Cuerdale Garden Village (CGV) & LOGIK

Planning Objection Pack

# Application References: CGV - 07/2022/00451/OUT; LOGIK 07/2023/00035/OUT

# **Key Information**

**Deadline for submissions: CGV 17th October & LOGIK 25th October .**

## How to submit your objection:

1. The easiest way is Google **South Ribble Borough Council Planning Portal**: search for application **Ref Number (see above)** and click “Comment on this application”.
2. Alternatively, you may email your objection letter to [**planning@southribble.gov.uk**](mailto:planning@southribble.gov.uk)**,** with the application reference clearly stated in the subject line.
3. You can also post written objections to:

Planning Department, South Ribble Borough Council

Civic Centre, West Paddock, Leyland, PR25 1DH

## Tips for writing your objection:

1. Use your **own words** – personalised objections carry more weight than identical form letters.
2. Focus on **material planning considerations** (e.g. traffic, infrastructure, Green Belt policy, environment); use the URL & QR code from leaflet to access further objection arguments.
3. Avoid non-material comments (e.g. property values, personal opinions about the developer).
4. Clearly reference the planning application number (**see above)**) at the top of your letter or email.
5. Submit your objection **before the respective deadline 17th & 25th October 2025** and keep a copy for your records.

## Important Planning arguments you might want to consider when drafting your objections:-

1. **Inappropriate Development in the Green Belt (National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 151–154):** The site lies wholly within the designated Lancashire Green Belt. The developer’s claim that it is 'grey belt' has no policy basis. The proposal causes substantial harm to openness and conflicts with Local Plan Policy G1.
2. **Conflict with the Adopted Development Plan:** The Central Lancashire Core Strategy and South Ribble Local Plan designate this land as Green Belt. Granting permission would breach Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.
3. **Prematurity Pending Local Plan Review:** The development is strategic in scale and would pre-empt the outcome of the Central Lancashire Local Plan review, contrary to NPPF 49.
4. **Failure to Demonstrate Very Special Circumstances:** Economic arguments linked to the National Cyber Force are speculative and insufficient to outweigh permanent Green Belt harm.
5. **Environmental Impact and Biodiversity:** The claimed 34% biodiversity net gain lacks evidence and fails to comply with the Environment Act 2021 and the Town and Country Planning (EIA) Regulations 2017.
6. **Unsustainable Transport and Access:** The site is car-dependent with no robust Transport Assessment. It will worsen congestion on the A59 and M6 Junction 31.
7. **Insufficient Infrastructure Provision:** The proposed single school and limited local services are inadequate for 1,300 homes. No secondary or health facilities are secured.
8. **Heritage and Landscape Harm:** The proposal threatens the setting of Cuerdale Hall (Grade II\*) and local heritage assets. No Heritage Impact Assessment has been provided.
9. **Housing Need and Viability:** There is no proven local housing need for Green Belt release, and the 50% affordable housing claim lacks viability evidence.
10. **Climate and Cumulative Impacts:** No carbon or renewable energy strategy has been submitted, contrary to NPPF 153 and the Climate Change Act 2008.
11. The development is NOT on the existing local plan and is NOT included in the emerging local plan and should be refused.
12. This development is contrary to Green Belt Policy and causes significant harm due to urban sprawl and loss of openness (and should be considered alongside the LOGIK planning application).
13. South Ribble Borough Council has objectively assessed housing need and demand studies all showing flats and bungalow accommodation are needed for the ageing population and those with disabilities.
14. South Ribble Borough Council has demonstrated they can meet their five-year housing target. The claim by Storey Homes that there is an unmet need is untrue.
15. Against National Planning Policy Framework – ‘ensuring the vitality of town centres’; takes growth investment and housing out of Preston city centre.
16. Preston city centre has two important areas for maximising the opportunities for cyber and innovation – The Station Quarter a commercial centre by Preston railway station and The Stoneygate Quarter, an urban village with 1600 homes by 2035 with the added benefit of The Harris Quarter providing cultural and social facilities all in walking distance.
17. Building densities are much higher in urban areas, we need to leave the vital food producing agricultural land to safeguard future generation’s ability to produce food we will need.
18. LOGIK also has planning permission submitted which takes the development all the way up Preston New Road this should be considered alongside the Storey Homes proposal.

**Conclusion:** The proposal is inconsistent with the Development Plan and NPPF. It represents unjustified Green Belt development and should be refused.