments and review by the Inspectors is also key. During the school summer holidays traffic is significantly lighter and therefore the Inspectors would not have been afforded full visibility of the issues. During the winter months my commute can double, frequently taking close to 2hrs for a 20-mile journey from Loveclough to the centre of Manchester.

Development at site H5 Swinshaw Hall, in conjunction with the other sites proposed at H4, H6, H7, H13 and H17, within the small village of Loveclough would be destructive to the character and nature of the area. Developing site H5 would lead to the loss of a well used and loved open green space amenity for residents.

Site H5 also raises other significant infrastructure issues, e.g. availability of doctors, dentists, hospitals and school places. Crawshawbooth primary is already oversubscribed. In 2017 a number of children from the village were allocated places in central Rawtenstall and Burnley as the village primary school did not have the capacity to cope with demand from existing residents. This was even after the school / Council had imposed a geographical priority area for the school due to high demand. Traffic and congestion around the school, due to the lack of parking / size of the school, at the start and end of the day is already dangerous for the children.

In severe weather Burnley Road already floods next to the proposed site with large volumes of water coming off the fields at site H5. Development and concreting over of the area would only exacerbate this issue.

If site H5 is to remain in the plan after addressing these legitimate objections then I would ask

that the Inspectors consider modifications to the plan to reduce the impact on existing residents as follows:

1. Site H5 should include development in keeping with the surrounding buildings, e.g. single storey bungalows to be located near Hameldon Road in line with those backing onto the site.
2. The site plan should included suitable screening and distancing/green areas between existing and proposed developments, i.e. provision of a buffer zone.
3. Restrictions to be placed upon the hours of construction for the consideration of existing residents.
4. Developers to fund a comprehensive junior playground at Loveclough park for the benefit of local children.

Yours sincerely,

Sally Dewhurst