

This is an entirely inappropriate development based on multiple factors as outlined below:

Location:

The site occupies a valuable parcel of open green space in a location and town where this is rapidly diminishing. It also sits yards from where a much larger development of new homes are in development on Westgate occupying a former brownfield site, there is therefore no demonstrable need/demand for more housing (including no 'affordable housing') in such close proximity. The geography of this site including gradient, access points, drainage, former mine workings and proximity to the listed Lower Blacup Farm, all appear to be ignored or inadequately addressed by the developer but would impact hugely on local stakeholders.

Natural Environment:

In spring and summer the current site/fields are a blooming wild meadow of multiple plant and insect life, as well as being permanent residence to many small mammals and birds, which contribute hugely to both natural ecosystem and human well-being. Why, in an era of combating climate change, encouraging habitat conservation and limiting carbon emissions, would such a greenfield site, be considered acceptable to concrete over for mainly larger houses with inevitably multiple car occupancy households? The fields also currently provide a natural store for rainwater, reducing run off on a steep hillside, something that would be lost with an urban development, increasing the likelihood of flooding, including the Blacup Beck which runs near the bottom of the site under Quaker Lane and which already regularly experiences high water levels.

Human Environment:

The development appears to ignore the impact of multiple occupancy and multiple car use households on existing infrastructure including roads, school places, healthcare and well-being of surrounding residents in a town already experiencing an increase in housing, population and strain on existing resources. Token financial contributions by developers do not create more school places, health centres or reduce traffic and pollution. As with many developments, the need for more housing is cited as a key factor but this proposal does not address any need/provision for 'affordable housing' and seeks to simply maximise developer yield of the site with larger and more expensive housing. It does not solve any housing crisis on a local or national level. Ignoring the local impact and opposition is utterly undemocratic.

In summary, as with previous proposed housing planned for this site, it does not address the adverse impact on environment, local residents and resources, therefore should be rejected.