

CONSULTATION SUMMARY REPORT

Development Brief
Grove Farm, Ormskirk

Feb-Mar 2014

CONTENTS

1. Introduction
2. Consultation & publicity methods
3. Summary of comments
4. Council response
5. Changes to the Development Brief
6. Next steps

Appendix 1

Consultation representations, summaries and the Council's response.

1. Introduction

Development briefs provide an additional layer of guidance for development on specific sites and sit between the West Lancashire Local Plan (2012-2027) and the planning application stage. They inform developers and other interested parties of the constraints and opportunities of a site and the type of development that the site should accommodate.

Development briefs are normally prepared in consultation with the public and, where appropriate, the developer. In accordance with this, the Council prepared a draft development brief and consulted on the brief between 6 February and 21 March 2014.

This document provides a summary of how the Council consulted, the general issues raised through representations and the Council response to those issues. This document also sets out how the development brief has been changed as a direct result of the comments received, to illustrate how consultation informs decision making.

It should be acknowledged that the Council do give careful consideration to all comments received, although may not always agree with the points or requests made. Therefore changes cannot be made in all cases. The Council are required to make balanced decisions, taking into account the views from all parties, and relevant planning policy.

2. Consultation and publicity methods

In consulting, the Council adhered to, and exceeded, the requirements of the adopted Statement of Community Involvement. Those methods used are set out below.

The Council publicised consultation on the Development Brief through the following methods:

- Letter sent to residents of the neighbouring area of the Grove Farm site
- Email / letters to all consultees on the consultation database, including statutory consultees
- Press release
- Council website and social media (Facebook)

Throughout the consultation, planning officers were available to answer questions:

- At one drop-in session at Ormskirk Library (held mid-week 2-7pm)
- By email
- By phone
- In person at Council offices

Consultation materials were available to read at

- Council website
- Libraries
- Post Offices
- Council offices

Comments were invited through

- An online form available from the Council website (powered by surveymonkey)
- By returning forms through email or post

3. Summary of comments received

A total of fourteen comments were received in relation to Grove Farm and this report provides a summary of the issues and points raised. The comments in full, along with the Council's responses are set out in Appendix 1 to this report. The comments as submitted can also be found on the Council webpage at www.westlincs.gov.uk/planningpolicy.

Traffic, Transport and Access

The Council were asked to consider the implications of, and to, the access road to the west of the A59 which serves 6 properties on High Lane and provides access to several properties / garages on the Scott Estate.

There were several requests received for traffic calming measures and speed limits along the A59. Some consultees raised concerns over the volume of traffic using the A59, safety records and access points, including existing access from residential areas onto the A59. Traffic mitigation was supported and there were requests for further traffic census / survey work to inform decisions.

Some comments were received in relation to ensuring access arrangements to surrounding land are not affected by access points created to the development site. There was a request for amendments to be made to the development brief to ensure that other land is not sterilized as a result of an inflexible development brief.

Newburgh Parish Council registered concerns regarding the cumulative impact of traffic through Newburgh from various development sites including Grove Farm.

It was also suggested that the potential impact of a more frequent rail service as a result of the proposed electrification of the railway between Ormskirk and Burscough should be considered through the development brief.

Open Space and Linear Park

Concerns were registered that the creation of public open space / play areas and the linear park would create, or exacerbate, crime, litter and anti-social behaviour around the current Pines estate. Some considered that a linear park / path would not be safe, particularly if it was unlit and attracts loitering by youths who leave rubbish.

The current park is considered to be too small to cater for a new housing estate and it was felt that a new open space area should be provided. Questions were raised as to how the park would be altered to accommodate paths for the linear park.

Residents highlighted concerns about the creation of open space at Pine Grove and pedestrian and cycle links to/from it. It was felt that access would not be safe and easy to use. There were concerns that access paths and exit points would be located too close to existing properties, and an alternative exit route was proposed onto Burscough Road using the Old Farm Gate entrance.

Drainage

There were concerns about increased flood risk and poor drainage on the development site, which would affect both new and existing properties. Questions were raised as to who would be responsible for dealing with issues should problems occur.

Heritage

There were concerns about the impact of development on Bath Lodge and Burscough Augustinian Priory, along with recommendations that the impact on the heritage assets should be minimal. English Heritage suggested that any harm caused by the development could be mitigated through other heritage benefits.

Wildlife

There were concerns over wildlife on the site, including bats, and the loss of their living and feeding habitat.

Housing / Design

Concerns were raised regarding the amenity of the existing residents and the separation distances between new and existing housing.

It was also suggested that the vision and key principles of the draft development brief do not accord with the Local Plan development policy as the affordable and elderly provision should be entirely combined. However, this is not the case as is clearly set out within Policy RS2 of the Local Plan. It was suggested that a new section should be included in relation to the viability of the development in accordance with the NPPF and this should include specific reference to provision of affordable and specialised housing. It was suggested that the provision of off-site affordable housing should also be considered.

An objection was received in relation to the requirements for the Code for Sustainable Homes, on the grounds that it repeats local policy and should therefore be removed.

Other

It was suggested that the document could be more concise and should be refined accordingly, as well as providing background information to its preparation and consultation processes.

It was requested that the reference to Grove Farm being green belt land should be deleted on the grounds that it has been removed from the green belt through the Local Plan and is now an allocated site. A similar request was also made in relation to the sites agricultural land classification and noise exposure assessments as this guidance had been updated.

A number of mapping amendments were suggested such as an additional key to the context plan and greater detail and the removal of the suggested location of older person accommodation as this was inflexible.

Flexibility in the delivery of non-market housing was welcomed by housing developers, but the requirement of a design panel was rejected as being unnecessary.

The provision of electronic vehicle charging points in communal areas was also rejected and further comments were also received in relation to affordable housing statements, draft S106 agreements, landscaping schemes and parking and access arrangements.

4. Council Response

Council responses are set out in full at Appendix 1 but in brief can be summarised as follows:

Traffic, Transport and Access

The Council appreciates that there are a number of local concerns regarding the existing highways arrangements along the A59. It is also acknowledged that the development of this site offers the potential to improve road safety at this location. Therefore, through the development brief, the Council will require any planning applications for the site to include a full Traffic Assessment and Travel Plan for the site and that the scope of these documents is agreed in advance with the Highways Authority, Lancashire County Council. This requirement ensures that the site specifics, such as speed management, traffic calming and access, referred to within the representations will be given full consideration before planning consent may be granted.

The dwellings fronting High Lane, have large gardens and so could offer some development potential. It is preferable to require such potential to come forward as part of a holistic and inclusive development. In addition, the Highways Authority has noted that it would not be inclined to support a proposal for increased accesses along High Lane, above and beyond the two proposed accesses that are set out within the indicative site layout. However, an amendment to the wording to indicate that the land to the rear of the properties fronting High Lane should come forward as part of the wider development site and that separate access should only be permitted if it is demonstrated safe to do so to the standard of the Highways Authority, Lancashire County Council can be included within the final document.

Linear Park and Play Area

The Council has considered some of the local concerns regarding the potential for antisocial behaviour and misuse of a new and improved play area and linear park. However, the location of the play area is surrounded by existing properties and therefore benefits from good levels of natural surveillance and its design will be to a high standard that meets the needs of existing and future residents, encouraging use of the feature. The design of the linear park will also need to be to a standard that encourages people to use it and includes features such as lighting and a quality environment.

Notwithstanding this point, the existing play area at Pine Grove is a small equipped play area which does not currently comply with the Council policy of providing "Fewer, Bigger, Better" equipped play areas. This would mean that our current policy

would be to remove it rather than replace it when it became degraded. This site presents an opportunity to improve this play area in order to meet the needs of the existing residents in the locality and those of the new development. This may also include the linear park cycle and footpath, allowing an accessible connection between Ormskirk and Burscough.

The new linear park will encourage cycling and walking from the Grove Farm site and beyond, and the proposed access through Pine Avenue to the existing link with Ormskirk Station is considered to be a quiet and safe location, more appropriate than a straight passage along the A59.

However, it is noted that the siting of the Linear Park, immediately adjacent to existing properties, has caused some concern amongst local residents. Therefore, the indicative plan within the development brief will be amended to show a location set further into the site.

Consequently, whilst there were some concerns expressed regarding the safety of such a feature, the Council and the Highways Authority are satisfied that the linear park and play area features can be delivered to a high quality standard and will provide vital open space and access facilities for site users and those traveling between Ormskirk and Burscough.

Drainage

The Council acknowledges concerns in relation to flood risk for the site and surrounding area. However, the development brief and wider planning policy requires that a sustainable drainage system is included within the design of this site. SuDS provide an opportunity to address existing flood risk issues and those that may be generated as a result of development. The existing brook, which is currently channelised, will form a central part of this drainage system and improvements are likely to reduce the occurrence of any localised flood risk.

Early engagement with Lancashire County Council, the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) is required and all SuDS will need to be approved by them as part of the planning application process and subsequently adopted by the LLFA. This provides some assurances for the community that this issue will be given full consideration and will be maintained in the future.

In addition, the development brief requires this site to remove an amount of surface water out of the existing network to be treated on site that is the equivalent to the foul (waste) flows that will be generated through the new development. This should result in no net increase in overall flows through the existing system to the waste water treatment works at New Lane, Burscough, thus limiting the potential for new development to exacerbate existing drainage network issues.

Housing Layout and Site Design

Whilst development on the site will be required to be built to a high standard, the precise details relating to orientation and scale will only be considered at planning application stage. However, the development brief and general design policies within the Local Plan will ensure good design and the amenity of existing neighbours is protected. A full landscaping scheme will be required as part of any planning application.

With regards to the height and design of buildings this will be only be available in detail at the planning application stage, however, in order to protect residential amenity and to respect the character of the surrounding area development should not exceed 2.5 storeys in height. Furthermore, the Council will continue to encourage good design and still require a Places Matter review panel, in accordance with the NPPF, in support of an application for this site.

The Land Use Plan within the development brief does not dictate the location of elderly housing, but states that the most sustainable location for such uses is on the edge of the site closest to bus stops and local amenities. The Plan therefore indicates how this could be delivered, but if an applicant deems a more suitable location is available or wider distribution of the accommodation type is more appropriate, then this will be considered as part of the application.

Off-site affordable housing is not acceptable on this site as it is already in a sustainable location and offers enough land to develop 300 dwellings. Therefore, the requirements of the Local Plan should be delivered on site.

Electric car charging points should be delivered in accordance with Policy IF2 of the Local Plan.

Noise implications for the site, given its proximity to the rail line, will be addressed through a noise assessment which will need to form part of the supporting documentation for a planning application.

Heritage

The Council will endeavour to minimise the impact of Grade II* Bath Lodge, with the existing railway line and proposed linear park acting as a buffer to development. Any planning application for Grove Farm will be required to provide a Heritage Statement and engage with the HER and County Archaeologist. The brief will not specifically detail Section 106 contributions as this would need to be determined at the time of planning application.

Wildlife

Through the allocation of this site in the Local Plan, consideration was given to the impacts of development on wildlife and ecology. This assessment did not raise any serious concerns that would prevent the principle of development being acceptable in this location.

However, the development brief requires that at planning application stage the site is assessed or screened for its compliance with the Habitats Regulation Assessments so that any ecological issues may be identified and any mitigation measures may be proposed in order to ensure ecological protection.

The Council is aware of the risks to natural habitat through development and mitigation is a high priority. The ecological survey will need to show the impact of the development on the natural habitat and outline mitigation measures required. Protection of wildlife will be considered through the creation of green links and the wildlife corridor.

Other

Further revisions of the development brief will note conformity with the Statement of Community Involvement to demonstrate the requirements have been followed in preparing the brief.

Viability evidence can be submitted, and will be examined, as part of the planning application process. Therefore, the Council consider that the development brief is flexible enough to respond to potential issues of viability, where evidence is supplied.

5. Changes made to the development brief as a direct result of consultation?

- Amendment to the indicative layout to indicate that the cycle path will not be located directly adjacent to neighbouring boundary fences and will fall within a wider landscaped linear park area.
- Amendment to the wording to indicate that the land to the rear of the properties fronting High Lane should come forward as part of the wider development site and that separate access should only be permitted if it is demonstrated safe to do so to the standard of the Highways Authority, Lancashire County Council.
- Wording amended to clearly point out that layout is indicative.
- Wording amended to clarify the requirements and cross-over between the 35% affordable and 20% elderly housing provision and how this could be delivered.
- Additional landscaping, existing and new has been included within the final development brief.
- Wording amended in relation to Technical Constraints relating to noise and agricultural classification.
- Addition of more information on the constraints / site analysis plan to show Bath Lodge, open space / play areas, railway line, watercourse, flood zone 3, bus stops and existing landscaping.
- Revisions made to character area section, to highlight general design principles and site specific design principles.
- Creation of a 'Connections Plan' to show site permeability and where the connections to the wider community will be made. This is designed to provide further detail to the Movement Plan.
- Reference to specific levels of 'Code for Sustainable Homes' has been removed to ensure no repetition with policy and ensure the document remains flexible and up to date in respect of sustainability.

- Indicative Land Use Plan amended to show more landscaping on boundaries adjoining the existing properties.
- Investigations into alternative linear park footpath / cycle way exits and clarity provided on indicative layout plan.
- Requirement of further works in relation to heritage buildings / sites.
- Wording amended to reference consultation and the SCI.
- Wording amended to remove confusion between Community Infrastructure Levy funded matters and possible Section 106 funded matters.

6. Conclusions / Next steps

The consultation responses have highlighted that there are still a large number of concerns in relation to specific issues including transport, traffic, drainage, design, housing provision, linear park and open space and heritage and wildlife. The Council acknowledge that these are valid concerns and where possible, amendments to the development brief have been proposed. However, in the main, the Council is satisfied that these concerns can be addressed through the requirements of the development brief at subsequent planning application stage. This will ensure that appropriate assessments are undertaken and the development responds accordingly providing any required mitigate measures.

Consultation responses have provided a base for a number of changes to ensure that the development brief provides the best level of guidance for the site.

Using the comments received through the consultation process, the development brief will be refined and then a final version published during the summer 2014. The development brief will then form part of the planning framework and will be used to inform and guide the preparation of planning applications for the Grove Farm site.

Appendix 1

Grove Farm Representations and Council Responses

Grove Farm consultation - Comments received and Council responses

John Barlow

Organisation

Comments:

With regards to "Transport", when determining the final location of the southern vehicular access point please consider the implications of, and to, the access road to the west of the A59. Hawthorn Road is council maintained and for over 100 years has serviced six properties on High Lane which have no other vehicular access provision. It also now services several properties/garages on the Scott Estate which back onto Hawthorn Road, and is currently a pedestrian and cycle access to the Scott Estate. The access road is used regularly by cars, service vehicles and pedestrians, particularly prior to 9am and after school hours. Visibility to the south along the A59 from Hawthorn Road is greatly compromised by the bend between it and Burscough Road on the east side of the A59. This, combined with the volume of traffic on the A59, mean it can take up to five minutes for a single vehicle to exit Hawthorn Road onto High Lane. Situating a vehicular access point to the Grove Farm development in the vicinity of Hawthorn Road would greatly complicate existing difficulties, and drivers accessing the A59 from both west and east would have to consider not only traffic on the A59, but also vehicles joining the A59 and increased pedestrian traffic. The current situation is exacerbated further by the speed of northbound traffic at this point on the A59, which is often well in excess of the 40mph speed limit as drivers familiar with the road anticipate the national speed limit signs, with some northbound vehicles also over-taking on this bend. Police records will evidence that this point of the A59 is also prone to road traffic accidents which have affected nearby properties: property boundaries and council wheelie bins left out for collection on the pavement have been destroyed, which would indicate that it is only a matter of time before there is a pedestrian casualty. In that sense the Grove Farm development offers the opportunity for appropriate traffic calming measures to be introduced, which would also aid vehicles joining the A59 from both east and west. A 30mph zone extending to the north of the Grove Farm site and south of the junction with Burscough Road may be a good beginning, while other traffic calming measures via appropriate street design would be welcomed.

Attachments included?

Council response:

The Council appreciates that there are a number of local concerns regarding the existing highways arrangements along the A59, particularly given the bend in the road to the south of the Grove Farm site. It is also acknowledged that the development of this site offers the potential to improve road safety at this location. Therefore, through the Development Brief, the Council will require the applicant to produce a full Traffic Assessment and Travel Plan for the site and that the scope of these documents is agreed in advance with the Highways Authority, Lancashire County Council. This requirement ensures that the site specifics referred to within your representation, such as the relationship between existing and proposed accesses will be given full consideration before planning consent may be granted.

Mr

John

Bootle

Organisation

Comments:

[Respondent skipped this question]

Attachments included?

Council response:

None

miss

lisa

carroll

Organisation

Comments:

Following the consultation meeting at Ormskirk library regarding the planning process for the Grove Farm site, I have great concerns with the current plan for the local playing area in the Pine Grove estate. At present it is planned to be opened up to a minimum of 300 residents with the addition of a Pedestrian walkway and a cycle footpath not only going through this already quiet and safe play area but walking right outside the residents of Pine Grove estates houses. As a resident of Pine Grove i can say that there is no Pedestrian walk way situated in this narrow street which enables you to walk safely through. pass safely and not including parked vehicles from visiting family/friends, how anybody could say or recommend that this is safe .li would suggest that a member from the council come and assess the estate so that they realize that this proposition is not.

Attachments included?

Council response:

The existing play area at Pine Grove is a small equipped play area which does not currently comply with the Council policy of providing "Fewer, Bigger, Better" equipped play areas. This would mean that our current policy would be to remove it rather than replace it when it became degraded. This site provides an opportunity to improve and expand this existing play area into the Grove Farm site to provide new and improved open space provision for existing and future residents of the area.

The new linear park will encourage cycling and walking from the Grove Farm site and beyond, and the proposed access through Pine Avenue to the existing link with Ormskirk Station is considered to be a quiet and safe location, more appropriate than a straight passage through the A59. This route has been considered by the Council and the Highways Authority, Lancashire County Council, who consider that it is appropriate and deliverable. The proposal for a linear park is required to deliver an off road cycle and walking link to connect Burcough and north of Ormskirk with Ormskirk town centre and transport links. However, it is noted that the siting of this immediately adjacent to existing properties has caused some concern amongst local residents. Therefore, the indicative plan within the Development Brief will be amended to show a location set further into the site.

Mr

Michael

Cunningham

Organisation

Comments:

The content of the draft Development Brief is considered broadly acceptable. However, the reference to access arrangements, particularly under the section on Page 16 headed "Transport Access & Servicing Requirements" is unjustified. This section states that development on land at the rear of existing properties on High Lane will be required to be accessed from the development site. The reason for this is stated to be to avoid highway implications along High Lane and the need to ensure that all development is in keeping with the character of the area. Access to the area of land to the rear of Hilbre on High Lane can be achieved even with the provision of the 2 access points proposed in the Master Plan. Attached with this report is a letter from traffic consultants, PSA Design, which confirms that access arrangements could easily be achieved without impacting on the proposed southerly access to the residential development at the rear. This proves there would be no highway implications of such a secondary access. If the wording of this section of the draft Development Brief is not altered it will have implications for the development of land at the rear of Hilbre. The requirement for this land to be developed solely off the development at the rear would effectively sterilize the land and result in a reduced number of residential units coming forward. There is no reason to insist on access being achieved from the land at the rear. The character and design of any development would be controlled by normal development management techniques employed by the local authority when considering any proposals for development. The site itself at the rear of Hilbre is secluded from the remainder of the site by existing trees and any development, even if it was accessed from the rear, would not necessarily be viewed as part of a general residential development scheme, but rather as a separate area. The wording of the section of the draft Development Brief referred to on Page 16 should acknowledge that subject to appropriate detailed access arrangements being provided development of the land at the rear of Hilbre is to be encouraged. The owner's concern is that if the form of wording which is currently proposed in the Development Brief remains it would restrict any future development of the site which could be shown to be capable of access from High Lane, but which would be contrary to the specific requirements of the Development Brief. Further to your recent instructions and our meeting on site, I have pleasure in setting out below a summary of the highways related issues associated with the proposed development illustrated on the Sketch Site Layout Plan at drawing number 13/093/sk01. The issues, which are considered in turn below, comprise:

- ▣ Feasibility of an access to serve the site directly on to the A59 High Lane.
- ▣ Compatibility of this site access with that anticipated for the potential larger residential site to the rear.

Site Access Feasibility As can be seen on the sketch site layout plan, there is sufficient width across the site frontage to accommodate a priority 'T' junction onto High Lane with kerb radii of 6m and a width of 5.5m. Such an access would be more than adequate to serve a development of 6 dwellings. An access shown in the position shown would enable the requisite sightlines to be provided for the 40mph currently in force on High Lane. In addition, this position would give a stagger distance of 20m with the rear access track serving the properties on the opposite side of the road.

Compatibility with the Larger Site to the Rear It is noted that the West Lancashire District Council newly published Local Plan includes this site together with a much larger area adjacent for residential development as illustrated in an extract from the Council's masterplan, which I attach for convenience. As can be seen the masterplan for the larger site envisages two access points to serve the potential residential development. One of which is across the frontage located between the Hilbre site and the existing properties close to the A59 junction with the B5319 Burscough Road. Such an access junction at this location is likely to take the form of a priority 'ghost island' junction. Consequently, in order to accommodate the carriageway widening to from the 'ghost island' and to get the necessary visibility splays, it is likely that the access will need to be positioned roughly centrally within the larger site frontage. This would result in a separation distance of over 40, to the likely Hilbre development access which I consider would be sufficient to prevent operational impacts on either access. In summary therefore, I conclude that it should be possible to serve the Hilbre development with in access directly onto High Lane and that such an access should not prejudice any subsequent access arrangements for the larger designated site adjacent.

Attachments included?

Council response:

The Council acknowledges that the dwellings fronting High Lane, including Hilbre, have large gardens and so could offer some development potential. However, it is preferable to require such potential to come forward as part of a holistic and inclusive development. In addition, the Highways Authority has noted that it would not be inclined to support a proposal for increased accesses along High Lane, above and beyond the two proposed accesses that are set out within the indicative site layout. However, an amendment to the wording to indicate that the land to the rear of the properties fronting High Lane should come forward as part of the wider development site and that separate access should only be permitted if it is demonstrated safe to do so to the standard of the Highways Authority, Lancashire County Council can be included within the final document.

Mr Nick Eckersley

Organisation

Comments:

There are proposals supporting the electrification of the railway between Ormskirk and Burscough and which are likely to form part of the transport masterplanning for the area. This should be specifically mentioned in the design brief as there is potential for considerably more train movements than currently exists. This will have implications for the land bordering the railway line.

Attachments included?

Council response:

The railway line has been identified as a potential constraint which may have noise implications for this part of the site. The Development Brief requires careful assessment of noise implications to be considered and any required mitigation measures to be proposed as part of the supporting documentation for a planning application.

Mr Stewart Griffiths

Organisation

Comments:

My home is adjacent to Ellerbrook and my ground floor was flooded in 1994. We have never received a satisfactory explanation from WLDC or Wainhomes why the stream banks were never constructed to a height where our homes would be safe from fluctuating water levels. We therefore strongly object to more properties being built alongside this stream due to the impact they would have on the existing properties and water flow. We selected this house in 1988 as a small 'infill estate', not wanting to be part of a large estate structure from which we had left in Maghull. Our house is adjacent to 'The Pines' play area and the plan to link the new estate through it, is completely unacceptable. An estate of 300 houses should have its own play area due to the number of families new housing will attract. The idea of a linear path and cycle track may sound attractive, but the existing linear pathway from Ormskirk Station to Old Boundary Way is not maintained, is unlit from 7pm, therefore attracts loitering and is unsafe. The whole area is littered with plastic bags, drink cans and bottles. The new pathway will be a continuation of the same.

Attachments included?

Council response:

The Council acknowledges concerns in relation to flood risk for the site and surrounding area. However, the Development Brief and wider planning policy requires that a sustainable drainage system is included within the design of this site. SuDS provide an opportunity to address existing flood risk issues and those that may be generated as a result of development. Ellerbrook, which is currently channelised, will form a central part of this drainage system and improvements are likely to reduce the occurrence of any localised flood risk. Early engagement with Lancashire County Council, the Lead Local Flood Authority is required and all SuDS will need to be approved by them as part of the planning application process.

Whilst there are some reservations from residents about the location of the new linear park and the quality of the existing link, the Council is satisfied that the linear park will be a success in providing an off road cycle and walking link to connect Burcough and north of Ormskirk with Ormskirk town centre and transport links. However, it is noted that the siting of this immediately adjacent to existing properties has caused some concern amongst local residents. Therefore, the indicative plan within the Development Brief will be amended to show a location set further into the site.

The existing play area is a small equipped play area which does not currently comply with the Council policy of providing "Fewer, Bigger, Better" equipped play areas. This would mean that our current policy would be to remove it rather than replace it when it became degraded. This site provides an opportunity to improve and expand this existing play area into the Grove Farm site to provide new and improved open space provision for existing and future residents of the area.

Dr

Stephen

Hanlon

Organisation

Comments:

At first glance, the development plans look reasonable. My main concern is that any development along High Lane should also include measures to calm the speed of the traffic along High Lane. As the volume of traffic has increased over the past few years, the speed is still quite high and it is generally taking much longer to pull out on to the A59 than it did when we moved here 7 years ago. Any development will increase the amount of traffic on the road and could make it difficult for ourselves or our neighbours to join the main road. Please could you include some measures to mitigate the increased traffic as part of any scheme that is brought forward to the planning committee. On a slightly more personal level, it would be better to be overlooking residential housing rather than elderly housing, as I suspect the elderly housing would be a large building similar to those built elsewhere in the town, while residential housing would have less of an impact. I appreciate that visual amenity is not something that we can use to oppose a planning application, but it would be good if the neighbours opposite could be considered at this early stage, especially as there is a lot of land further up the A59 which isn't overlooked by anyone.

Attachments included?

Council response:

The Council appreciates that there are a number of local concerns regarding the existing highways arrangements along the A59 including speed of traffic and existing traffic flows. It is also acknowledged that the development of this site offers the potential to improve road safety at this location. Therefore, through the Development Brief, the Council will require the applicant to produce a full Traffic Assessment and Travel Plan for the site and that the scope of these documents is agreed in advance with the Highways Authority, Lancashire County Council. This requirement ensures that the specific concerns referred to within your representation, such as the potential need for traffic calming measures and speed restrictions along the A59 at this location, will be given full consideration before planning consent may be granted.

Housing to meet the needs of the elderly population can be delivered through a variety of accommodation types such as bungalows, modified two storey homes, apartment style accommodation and extra care facilities. Planning policy requires that this type of accommodation is provided on the site and that it should be in the most accessible location possible with good access to the road and bus stops. However, the plan is indicative only and does not necessarily indicate the final location for elderly accommodation. The proposal, when submitted as a planning application will be required to be designed to consider the context of the existing environment and the impact on the amenity of surrounding properties. Therefore, any issues relating to scale and size will be picked up as a matter of course through a planning application.

Mrs	Sandra	Jones
-----	--------	-------

Organisation	
--------------	--

Comments:

The comment below is submitted on behalf of Newburgh Parish Council in my role as Parish Clerk. Newburgh Parish Council is extremely concerned about the increased levels of traffic through the village, which are likely to be generated from this housing development and others such as Firswood Road in Skelmersdale, Yew Tree Farm in Burscough and Whalleys in Skelmersdale. It is possible that hundreds of extra vehicles will travel on the A5209 through the village every day especially at peak times. This will impact not only on the quality of life for residents but will also affect the condition of the road which has suffered from flooding/surface water in recent years. It is acknowledged that additional housing is required in the Borough but it is essential that both the County Council and Borough Council make it a priority to address the impact that these housing developments are going to have on the local road network to mitigate the impact on local residents.

Attachments included?

Council response:

This site, along with the other larger housing sites, has been given full consideration by Lancashire County Council as the Highways Authority during the Local Plan development process. Therefore, the likely rise in traffic within the Borough and the principle of development on this site has been established through the adoption of the Local Plan. However, through the Development Brief, the Council will require the applicant to produce a full Traffic Assessment and Travel Plan for the site and that the scope of these documents is agreed in advance with the Highways Authority.. This requirement ensures that your concerns about possible routing of traffic will be given full consideration before planning consent may be granted.

Mr

Thomas

McVeigh

Organisation

Comments:

I am very concerned to see what I thought was going to be a small grassed buffer area to the side and rear of my property, is now allocated to housing? This is despite seeing at your offices some time ago a plan showing a small grassed area to the side and rear of my property. I was also told at the time that no houses would directly back onto my property. I would have also have thought that this small buffer area is the least you can do to see that existing properties are not cramped together with the new development. I would also have thought that this is the very least you can do for my wife and I who are both in our seventies, after inflicting this development upon us on what we thought would always be greenbelt land. Surely you have a responsibility for the developer to respect the existing households next to the site and not allow them to build as many houses as possible only to enhance their profits. Hoping these comments may alter the plans.

Attachments included?

Council response:

The Development Brief includes a layout that is indicative only and the final layout of housing and landscaping will be agreed at planning application stage. However, the Council acknowledges the concern of local residents relating to the retaining of existing landscaping features and the appropriate boundary designs which will, in many parts of the site include additional landscaping and planting. Therefore, the indicative layout will be amended to better reflect the existing green buffers around the site and those that are likely to come forward through the development of this site. The Development Brief will also ensure a full landscaping scheme will form part of the planning application and appropriate separation distances between existing and proposed properties will be a fundamental part of the site design in order for planning consent to be granted.

Mr Geoff Roberts

Organisation

Comments:

As seen in the Somerset area in 2014 flooding is only becoming worse. I have concerns that the new estate will exacerbate the existing flooding issues surrounding the pine grove estate and should the brook become blocked or excess water from the new development not have adequate drainage this will back up onto the Pine Grove Housing Estate causing flooding. Is it wise to build on/next to a known flood plain when flooding on the Pine Avenue estate is well documented with nobody having ever taken responsibility. The natural flood plain will now be lost. Should my worst fears be confirmed and flooding occurs who will be responsible and what provision will be in place to remedy the situation and compensate the existing home owners for their losses and the negative impact to their homes/properties. I also have concerns about the extra bodies from the new 300+ houses and the footfall from the Linear Park passing through Pine Grove Estate as this appears to be the planned thoroughfare. Presently everyone is known to everyone on the estate however with the proposed changes this will be akin to living on a main road. The park is too small to cater for the new housing estate and was only designed to cater for the existing 50 houses. It is designed for small children only and I am concerned about potential unruly behaviour. Are there plans to alter the park to make provision for the people coming off the new estate and the linear park as currently there is no path. Concerns for the existing bats and wildlife and the loss of their habitat. What provision will be made to protect them.

Attachments included?

Council response:

The Council acknowledges concerns in relation to flood risk for the site and surrounding area. However, the Development Brief and wider planning policy requires that a sustainable drainage system is included within the design of this site. SuDS provide an opportunity to address existing flood risk issues and those that may be generated as a result of development. The existing brook, which is currently channelised, will form a central part of this drainage system and improvements are likely to reduce the occurrence of any localised flood risk. Early engagement with Lancashire County Council, the Lead Local Flood Authority is required and all SuDS will need to be approved by them as part of the planning application process.

Whilst the new linear park access will encourage cycling and walking from the Grove Farm site and beyond, it is unlikely that it will create an environment akin to living on a 'main road' as is noted within the representation. Not least because this access is not for vehicular traffic. The proposal for a linear park is required to deliver an off road cycle and walking link to connect Burcough and north of Ormskirk with Ormskirk town centre and transport links. However, it is noted that the siting of this immediately adjacent to existing properties has caused some concern amongst local residents. Therefore, the indicative plan within the Development Brief will be amended to show a location set further into the site.

The existing play area is a small equipped play area which does not currently comply with the Council policy of providing "Fewer, Bigger, Better" equipped play areas. This would mean that our current policy would be to remove it rather than replace it when it became degraded. This site provides an opportunity to improve and expand this existing play area into the Grove Farm site to provide new and improved open space provision for existing and future residents of the area.

Through the allocation of this site in the Local Plan, consideration was given to the impacts of development on wildlife and ecology. This assessment did not raise any serious concerns that would prevent the principle of development being acceptable in this location. However, the Development Brief requires that at planning application stage the site is assessed or screened for its compliance with the Habitats Regulation Assessments so that any ecological issues may be identified and any mitigation measures may be proposed in order to ensure ecological protection.

Ms	Caroline	Simpson (NLP)
----	----------	---------------

Organisation	NLP
--------------	-----

Comments:

West Lancashire: Draft Grove Farm Development Brief

We write on behalf of our client, Taylor Wimpey UK Limited, to make formal representations on the Grove Farm Development Brief. These representations are subsequent to the recent meeting with your colleague Gillian Whitfield (9th January 2013) in which myself and Andrew Thorley (Taylor Wimpey UK Limited) went through our comments on the document. It was agreed at the meeting that we would work with the Council on the preparation of the document going forwards, to ensure that it facilitates the delivery of the Grove Farm Site, which is a key housing site in the Council's five year housing land supply contributing some 300 dwellings to the town of Ormskirk.

General Comment

Taylor Wimpey considers that there is unnecessary repetition throughout the document and the document could be far more concise if the Council deleted some of the sections. Whilst it was discussed at the meeting that the Adopted Local Plan and guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework [Framework] provide certainty in respect of development viability, we request that a section is included in the document to cross refer viability to the Framework [173] which states: "To ensure viability, the costs of any requirements likely to be applied to development, such as requirements for affordable housing, standards, infrastructure contributions or other requirements should, when taking account of the normal cost of development and mitigation, provide competitive returns to a willing land owner and developer to enable the development to be deliverable." There should be an acknowledgement in the document of the fact that all the policy and infrastructure requirements could impact on the viability of the development. The ability to submit viability information should be expressed clearly within the document and recognise that the council's requirements will have to be considered in the context of this deliverability test.

Introduction

Whilst we acknowledge that the Development Brief is not a Supplementary Planning Document it needs to summarise how it has been prepared and consulted upon. It should also include a short statement indicating that it has been prepared in conformity with the Statement of Community Involvement.

Vision & Key Principles

The 'Vision & Key Principles' chapter states that: "The housing aspect of the development will need to include a good mix of housing types to meet all local needs, including 35% affordable and up to 20% to meet the needs of older persons. Cross over between the two types of provision may be acceptable subject to the needs at the time of development i.e. some of the affordable housing element may also count toward meeting the provision for the elderly." Taylor Wimpey UK Limited considers that the drafting of the provision of the affordable housing and needs of older persons does not accord with the existing development plan policy and should be clarified to ensure that the 35% includes the provision for older people. The provision of affordable housing at the site should also be appropriately referenced in accordance with the Framework [§173] which states: "Pursuing sustainable development requires careful attention to viability and costs in plan-making and decision-taking. Plans should be deliverable. Therefore, the sites and the scale of development identified in the plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened. To ensure viability, the costs of any requirements likely to be applied to development, such as requirements for affordable housing, standards, infrastructure contributions or other requirements should, when taking account of the normal cost of development and mitigation, provide competitive returns to a willing land owner and willing developer to enable the development to be deliverable. Taylor Wimpey UK Limited proposes the following replacement wording: "The development will include a mix of housing types to meet local needs. These needs will be assessed and quantified at the time of development and will include the needs of the affordable and older persons tenure types. Any quantified need will not undermine the viability of the Grove Farm site, and will be limited to a maximum of 35% affordable housing, including provision to meet the needs of older people." The 'Vision & Key Principles' chapter goes on to state that: "Any new development to meet Code for Sustainable Homes Level 3 as a minimum standard for new residential development, rising to Level 4 and Level 6 in line with the increases to Part L of the Building Regulations." Taylor Wimpey objects to the inclusion of the Code for Sustainable Homes in this document as it is unnecessary to repeat national requirements and the provisions of the Adopted Local Plan [Policy EN1]. It is requested that this requirement is deleted from the brief. When the new code level standards increase it is imperative that the Brief facilitates the delivery of a viable development. Therefore, if the Council chooses to leave the Code levels wording in the brief, an allowance to submit viability information should be provided.

The Site & Context

"Grove Farm comprises of 13.2ha of greenbelt land which has been released through the Local Plan 2012-2027 for

residential development.” Taylor Wimpey UK Limited objects to the inclusion of wording which suggests the site is still within the Green Belt. Grove Farm no longer forms part of the Green Belt, and any reference in this regard should be deleted. Grove Farm is now designated for housing in the Local Plan [Policy RS1(a)].

Context Plan

Taylor Wimpey considers that it would be useful to include a key on the Context Plan so it is clear what the plan is showing.

Technical Constraints Noise
“The site falls mainly within Noise Exposure Category B during both daytime and night time periods.” Noise exposure categories refer to guidance which has now been withdrawn. The guidance was contained within Planning Policy Guidance 24 (Planning and Noise) which has now been replaced by the National Planning Policy Framework. It is imperative that the development brief is based upon current policy.

Agricultural Classification

The Development Brief refers to the agricultural land classification of the site. Taylor Wimpey objects to this inclusion and requests that this reference is deleted. It is of no longer of relevance given that the site has been allocated for residential development. **Design Principles & Objectives Reducing Climate Change** The Development Brief [p13] states: “It is important that any development will take into account sustainable design and construction methods, whilst meeting the Code for Sustainable Homes requirement as set out in policy EN1 of the West Lancs Local Plan 2012-2027 and through the use of renewable energy.” Taylor Wimpey objects to the inclusion of this statement given it is a repetition of existing Local Plan Policy EN1. As stated above it is not necessary to repeat this requirement in the Brief.

Transport

The Development Brief states [p13]: “There is capacity within the highway network to accommodate at least 400 dwellings, with limited highway improvements.” Taylor Wimpey UK Limited query whether there is a typographic error in this part of the document as earlier parts of the document say 300 dwellings

Development Requirements

Quantum and mix of development The Development Brief states [p15]: “Development on Grove Farm is proposed to deliver at least 300 dwellings and approximately 1.5 ha of public open space.” Taylor Wimpey UK Limited requests that the wording is extended to refer to the relevant adopted Local Plan Policy or Supplementary Planning Guidance. The Development Brief states [p15]: “The allocation of affordable homes and elderly provision is determined by policies RS1 and RS2 of the Local Plan.” As previously outlined, the combination of the two requirements, 35% affordable and 20% older persons should be clarified in the context of the above comments. Taylor Wimpey UK Limited also welcomes the acceptance of flexibility in the delivery of non-market housing as adopted within policy RS2 of the Local Plan. The Development Brief [p15] states: “Any subsequent application or applications will be required to attend a Places Matter design review panel, at the expense of the applicant.” Taylor Wimpey UK Limited strongly objects to the requirement to provide a ‘Places Matter design review panel’. As a responsible house builder, Taylor Wimpey UK Limited engages in extensive consultation prior to the submission of planning applications. Taylor Wimpey looks to work with officers, members and local communities. It is considered that an unrepresentative design review panel is not necessary or appropriate for this scale of development and this document assists in the delivery of a high quality designed development.

Sustainability requirements

The Development Brief states [p15]: “The required minimum design standards for Grove Farm are, to achieve the Code for Sustainable Homes Level 3 as a minimum standard for new residential development, rising to Level 4 and Level 6 in line with the increases to Part L of the Building Regulations.” We refer to earlier comments made in this regard. The Development Brief states [p15]: “Attention is to be drawn to the requirement for Electrical Vehicle Charging Points (Policy IF2), each dwelling is required to provide a charging point and communal parking areas should provide at least 1 space for charging or a 10% of spaces on site, whichever is the greater.” Taylor Wimpey UK Limited accepts the need to provide electrical vehicle charging points within residential dwellings with garages, but objects to their provision in communal areas at this stage because their provision is dependent on the type of housing delivered. If no communal parking is to be provided on the scheme then no charging points should be provided. Taylor Wimpey requests that there is flexibility in the delivery of the electrical vehicle charging points in communal areas as it is considered that they have a visual effect on the quality of the environment. **Land Use Plan** Taylor Wimpey UK Limited objects to the use of the ‘Land Use Plan’ in its current form and requests that the location of older person housing and affordable is not indicated on the land use plan at this stage as it prevents flexibility when preparing the masterplan for the future planning application. The inclusion of text for its delivery is adequate at this stage. **Development Process Outline of potential planning obligations** Taylor Wimpey UK Limited recognises the importance of ensuring that any negative impacts associated with new development can be mitigated by making appropriate contributions to improvements in local infrastructure. However, as a commercial organisation, it also understands that new development cannot be achieved if it is unviable. Taylor Wimpey is

therefore keen to ensure they are not double charged for obligations while the Council's CIL document progresses. The Development Brief lists Green Infrastructure as an item that could be funded through planning obligations. It is noted that this requirement will be satisfied on site. Contributions listed within this part of the development brief also include affordable housing. Taylor Wimpey UK Limited would like to discuss the flexibility of the Council in this instance in allowing some affordable housing to be provided off site.

Required Supporting Information

The list of documents required to validate a planning application are listed in the brief. It is requested that the details of affordable housing can be provided within the Planning Statement. It is not necessary to have a separate Affordable Housing Statement. We envisage that the contaminated land report will comprise a 'Phase II Site Investigation'. It is unlikely that a draft section 106 Agreement would be prepared at the submission stage. A draft Heads of Terms document should however be required to validate the application. The validation requirement to provide a detailed Landscaping Scheme and Parking & Access Arrangements are only necessary when a full planning application or reserved matters application is submitted. Taylor Wimpey respectfully requests that the Council considers our representations in the further drafting of the Development Brief.

Attachments included?

Council response:

General comments regarding layout, typographical errors and repetition will be addressed in the final drafting of the development brief.

Comments about viability are noted and it is agreed that some clarity can be provided. However, the document need not repeat local or national planning policy in respect of the need for development to remain deliverable and viable.

Reference to the preparation of the document is useful and will be included within the document.

Cross over between affordable housing and elderly person's accommodation is acceptable where it can be demonstrated that this is necessary to ensure delivery of such types of accommodation and the overall development, as noted in Policy RS2. However, further detail will be provided in the final Development Brief which sets out the most up to date evidence relating to affordable and elderly housing provision, in order to provide additional guidance to applicants using the brief.

Unnecessary references to code levels will be removed and a constraints and opportunities plan will be included as suggested.

The sites planning history e.g. GreenBelt designation and former agricultural classification will either been removed or more clearly defined.

The section of the document referring to noise will be updated to reflect the latest guidance. However, the Council have included the requirement of an independent design review panel within the development brief as it is in accordance with Para 62 of the NPPF. "Local planning authorities should have local design review arrangements in place to provide assessment and support to ensure high standards of design. They should also when appropriate refer major projects for a national design review. In general, early engagement on design produces the greatest benefits. In assessing applications, local planning authorities should have regard to the recommendations from the design review panel."

The requirement for electric vehicle recharging points is reflective of current planning policy requirements (Policy IF2) and so cannot be discounted without evidence to suggest why.

The land use plan is indicative only. However, the key will be clarified to demonstrate that elderly accommodation need not be fixed to that sole location if a more preferred distribution is offered.

The planning contributions section will also be simplified to ensure no cross over between Community Infrastructure Levy and Section 106 funded items.

Comments noted regarding supporting information requirements and these will be considered in the final drafting

the development brief.

Mr

Alan

Snape

Organisation

Comments:

The site in question is and always has been a quagmire why do you think it is never planted with crops – too much groundwater! 300+ dwellings, hard surfaces will greatly exacerbate this problem and brook continually floods, and affects existing dwelling around play area! Water table high! Where will surface water discharge to – into brook? How much volume will there be – same question applies to foul water sewers for which are already at capacity. Which idiot thought up the idea for a linear footway when there are already exists a satisfactory footpath system all along the A59 to Burscough! The existing linear footpaths across the pads from here to the rail interchange is always a disgusting mess of litter and general detritus which is never cleared away on a regular basis!! This new one will become just the same given time I will bet on it! Two vehicular access points on to the A59 – which idiot thought up this proposal – has anybody done a traffic census/survey, particularly morning/evening work/school runs?? It is difficult at the best of times to get out of Burscough Road on to the A59, with the current volume of traffic – what a nightmare will unfold with a further 300++ vehicular movements on to this already congested route.

Attachments included?

Council response:

The Council acknowledges concerns in relation to flood risk for the site and surrounding area. However, the Development Brief and wider planning policy requires that a sustainable drainage system is included within the design of this site. SuDS provide an opportunity to address existing flood risk issues and those that may be generated as a result of development. The existing brook, which is currently channelised, will form a central part of this drainage system and improvements are likely to reduce the occurrence of any localised flood risk. Early engagement with Lancashire County Council, the Lead Local Flood Authority is required and all SuDS will need to be approved by them as part of the planning application process. In addition, the Development Brief requires the development of this site to remove an amount of surface water out of the existing network to be treated on site that is the equivalent to the foul flows that will be generated through the site. This should result in no net increase in flows through the existing system to the waste water treatment works at New Lane, Burscough.

The proposal for a "linear footway" is actually a linear park. The justification for this is the need for an off road cycle and walking link to connect Burcough and north of Ormskirk with Ormskirk town centre and transport links. Lancashire County Council Highways Authority Officers have carried out a high level initial assessment of the traffic implications for the Grove Farm site. Two vehicular access points at this location are considered both deliverable and appropriate. Through the Development Brief, the Council will require the applicant to produce a full Traffic Assessment and Travel Plan for the site and that the scope of these documents is agreed in advance with the Highways Authority. This requirement ensures that the specific concerns referred to within your representation, such as speed of traffic and congestion along the A59, will be given full consideration before planning consent may be granted.

Mrs Lynda Snape

Organisation

Comments:

When I visited Ormskirk Library I was very disappointed to see the number of houses proposed for Grove Park had risen to 300++!! Flooding has been a problem on "The Pines" estate in the past. I am now even more concerned that this will happen again. The land proposed for building lies low – below the existing housing and the culvert easily gets blocked with debris. Worse still is the position of the proposed walkway to Burscough – immediately behind our property – noise, litter, nuisance, lighting, all of which will increase with foot fall along the path. In addition – why –oh, why put the exit to Pine Avenue and not Burscough Road through the proposed exit path will go straight through the very small kiddies park adjacent to our property. The park was designed with raised "humps" to stop ballgames being played so the only route from the new walk way onto Pine Avenue will be within a couple of feet of our house boundary. In the past we have had problems with youths congregating on the park and one weekend I found 17 ¼ bottles of vodka empty!! Along with associated other litter – hypodermic needles (used), coke bottles, crisp packets and cigarette packets etc. The litter around Ormskirk is awful and this new path will only add to this problem. The obvious exit route would be onto the main Burscough Road – the Old Farm Gate entrance. At least then we would only have "passing traffic" walking/cycling passing the end of our garden and not going past two sides of our property. We live in a small cul-de-sac and the proposed traffic, walking and cycling will change the dynamics of the area we live – we thought we were living on the edge of countryside!!

Attachments included?

Council response:

The number of dwellings (300) was identified within the Local Plan some time ago and was subsequently adopted by the Council in October 2013.

The Council acknowledges concerns in relation to flood risk for the site and surrounding area. However, the Development Brief and wider planning policy requires that a sustainable drainage system is including within the design of this site. SuDS provide an opportunity to address existing flood risk issues and those that may be generated as a result of development. The existing brook, which is currently channelised, will form a central part of this drainage system and improvements are likely to reduce the occurrence of any localised flood risk. Early engagement with Lancashire County Council, the Lead Local Flood Authority is required and all SuDS will need to be approved by them as part of the planning application process.

The proposal for a "walkway" to Burscough is actually a linear park. The justification for this is the need for an off road cycle and walking link to connect Burcough and north of Ormskirk with Ormskirk town centre and transport links. However, it is noted that the siting of this immediately adjacent to existing properties has caused some concern amongst local residents. Therefore, the indicative plan within the Development Brief will be amended to show a location set further into the site. Whilst concerns regarding the location of the linear park exit have been noted, the Council does not consider that the impact on amenity of the nearest properties would be so great that this proposal should be amended. Furthermore, whilst access through to Burscough Road will also be encouraged, the route through Pine Avenue offers a safer option for walkers and cyclists to link up with the Ormskirk linear path to the station.

The existing play area is a small equipped play area which does not currently comply with the Council policy of providing "Fewer, Bigger, Better" equipped play areas. This would mean that our current policy would be to remove it rather than replace it when it became degraded. This site provides an opportunity to improve and expand this existing play area into the Grove Farm site to provide new and improved open space provision for existing and future residents of the area.

Ms	Alice	Ullathorne
----	-------	------------

Organisation	
--------------	--

Comments:

The grade II* listed Bath Lodge was built in the mid-18th century and its function remains enigmatic. It seems to have been used as a folly, hunting lodge and intriguingly the site might have originated as a cold water plunge bath in the late 17th century. The lodge was built by the Stanley family on the Lathom Hall estate. The building has been subject to some modification since its original construction but retains a distinctive appearance in red brick embattled Gothic style. The grade II* status places Bath Lodge within the top 8% of listed buildings nationally. Key elements that add to the significance of the building include its intriguing history; its Gothick style represented by architectural detailing and symmetry; and its materials and craftsmanship. To the east of the development site adjacent to the proposed linear park is the site of Burscough Augustinian Priory scheduled monument. The above ground remains (listed at grade I) are just a fragment of the priory but the underground remains are believed to be extensive with evidence documenting all elements of monastic life. The priory was founded by Robert Fitz Henry Lord of Lathom and Knowsley in c. 1190 and most of the buildings had been demolished by the end of the 16th century following the dissolution of the monasteries. The monument is significant for its evidential value in the below ground remains; in its aesthetic value in the fragments that remain as well as those yet to be discovered; and in its historical value telling the story of one of the most important parts of our national story as well as one of its most turbulent episodes. The development brief is for 300 houses on Grove Farm including a linear park connecting Ormskirk to Burscough. The development site is at a sensitive heritage location being positioned 100m to the north of the grade II* listed Bath Lodge and within 2km of Burscough Scheduled Monument. The development of the houses on Grove Farm will have an impact on the setting of the grade II* Bath Lodge. The rural setting of the surroundings in which it is experienced so cannot be limited to what can be seen from the building itself. We would hope that the harm caused by the development could be mitigated through other heritage benefits such as heritage interpretation within the development, connection through the linear park to Burscough Priory Scheduled Monument or even repairs to the remains of Burscough Priory. To assess the visual impact of the development we recommend that you use the methodology in English Heritage's setting guidance (<http://www.helm.org.uk/guidance-library/setting-heritage-assets/>) and Seeing the History in View (<http://www.helm.org.uk/guidance-library/seeing-history-view/>). The design and heights of the new house on Grove Farm will affect the level of harm caused by the development. We would hope that a high quality of design would be achieved in line with NPPF paras 56-61. We welcome a development brief to inform the appropriate development of houses on Grove Farm, however, we would like to see it address the opportunities for the mitigation to harm to Bath Lodge; such as the use of heritage interpretation, the connection of the development to Burscough Priory or the repair of the priory. These could be specified in the section of the document detailing potential planning contributions.

Attachments included?

Council response:

The Council notes the proximity of the development site to the Grade II* Bath Lodge. However, it is considered that the existing railway line and proposed linear park will act as a substantial buffer, not only from a visual point of view but as a physical barrier limiting the interaction between the Grove Farm site and Bath Lodge surroundings. Any planning application for the Grove Farm site will be required to provide a Heritage Statement and engage with the HER date record and the County Archaeologist. If, through the planning application, it is considered that there is a requirement for mitigation to any of the surrounding heritage features near to Grove Farm as a result of the proposals, the Council could use a Section 106 obligation to secure this. However, it is not considered appropriate at this stage to include a specific requirement as this would need to be demonstrated at the time of the planning application and clearly show how the obligation accords with the tests of securing a Section 106 in line with Community Infrastructure Levy Regulation 122.