
From: hilary robertson [mailto:]
Sent: 01- Apr- 11 14:45
To: Development Plans
Subject: Heversham and Leasgill

Dear Sir

Heversham and Leasgill Development Plan - Map 23

As a general point, it is unclear to the residents of the village exactly why we need to be building in such great numbers that will overwhelm the existing communities and irrevocably change the nature of the village. The need for such expansion does not exist within the local area where we know that 16 families are looking for new housing, this would be proportionate and easily absorbed into the present village. Therefore **the scale of the development proposed needs to be seriously questioned.**

Low cost housing, although desirable for our local families and existing residents is not welcome for anyone being attracted into the area simply for the housing. The reasons for this attitude are that we have no sources of local employment, no services or facilities within the village, and all needs have to be met by driving to towns further afield. Heversham is a dormitory village, as such I believe it is **unsuitable for creating housing for people who have no transport and no jobs.**

The consultation process leading to the recommendations by the Parish Council is flawed in that the Parish Council can be strongly influenced by those with position and power in the community. Only a minority of the PC live within the village and have personal experience to draw on. As a result I have comments to make regarding the site of immediate interest to me - RN118 off Dugg Hill and Park House Drive (where I live), and also on other sites which were discussed. I will deal with the latter first:

R41 - this is directly in front of the large houses of those most opposed to changes to their country views. They have all built extended conservatories in their back gardens which can be viewed from the main A6, this is the view of the conservation area from the A6 which they wish to retain. The access to the site from the lane is not directly onto the A6 and therefore not as dangerous as stated, there could also possibly be an alternative access further down the Heversham village road from opposite the tennis courts.

R445 - the school car park. I think that loss of this open space at the entrance to the village would lead to a cluttered over-developed appearance, it should be left as green space. I am also very concerned that the school wish to use the only remaining green space within their boundaries for the new car park. The children in the boarding houses play here almost constantly of an evening - football and other games, where else will they go? The school wishes to continue expanding their boarding facility - there must be places for these young people to expend all their energy within the boundaries or at least within a very short distance, so much more thought must be given to green space and

outdoor facilities for 30 - 100 young people resident during a majority of the year. It is just a money-making opportunity to dispense with the car park and gives us another, much harder, problem to solve if noise and disturbance escalates. This urgent question must be addressed.

RN 118 - The field to the east of Park House Drive.

I am strongly opposed to development of this field - it has been rejected at previous meetings and should be again.

1. The people who currently live here came because of the **peace and quiet**. It is tranquil of an evening, there is no passing traffic.
2. With **no passing traffic** it is a very **safe environment** for the elderly and children. People exercise here to recuperate from hip replacements, and children come to practice on their first cycles with their parents.
3. **Neighbourhood watch** and the fact that no-one comes here unless they are visiting and usually known to us, means that we have very low crime and nuisance, the existence of a greater estate will detract from our knowledge of security.
4. **Parking** is limited due to the original design of the houses and gardens which we are prevented from changing due to our Deeds. Therefore extra parking for family members (beyond the one car in the drive) has to be half on the pavement to allow a single carriageway down the centre of the road. This is a narrow estate road, not designed for parking and through traffic.
5. These same restrictions in the **Deeds** should be applied to any new development too, otherwise the new houses will be able to completely ignore all of the framework which has built up our peaceful estate.
6. **Sightlines** - due to the bends in the road access there are very bad sightlines for traffic entering both Dugg Hill and particularly leaving Park House Drive. These bends are narrow and cause congestion if more than one vehicle is on the road.
7. Park House Drive is currently a **dead end with a turning space**. There should be **no circular route** made through to another estate, it would create an immense amount of passing traffic and disturbance. Additionally, the turning space is required by the bin lorry and visitors, especially during the winter when snowfall precludes access to the rest of the road.
8. **Winter pressures** on the road during icy and snowy spells are extreme. The bottom of **Dugg Hill is very steep, it is not gritted** and nor is the road through the village. It is sometimes impossible to drive up the hill and cars have to be left at the bottom - sometimes in the school car park (as a safe, accessible place overnight) or along the road. Residents have to salt and scrape the road themselves to gain access, work days have been lost through dangerous road surfaces causing impossible conditions on Dugg Hill. Extra traffic would be asking for accidents as cars have to slide down the hill onto the road without touching the brakes.
9. **Roadside drains**. These are inadequate and badly placed for large amounts of run-off from an extended tarmaced area. This winter the snow built up in the field and when thawing it made a pond which started a fast-flowing stream rushing past No 4 and down into the road in front of No 3. This was only just coped with by the drains which are shallow.

10. **Sewers. This is the most important current problem.** The sewer system was laid without adequate run on it from north to south along Park House Drive, they also do not run as shown on the plans previously held by SLDC. Over the years that I have been here the sewers have blocked up at approximately 2 year intervals and have had to be flushed out. SLDC has now handed over control of this to United Utilities, who do not have any responsibility for how the original pipes were laid, although they have been helpful. The fact remains, there is a problem with the route of these sewers, they are not up to required standards for the present houses, and they would most certainly not be able to cope with any additional houses' requirements. Any development that does not take this into consideration and either re-route the sewers or create new ones would be irresponsible.

Finally, I urge you to reconsider whether there is a real and justifiable need to materially alter the character of a peaceful village in the interests of increasing populations building up in urban areas of Britain.

Thank you

Your sincerely
Hilary M Robertson

This email has been scanned by the MessageLabs Email Security System.
For more information please visit <http://www.messagelabs.com/email>
