

APPENDIX G

Summary of Representation to Masterplan January 2020

A total of 5768 letters were sent out publicising the two planning applications 07/2020/00014/FUL and 07/2020/00015/ORM together with The Masterplan.

A total of 59 comments were received through the Council's dedicated email address set up to receive comments specific to the Masterplan. However, many of the comments received related more to the planning applications. Additionally, a number of objections received to the two planning applications also contained comments specifically relating to the Masterplan. In total 153 representations were received. A summary of the comments specifically relating to the Masterplan is set out below:

Flooding and Drainage

The fields to the north of Bee Lane are regularly subject to waterlogging and flooding, and the fields directly bounded by Lords Lane, Bee Lane and Nib Lane can be submerged in a substantial amount of water. The masterplan location for the proposed primary school is located directly within the area subject to the most flooding.

The main components of a drainage strategy required for major developments usually include the site's characteristics (slope profile, soil geology, existing flood risk), the calculated surface water runoff rates and required storage volumes, and where the runoff is to be discharged to.

The areas identified on the masterplan to manage and contain surface water are likely to be inadequate given the local conditions, and this is without taking into account the impacts of climate change.

Surface water run-off from the new roads and residential hard standing spaces will result in an increased demand on existing drainage which already struggles to cope with existing water volumes and increasing the area sewer capacity will simply move the problem into other downstream areas.

Live near to a brook and the change of climate has meant this has raised considerably over the last few years. Concern is flooding and will be monitoring this closely with the proposed building on potential 'flood plains' and drainaways. This is a written confirmation of my concern and any damage to my property through flooding will be directed to yourselves

The drainage is an issue as shown with the extensive flooding caused by yesterday's storm. The proposed water collection tanks alongside the A582 show the planners have concerns and they will have to raise the land to accommodate these.

The fields near my house on Kingsfold are waterlogged regularly, they will need pumping stations This is moss land, so drainage will always be a problem. The more paved/concrete areas created add to the problems of potential flooding in other areas locally.

This area floods regularly and is fairly self-contained due to green areas and trees. The surrounding residences will undoubtedly be impacted by the removal of this and the laying down of housing and concrete. This is not acceptable to local home owners. You must provide a steadfast guarantee that this will absolutely not occur.

The fields around Bee Lane regularly flood, and water is at least 1 foot deep. It has already been suggested that the brook could not cope with extra run off from all these homes, so what will happen to all this water?

In light of the increasing rain fall in recent years, is it wise to concrete and tarmac over a large area of land soak. Over the last month it has been quite evident of the amount of rain water the fields are absorbing.

Large lake like areas built up on the fields and quite a few of the roads in the area flooded recently mainly because the local drainage cannot cope. This development would only add to the existing problems.

At the moment, 100% of all rain water on the development site is soaked up and absorbed by the existing ground soil. Once the proposed development takes place then the vast majority of the surface water will be removed into the main drainage system.

In periods of heavy rain, which is becoming more and more prevalent, the drains in Middleforth overflow because the area is low lying. This applies to both public drains and private houses.

The drains taking away the water from the gutters on local houses have backed up and overflowed a number of times in the last month and caused flooding to gardens and driveways. The drains are NOT BLOCKED, they just cannot cope with the amount of water using the system. To knowingly overload the existing drainage even further and exacerbate problems, would be irresponsible and completely unacceptable. The current volume of water cannot pass through the existing system quickly enough and this is the cause of the flooding.

Sewerage and surface drainage beyond the development does not have sufficient capacity. As recognised in the report [December 2015 Floods in Lancashire Flood & Water Management Act 2010 Section 19](#) paragraph 2.2.3.2 *City and Borough Councils have a number of wider functions and roles that can be relevant to flood risk management and response. These include local planning, housing, environmental health and community engagement activity, as well as private responsibilities for land drainage where they are a land owner.* The area in question is a known flood risk area as detailed on pages 54 to 62 in the [Appendix A of the December 2015 Floods report](#), and the fields upon which the development is proposed regularly have standing water during wet periods. While additional drainage on the site might reduce the standing water, this water would still need an increased run-off capacity to limit risk for the identified flood areas. the local schools are already full. There is proposal for a school, however, Taylor Wimpey will not be providing this, you will.

I live on School lane opposite Charnock Moss a relatively small estate of detached houses. When I moved back to School lane in 1970 there was a field across the road where Charnock Moss now stands that field also flooded when we had torrential rainfall and the two drain age ditches overflowed regularly. Twenty years since they were built, the LCC still won't adopt the road into Charnock Moss in spite of it being in the plans that School lane would be closed at one end to prevent it becoming a rat run for speeding cars. My neighbour who lives at the top of School Lane regularly experiences flooding around her pathway to her front door since the estate was built. I too have noticed the drains around my house to contain a considerably higher level of water than they used to. I know some residents on Charnock Moss had problems with their homes and had new footing ? I often see the drain clearance lorries after heavy rain .

Traffic

Three years ago the standing traffic going down Pear Tree Brow on Leyland Road had generally started to dissipate by about 8:50am. The traffic has been steadily increasing with the rise in residential development in the area. In recent weeks there has been a very noticeable increase in traffic both on Leyland Road and Marshalls Brow as a result of the closing of the slip road from Liverpool road onto the bypass over the River Ribble. Commuters in Kingsfold, Cop Lane and Penwortham who formerly used Liverpool road to access the bypass into Preston are now coming down onto Leyland road instead. The traffic is now still solid nose to tail on Leyland Road at 9:15am every morning. This traffic will not be alleviated by the construction of a link road between Leyland Road B5254 and Penwortham Way A582, because so many commuters are still opting to use Leyland Road rather than Penwortham Way.

Penwortham Way, Golden Way, Flensburg Way and Leyland Road already suffer congestion which will be added to by traffic entering and leaving the proposed development. This will worsen existing bottlenecks for traffic entering Preston via Leyland Road and Golden Way, which at the time of writing regularly backs up for 1 mile towards the roundabout at Penwortham Holme. In addition, as shown in the Central Lancashire Transport Study Final Report (Appendix D), traffic accessing the motorway network will exceed the capacity of Penwortham Way and Flensburg Way, while also taking Leyland Road to its limit and exacerbating the air quality issue covered above. Funding for highway improvements to mitigate this situation, if available at all, will almost certainly rule out the necessary additional health care facility requirements covered below.

Leyland Road is already heavily congested most of the day and night. Plans to add a minimum 2500 cars from this site alone, along with all the other sites in the area, such as the old gas works, the old mill site, and Cuerden, who make congestion unbearable and raise already unacceptable pollution levels to dangerous levels.

Masterplan fails to isolate the existing country lanes from being utilised by the new residents. The increased amount of traffic as the proposed 1100 homes would on the conservative side bring over 2000 more vehicles to the area. Looking at the plans on the internet the suggested out let on to Chainhouse Lane/Coot Lane would cause significant problems at the weight restricted bridge over the rail way line on Coot Lane. It has been made into a single lane for traffic in both directions. This will cause my neighbours and myself in my opinion a hazard when leaving and entering our drives. Due to the existing priority restriction over the weak bridge an increase level of traffic will cause a tail back of traffic crossing ours and neighbours driveways. This in turn making it difficult for us to access and leave our properties. In addition, it could cause hazardous driving of vehicles trying to compete to get across the bridge and this in turn increases risk of accidents to pedestrians and other vehicles on the road.

An additional serious current problem, access to Leyland Road, from Studholme Avenue will be made worse due to increased traffic. Some kind of traffic control at this junction is necessary.

The two sets of traffic lights at the centre of Lostock Hall would become gridlocked at both morning and evening rush hours as traffic from Penwortham on Leyland Road would block the exit from Coot Lane causing tail back towards the rail way bridge previously mentioned.

It would put a strain on the A582 to Preston and back to the motorway M65 which even now can run at a snail's pace at rush hours.

The increase in traffic congestion throughout Penwortham and Lostock Hall will also increase noise and pollution in the area.

The surrounding area barely copes with traffic. Often traffic is backed-up from Lostock Hall to The Pear Tree Inn. Adding an entry/exit route on to the poorly-planned by-pass will not divert all traffic and it is likely we will see an increase in some 2000 cars in the area on a daily basis. We absolutely cannot cope with current traffic levels. I also note the residents of Flag Lane will be providing access to almost 50% of the proposed build site. That is not acceptable.

Highway Safety

I can see you have proposed a link into the community centre area. However, I am very, very concerned about the proposed building layout. It would appear you are providing potential options in the future by way of placement of housing to open up Braintree Avenue and other cul-de-sacs to access roads. This will ruin quiet areas where children can play safely and turn them into rat runs. This is not acceptable.

Quiet Lanes are minor rural roads, typically C or unclassified routes, which have been designated by local highway authorities to pay special attention to the needs of walkers, cyclists, horse riders and other vulnerable road users, and to offer protection from speeding traffic. Cars are not banned

from Quiet Lanes and their use is shared by all road users. Measures such as lower speed limits and discrete road signs aim to encourage drivers to slow down and be considerate to more vulnerable users who can in turn use and enjoy country lanes in greater safety, with less threat from speeding traffic.

The current lanes are quiet, they are minor rural roads. There is a danger of these roads becoming rat runs despite the proposals. Currently we enjoy these country lanes with almost no traffic. Also: With regards to transport and access, respondents indicated a desire to see the local bus service connect to the site to provide public transport facilities for the new

The safety of our children would then be put at risk with the increased congestion.

Pollution and Air Quality

In recent years the volume of traffic on Leyland Road has increased exponentially and so has the amount of pollution and resulting decline in air quality.

According to the Lancashire County Council, 'total carbon dioxide emissions in South Ribble when measured by tonnes per resident reveal a rate that is above the national average. Emissions of nitrogen oxides are the second greatest by weight in the county, while average particulate emissions by area are also second highest' – allowing this development will contribute to an associated rise in vehicular travel with increased pollution. This will have a

The unnecessary emissions and carbon released through the construction and life cycle of the development is not sustainable and not wanted by anyone in the area.

The added pollution within the area - Leyland Road even with the bypass improvements still has a high volume of queuing cars producing pollution for large parts of the day.

Air pollution will increase and there is already a rising issue at peak times with this. Can you provide us with current levels and comparisons from other such builds to guarantee there will be 0% impact on the area?

Traffic levels in the area are already under pressure and according to the Central Lancashire Core Strategy Monitoring Report (2018 – 2019), '0 of South Ribble have reduced whilst the rest have risen'. Adding new dwellings will increase the burden on the local road infrastructure with an attendant decrease in traffic flow, and more vehicles experiencing traffic congestion and thus increasing air pollution.

Pollution levels along the whole of Leyland Road exceed EU permitted levels this will be magnified by a huge housing development. Link roads will be built but people will still use Leyland Road. The proposed development is in conflict with the main objectives of the [South Ribble Borough Council Air Quality Action Plan 2018](#) and the National Planning Policy Framework paragraphs 103, 170 and 181 that the Air Quality Action Plan refers to on page 8. Air quality in the Leyland Road area of Lostock Hall is already recognised in the Air Quality Action Plan as being poor during peak periods. Adding any traffic to this area, whether using existing roads or planned links, will reduce the air quality further. In addition, delayed development of the planned links and the slow uptake of electric vehicles is unlikely to change this situation for the current and future generations of children growing up in this area.

Infrastructure and Services

The infrastructure needs to be fully in place prior to any huge development like these be considered, and although there is a plan to develop roads in this area, it is not yet in place.

We haven't even got a full dual carriageway from the motorway into Preston yet and due to the railway bridge and other land issues in my opinion it is unlikely to be resolved in the immediate future.

The plans show the cross borough link road joining up with Bee lane, but how can this happen if not all the land is purchased? The small single track lanes around Bee and Flag lane could not cope with that traffic, and you are restricted by the railway. Are Network Rail clear on the plans and the disruption to the train journeys that could ensue?

The Masterplan states there will be an increase in community buildings walkways, schools and other amenities. Don't believe this will happen.

What about Doctors, shops etc. The land will be made up of purely residential housing and therefore stretching the current amenities available in Penwortham and Lostock Hall

Children could be forced to travel further afield to obtain a school place which affects the safety of children having to travel further depending on mode of transport. This impacts on their social lives as they would then spend potentially more time commuting rather than being able to attend after school activities. If children have to attend a school at a further distance this again increases transport on the roads again affecting the environment.

All new developments should be accompanied with the necessary infrastructure and apart from a primary school there doesn't appear to be any proposals for secondary schools or shops. This will mean residents having to drive into Lostock Hall, New Longton or Penwortham.

There is currently a high demand for school places, taking the Buckshaw development as an example. Does not trust any developer's calculation on the need for primary and secondary schools and does not think this development would cater for the current and proposed demand

The local schools are already full. There is proposal for a school, however, Taylor Wimpey will not be providing this. Want a guarantee that it will be provided without impact to local residents

Has there been consideration of the parking? With a school that contains 400 children, the likelihood is you will have to provide parking for 200+ cars as parents drop off and pick-up during their work commutes. I realise you are encouraging walking but, in reality, you are as aware as I am that there will be an enormous issue with parking if the school is built. This is not acceptable.

Question how the energy networks will support all the additional housing?

Question which doctors and hospitals will cope with the influx of people?

The infrastructure locally cannot cope builders come and go and leave their impact on residents forever. We don't need another school. We only need another school to cope with the influx of another housing development.

We don't need another pub, The Sumpter has laid derelict for years if the council are so bothered about public / community meeting places why has this pub been vacant and vandalised?

There are plenty of retail areas in Penwortham to cater for the population if retail is so much needed why are their two retail units which have remained empty on The Capitol Centre development for over a year.

The building of a school, community centre etc are things that we have now, the council should be putting resources into all these areas.

Existing medical/dental services are reaching capacity to fully support the existing surrounding communities. The effects of the proposed development are considered in the [Chorley and South Ribble CCG and Greater Preston CCG - Capital development and estates strategy \(Primary Care\)](#) (pages 53-56) which state "*The Lostock Hall practices are unlikely to be able to cope with the potential patient influx...*", "*Penwortham St Mary's has a list size of over 16,000... The practice*

does not [currently] have enough space..." and that "The need for a new primary care facility in Lostock Hall / Penwortham has been identified by the Council (£3.5m) and some of the funding for this may come from the Council's CIL... ..however, currently the majority of such funding is being directed to highways infrastructure". Without the additional health care facilities, adding the proposed number of additional residents can only reduce the standard of health care for both them and the existing communities.

The current 111 bus service which is all there is down Leyland Rd, is already unreliable and infrequent, partly in fairness due the traffic jams on Leyland Rd. I cannot see how this bus service can be improved without investment.

I believe Lancashire has no plans or budget to build any schools for the next 5 years??? Yet this seems to be something which the builders are suggesting is in scope???

Green Belt and Open Space

This is not sustainable development, and there is no reasonable justification to churn up 53 hectares of fields, trees and Greenbelt land, into tarmac, houses, roads and cars. There consensus within the local community is that this is not a favourable development and there is a strong will to maintain the rural area.

I thought this site would be protected as green belt land. The Council should not be allowed to keep giving green belt land to greedy property developers. Build houses were there is already disused factories or developments not in the countryside. We will have no farms or fields left at the rate the Council is going.

This is green belt land and so I am concerned that development on this scale, on this site, is being considered.

There are enough brown field sites around without having to encroach onto patches of safe guarded land.

It is clear from the Save our Fields signs in the area that the community is opposed to housing developments in the area.

Rural spaces are important to our well-being. This is recognised in [Government Advice on the role of the Green Belt in the planning system](#), which also outlines the requirement for compensatory improvements to the environmental quality when development of green belt land is proposed. The limited "green spaces" included in the application falls beneath national grid electricity pylons, so cannot be considered compensatory improvements as they are in no way open or rural. As such the proposed development will unacceptably detract from the benefits of open green space to the surrounding communities of Lostock Hall and Penwortham.

Environment/Ecology/Wildlife

This development would remove a large area of rural space. This would have a negative impact for wildlife losing their habitats and replaced with noise and pollution which would then adversely affect health of the occupants of the surrounding areas.

The area has abundant wild life and is one of the few places where local residents can enjoy a pleasant walk.

Many species of birds next in the ancient hedges and old trees in the area.

The thought of even more houses, roads etc., is an appalling prospect for residents saying nothing of the destruction of trees and habitats for wildlife.

I note you have made reference to no roosting bats. There are most certainly bats in the area which I have witnessed in the early evening on numerous occasions. This should be readdressed as well as looking at the removal of trees and hedgerows.

Environmental impact is forever once this habit has gone under feet of concrete it will never return, we owe it to the planet and future generations to protect areas of natural habitat. The Cawsey developments and Vernons has already seen vast swathes of natural habit in this vicinity buried under concrete and I feel that Penwortham is being turned from a semi-rural area into a concrete jungle.

Reference is made to no roosting bats. There are most certainly bats in the area which I have witnessed in the early evening on numerous occasions. This should be readdressed as well as looking at the removal of trees and hedgerows

Hedgehogs at this time are greatly at risk. Having been driven from the wild to urban areas because of threats like climate change, pesticides and loss of habitat, numbers have plummeted in the UK by about 50% since 2000. Leyland Hedgehog Rescue centre is struggling to manage due to high numbers needing care and treatment. This is not the only centre in Lancashire helping Hedgehog's. The land and hedges on this land are important for these animals and the more fences and buildings that are put up mean that they are impacted. Hedgehogs struggle to move in-between gardens in built up areas due to buildings and fences and they are more likely to be harmed by people, cars and pollution.

Loss of agricultural land and loss of orchard habitat

There are environmental concerns with regard to the fields between here and Bee Lane. As things are, the area is home to hedgehogs, bats, tawny and barn owls, and this habitat would be destroyed and not replaced. Immediately behind 21 and 22 Queenscourt Avenue is a dense thicket, which at the moment shelters various colonies of birds, including nationally threatened house sparrows and starlings. There are many trees in the immediate vicinity which would have to be removed in order to provide access.

There are lots of wildlife in the area, including barn owls, hedgehogs and bats. Where will these animals go when their habitat is destroyed.

Many species of birds next in the ancient hedges and old trees in the area.

The loss of habitat and green space will be likely to be detrimental to the local ecology and wildlife and decrease ecological diversity. Even though there are green spaces within the development this may still result in habitat fragmentation and a resulting decrease in wildlife viability.

The National Policy Planning Framework states that the planning system should contribute to and enhance natural environments by minimising impacts on biodiversity, and providing net biodiversity gains where possible. Allowing this development seems at odds with this statement.

The Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 references the 'duty to conserve biodiversity' which includes 'restoring or enhancing a population or habitat'. Again, the development seems at odds with this statement.

The Bee Lane/Flag Lane loop is a nice pleasant family walk in the evening and weekends, having this area is good for children without the need to travel in the car, thus reducing pollution, traffic. The construction of houses on the last strip of semi-rural land in the Penwortham and surrounding areas will destroy a multitude of wildlife, flora and fauna.

As a young family of 4, 2 adults and 2 children under the age of 12- this planning is deeply concerning to hear. It goes against what my children (at local schools) are being educated on... look after their environment, protect and appreciate the wildlife etc.

Every day I see people visiting this lovely area to enjoy the current, untouched natural beauty this area brings.

Need for Development

Taylor Wimpey state “*the proposed development will support the creation of a strong, vibrant and healthy community.*” Question how can the replacement of 53 hectares of fields, trees and countryside, with houses, tarmac and concrete be a healthy alternative?

Taylor Wimpey explains that “*the proposed development will deliver a range of new homes to meet the needs of the area*” Question what the needs of the area are? There are a large number of developments already going up such the test track so question the need for this development.

Taylor Wimpey would simply like the outrageous profit from the scheme, with the cost of us losing such beautiful countryside.

South Ribble Council have already achieved 126 percent of housing targets, these homes are not needed

According to publicly available information, an annual figure of 1,026 dwellings is expected to be delivered by Central Lancashire as a whole, with approximately 32% to be fulfilled by South Ribble. The Local Plan (2012 – 2026) was endorsed by the council for use in development management purposes to guide decisions on planning applications, and as such the construction of 1100 dwellings seems disproportionate against the overarching criteria when viewed in the context of all other areas already identified for development.

As a member of the Woodland Trust I see what the march of progress does to ancient woodland, animal habitats and the quality of life for local people. It seems to me that many councils feel that they have to put the needs of the developers first and foremost, sorry but I believe you have a more pressing case for putting the needs of your existing residents first.

This whole development is unnecessary on so many levels. There is no guarantee a school will be built, shop spaces will be occupied or community facilities created. What guarantees are in place that TW will see all this through? Are any checks made to see that the Masterplan is fulfilled in all its details? I also wonder about how Lostock Hall and Lower Penwortham is to cope with the influx of new residents? Is there any suggestion of a GP surgery, a Dentist, a Post Office? I see a Vets is suggested!

This whole development is unnecessary on so many levels. There is no guarantee a school will be built, shop spaces will be occupied or community facilities created. What guarantees are in place that TW will see all this through? Are any checks made to see that the Masterplan is fulfilled in all its details? I also wonder about how Lostock Hall and Lower Penwortham is to cope with the influx of new residents? Is there any suggestion of a GP surgery, a Dentist, a Post Office? I see a Vets is suggested!

Climate Change

Surely the council has some green policies particularly in this day and age where climate change is the main topic of conversation and the destruction of yet more trees and habitat is foremost in today's debates.

Concerned about flooding risk as lives next to a natural water course and with the increase in wet weather this brook is already reaching the top of its banks on occasion. Any change to water levels or damage to property will be pursued through the various Legal channels available.

The climate is getting wetter so where is all the additional water going to drain off from after all the concrete is laid?

How can South Ribble claim they want to increase green spaces and improve air quality when the Pickering Farm project of 1100 houses will reduce green belt and every home built will have at least one motor vehicle.

Climate change won't go away and you seem blissfully unaware of the extra traffic this would place on our already congested polluted roads. The residents of Penwortham Bee Lane area chose to live in that area because of its tranquil quality and the proximity to quiet walks and green fields. Also possibly it's relatively short distance to shops, Preston city centre and other amenities,

Health

You are elected to represent the people's view follow your conscience when gone the fields are gone forever think about people's health before profit

Negative impact on health due to massive increase in levels of traffic both during construction and at a later date from massive number of cars irrelevant of a link road people will still choose to use Leyland Road. Emission levels for traffic pollution are already in excess of permitted levels

I have been reading the Masterplan for the above project. I live in Penwortham fairly adjacent to the Bee Lane end of the proposals. I regularly walk and run around Bee Lane, Flag Lane and Moss Lane. Yesterday I went for a walk, met people out walking their dogs, saw snowdrops, sheep, horses, an odd car or two, budding hedgerows, etc. Although the Masterplan suggests that all these things will still be possible, it is not going to be the same. We will lose our only bit of 'rural heaven' for some distance. My nearest park is Hurst Grange and unless I want to walk some distance to it, I have to drive or take a bus. Neither conducive to the environment. It is remarkable that in our urban environment we have a space such as this. But it is basically to become housing estate. The master plan says: *Green Infrastructure - A strong green infrastructure network will be provided across the site. The green infrastructure will have differing forms, functions and uses and will be connected by the extensive network of green links across the site. On site green infrastructure provision could include amenity green space, equipped play areas, natural / semi natural open space, playing fields and allotment provision.* We already have all of this - why are we reinventing the wheel?

The land is currently used by lots of dog walkers, families and cyclists as it is a quiet, safe and peaceful area. This is good for the well-being and health of residents

Residential Amenity

All of the bungalows in Queenscourt Avenue are part of an over-55s scheme, where we enjoy relative peace and quiet. Obviously this tranquility will be shattered both during the months and years of development and afterwards by neighbour disturbance from families in the new properties. Many of the residents in our scheme are very elderly, some in their 80s and 90s.

We believe privacy levels would be compromised for a number of neighbouring properties and increase in noise from the occupants of the development

I oppose this planning application on so many levels, not least environmental. I also feel for the people currently living on Bee Lane and its adjacent lanes-their lives are to be turned upside down. I don't feel that any consideration is being given to local residents and those in the surrounding areas. I have not met one person who lives around here who supports these proposals. However, many feel it is a 'done deal' and that opposing it makes no difference. That makes a mockery of our planning process but it is hard not to believe it.

The masterplan now shows proposed dwellings of 2 or more storeys immediately behind the six bungalows 17-22 Queenscourt Avenue which face these fields directly. If houses are built, they will overlook our properties and ruin our privacy.

Housing

Masterplan does not deal with the details of the split of Affordable Housing as per Policy 7 in the CLCS. A target of 330 should be achieved to ensure that the development provides for a mix of housing including for people in housing need who cannot afford housing on the open market. House values on existing properties close to the proposed development will inevitably suffer because of all the above problems of noise, loss of privacy, etc.

At the meeting with the builders' representatives last year at the Methodist church, I and some of my neighbours were given to understand that the fields between us and Bee Lane contained a pipeline which was highly likely to preclude any building.

Building homes, with decent room sizes, not tiny doll's houses. Leaving substantial room between houses, allowing for gardens and garage if required.