

CONSULTATION SUMMARY REPORT

Draft Masterplan
Yew Tree Farm, Burscough

December 2014

CONTENTS

1. Introduction
2. Consultation & publicity methods
3. Summary of comments
4. Council actions and influences on the Masterplan
5. Next steps

Appendices

Appendix 1 – Consultation Representations and the Council's Responses

1. Introduction

The development of a Masterplan for the Yew Tree Farm site as a Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD) will give supporting guidance for this development which has been identified as a strategic site through the Local Plan. Masterplans can be used to establish how a site may be laid out to accommodate the development and which areas of the site may be safeguarded for future development purposes.

Masterplans are normally prepared in consultation with the public and stakeholders such as infrastructure providers, regulatory authorities and, where appropriate, the developers, land owners and those with an interest in the land.

In accordance with this, and in addition to the work the Council has carried out with a specific group of stakeholders, the Council prepared Draft Masterplan for consultation following a previous series of Options for the Masterplan and publically consulted on them between 9 October and 21 November 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 Final Masterplan will be shaped as a direct result of the comments received, to illustrate how consultation informs decision making.

It should be acknowledged that the Council do consider all comments received, although may not always agree with opinions and therefore changes cannot be made in all cases. The Council is required to make balanced decisions, taking into account the views from all sides.

2. Consultation and publicity methods

The Council publicised consultation on the Draft Masterplan through the following methods:

- Half page press advert in the free, local Champion paper
- Leaflet distributed to all homes and businesses in Burscough
- Email / letters to all consultees on the consultation database, including statutory consultees
- Press release
- Posters displayed in Burscough shops and Burscough Bridge rail station
- Council website and social media (Facebook)

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

- At four exhibitions (two held mid-week 2-7pm, two held on Saturdays 10am-4pm)
- By email
- By phone
- In person at Council offices

Consultation materials were available to read at:

- Libraries
- Council offices
- On the Council Website

Comments were invited through

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

3. Summary of comments received

48 comments were received on the Draft Yew Tree Farm Masterplan. A report containing those comments, in full, can be found on the Council webpage at www.westlancs.gov.uk/YTF or in Appendix 1 to this document. Comments generally focused on a series of key concerns, as set out below.

Traffic, highways and transport

There were concerns expressed about creation of a new access road on the A59 given the proximity of a new junction to Lordsgate Primary school, and the ensuing fears for the safety of children. Many emphasised the problems that parents parking vehicles to drop off / collect their children creates to congestion and suggested that parking areas be provided to resolve this issue.

Some consultees registered their doubts over whether accurate assessments have been undertaken in relation to increased traffic flows and the impact on local roads, including 'pinch points'. Concerns were registered over the current speed of traffic, and the creation, or worsening, of existing rat –runs. Consultees questioned whether the recommendations of the surveys, for example remodelling junctions, would sufficiently address and resolve the identified issues.

A number of consultees suggested alternative locations for the proposed new junction onto the A59., Other consultees suggested additional accesses should be considered such as support for an access at Meadowbrook. However, significant opposition to any other access along the A59 including any via Meadowbrook was also registered by Lancashire County Council as the Highways Authority.

Support was registered for a 20mph speed limit on the internal road network of the site and encouraging delivery of cycle and footpaths.

It was highlighted that parking provision at the rail stations is insufficient with few available spaces.

There were concerns over traffic and flooding in areas outside of Burscough, including Scarisbrick.

It was suggested that access to the employment land should be separate from the residential use to avoid adverse impact on residential occupiers. Creation of new roads should take into account the diversion of industrial traffic away from the residential areas.

LCC submitted a series of recommendations and suggestions for vehicular access, cycle and pedestrian link, incorporation of existing public footpaths into the linear park, and internal roads which would support public transport services.

Council response

Lancashire County Council (LCC), as the local Highways Authority, have carried out initial strategic traffic modelling at the Local Plan site allocation stage, more localised traffic counts and modelling within Burscough alongside the Masterplan process, and have provided the Borough Council with their professional view in terms of the requirements of the Masterplan and how the site interacts with the highway, and both vehicular and sustainable transport measures.

In addition, the Masterplan will require that all applications for development are supported by a full Transport Assessment and Travel Plan, the scope of which should be agreed with the Highways Authority in advance of submission.

The Council is satisfied that the principles set out within the Final Masterplan, along with the additional detailed work required at planning application stage, will ensure measures are delivered to help mitigate the impacts of traffic on the local highway network and to encourage cycling and walking over car use.

Drainage and flooding

Many of the comments cited the issues relating to surface water problems, including flooding, on the site and registered concerns that these problems would be exacerbated once building commences. There were concerns that attenuation ponds would be insufficient.

Reassurances were requested that flooding issues will be tackled prior to, or during, development to ensure flooding does not occur on the site or within the surrounding area. Further surveys and evidence were requested to ensure that property and land will not be at risk. Some wanted reassurances as to which agencies would be responsible for resolving any issues, should problems occur in the future following development.

Concerns were registered over the safety of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) in the event children fell in to open water.

Council response

The Council acknowledges that there are issues with surface water within Burscough and are committed to ensuring that surface water problems are not exacerbated.

In addition, Policy SP3 of the Local Plan and the Masterplan both require that works are undertaken to remove some surface water from the existing system that runs through Burscough and deal with this on-site along with the development's own surface water. This will ensure that any additional waste water (foul) flows that must go into the system are offset by the removal of surface water flows. This may also

result in some improvements to the network as a whole.

However, land drainage beyond the extent of the site is a complex issue and whilst the Masterplan will seek to ensure this site does not worsen the situation, planning cannot control all matters beyond the site in question.

Lancashire County Council are the responsible body, as the Lead Local Flood Authority, for managing flood risk. The Flood and Water Management Act (FWMA) sets out the requirements of the LLFA to manage local flood risk (surface water, groundwater and flooding from ordinary watercourses) within their area. Other Risk Management Authorities (RMA), such as the Environment Agency (EA) are responsible for other sources of flooding e.g. the EA is responsible RMA for coastal and main river flooding.

In light of the current DEFRA and DCLG “Delivering Sustainable Drainage Systems” consultation, the current position of the LLFA as the adopting body for SuDS is uncertain. West Lancashire Borough Council have stated that until further guidance is provided, West Lancashire Borough Council will act as the adopting body for SuDS systems.

Education

Many consultees cited concerns that the primary schools and secondary schools in Burscough are already at capacity and cannot take on more pupils.

It was proposed that provision for a school should be contained within the safeguarded land, so that a need could be assessed later down the line.

Council response

Lancashire County Council, as the Education Authority, has provided a high level analysis of the impacts of the site on both primary and secondary education. The analysis is clear that the assessment is a snapshot in time and may not be accurate as time progresses given the length of time it may take to deliver this site in its entirety. Therefore, assumptions may change in future.

In terms of primary school provision, the information available at the time of the Final Masterplan indicates that even with the impact of the Yew Tree Farm development in 2019 and in 2024 there will be sufficient provision within existing primary schools to accommodate demand.

However, a shortfall of 37 places is expected in 2029. A financial contribution would be sought through a Section 106 agreement in line with West Lancashire’s CIL Policy for education.

In terms of secondary school provision, there is one such school in Burscough,

which will offer sufficient provision to accommodation up to 2024.

In 2028, there is expected to be a shortfall of 6 places for which a financial contribution will be sought from a Section 106 agreement.

Beyond 2027, a total of 500 dwellings are proposed on the site.. As this information is likely to change a great deal by 2027 there is limited benefit from producing pupil projection on this long term plan.

Community services and retail

Consultees registered concerns that development of the YTF site would threaten the integrity, vitality, viability and sustainability of the shops and services currently in the centre of Burscough.

The YTF site should provide some element of outdoor play space along with a linear park.

It was noted that flexibility should be applied to the type of retail and local facilities to be located within the Yew Tree Farm site to ensure they are truly required and driven by market forces. In addition, a number of representations stated that the local facilities should be located within the centre of the site rather than close to the A59 to ensure they would serve the majority of the homes on the site and the employment area. However, there was an expression for the retail element of the site to be located further towards the frontage of the A59.

Council response

Comments relating to community services and local facilities, including small scale retail were all welcomed. The Council will ensure that the Final Masterplan focuses any improved community facilities within the existing Burscough centre. The Final Masterplan should also ensure that any onsite retail and / or local facilities are delivered closer to the centre of the site to ensure the best catchment area and that the components of such facilities are given a degree of flexibility to avoid the land being sterilised in the event the market does not deliver such requirements.

Non-material planning considerations

Many consultees voiced their concerns over the loss of value in their homes. A minority expressed concerns that there has been enough affordable housing provided in Burscough and that people should train and work sufficiently hard to be able to afford their own homes.

Council response

Whilst the Council empathises with residents genuine concerns regarding such matters, the planning system does not allow consideration of these factors in determining when and where land should come forward for development that will meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. This is to ensure that development can reasonably be delivered as these issues effect most people, regardless of the location of development.

Design

Support was registered for the development, with the recognition that employment, housing and infrastructure need to be provided or improved in Burscough. There was support for a mix of houses, varying densities and design and creating a character which also integrates with existing built design. However, concern was expressed through the use of the term “residential gateway” and what it meant for the site.

Council response

Ensuring the development fits into the local context and delivers good design is a key concern to the Council and will be a fundamental principle of the Draft Masterplan document. Therefore, support for good design is welcomed. “Residential gateway” is the design of a building, site or landscape to symbolize an entrance or arrival. In this respect our vision is for residential development to be of a high quality nature acting as an attractive entrance to the site.

Employment

It was considered that the north-west corner of the site is the most suitable for employment purposes, providing a logical extension to the existing employment area.

In relation to the options proposed for development, the Environment Agency highlighted that a number of occupants on the adjacent industrial sites have their operations regulated by the EA under an Environmental permit. The location of new housing on the site therefore needs to be determined in mind of these operations.

Council response

The Council concurs with the majority of feedback received regarding employment uses and will ensure in the Final Masterplan that the employment uses are in the most appropriate place (north and west of the site), whilst factoring in the amenity of surrounding uses. Flexibility regarding the type of employment uses will also be considered whilst ensuring the document does provide some guidance on this matter. With regards to the comments from the Environment Agency the Final Masterplan promotes the land allocation of public open space and the linear park, which addresses the issue of sensitive development located adjacent to existing regulated employment uses.

Housing

Social rented housing provision in Burscough was supported by some consultees, including the Parish Council. The Parish Council also supported public open space.

Elderly housing was supported by consultees and should be located close to public transport and local facilities.

Affordable housing should be provided with the residential development.

It was proposed that residential amenity should be protected through the segregation of employment and residential uses and the direction of construction traffic through the employment side of the site would assist in limiting the impact on residents.

Landscape buffers should also be used to help protect amenity.

Council response

In accordance with the Local Plan policies the Council will support the delivery of elderly and affordable housing within the Final Masterplan. In order to assist this, greater detail will be provided regarding the expected location of elderly accommodation and the proposed suitable mix and cross over between affordable housing and elderly accommodation types, based on current need.

Other

There was support for the provision of decentralised energy networks, carbon neutral development and standards for encouraging low carbon design. Renewable energy provision was deemed to be a positive inclusion, with support for solar panels in the design of residential and commercial properties.

There were still on-going objections to using agricultural farmland / Green Belt for development, and the volume of development which is being granted in Burscough – including the Pippin St development - and the fears that this would affect the character of Burscough.

Concerns were voiced that features promised as part of the development (open spaces, community facilities, shops) may not be provided when building work has been completed. A distrust of the development process generated calls for monitoring and enforcement should developers fail to deliver their promises.

Natural England submitted comments emphasising the importance of providing green infrastructure. Provision of green infrastructure will help manage environmental risks, and minimise adverse effects on biodiversity. Natural England refer the Council to a number of documents to provide examples of best practice, and reiterate the importance of ornithological surveys and mitigation of any impacts on SPA / Ramsar sites near to the development site.

LCC reinforced the need to consider the impact on local ecology and mineral resources on the site, which may impact on the layout, phasing and density of the proposed development.

Council response

Comments relating to support for various elements of the development were welcomed by the Council. Although some representations expressed concern regarding development that has taken place in Burscough in the past, the Council is satisfied that the delivery of the Masterplan document will assist in avoiding occurrences of incomplete or poorly designed development.

Comments submitted by Natural England were also welcomed and reinforced the Council's own views in respect of ecological and drainage matters.

Phasing and Safeguarded land

It was considered that the phasing of the site should be dictated by the provision of infrastructure.

One consultee expressed concern over the development following a north/ south divided for the allocation of safeguarded land. Suggesting that the development be delivered in an east/west direction instead, in order to maintain the character and openness of the protected views indicated on the Draft Masterplan.

Council response

Whilst the Council must have regard to the multiple land owners within the Yew Tree Farm site, decisions relating to land to be brought forward and that which is to be safeguarded will be based on expected delivery of both development and other key components of the Masterplan including infrastructure.

The comments on delivering the site in a west to east pattern have been taken on board and a section of land located on the west of the site has been indicated to be safeguarded, therefore protecting the views into the open countryside.

Consultation

Some objections were received in relation to the consultation, and the omission of adequate details which would enable the public to respond to the consultation. There was some confusion over the full Transport Assessment not being available at the start of the consultation. Furthermore, complaints were raised stating that the Council was misleading local residents by increasing the housing allocation from 500 to 'at least 500' and that only 200 dwellings could be delivered before any work to the sewerage systems was completed.

Council response

Consultation was undertaken in accordance with national requirements and the Statement of Community Involvement.

The Draft Masterplan made clear that the number of dwellings to be delivered is 'at least 500' as stated within adopted policy SP3 of the Local Plan. The reference to only 200 dwelling being permitted before works to the sewerage system were from discussions before the Local Plan was adopted, during the EiP UU stated that they would delivered the improvements to the system as required by legislation in order to meet the needs of the borough.

There was a technical problem with the LCC Transport Review during the first two days of the consultation online and 2 of the last pages were not viewable, this was immediately rectified and available for viewing.

4. **Council actions and influences on the Masterplan**

All methods of engagement including written representations, , exhibition sessions, school session and the Stakeholder Group have proved to be extremely useful in cataloguing a significant level of detailed feedback from a broad section of the Burscough community.

All of the written representations have been responded to directly within Appendix 1 to this document.

In terms of moving the Masterplan forward to the draft final stage, a number of specific actions will be carried forward as a result of comments from representations. The broad direction for the site in terms of land use and layout will also be determined as a result of considering the overall feedback and technical advice supplied by infrastructure providers.

The below table lists a number of key actions that will be carried forward into the Masterplan. For clarity it does not list every matter, rather it focuses on the key issues that were flagged up through the consultation.

Action
Land use allocation of employment uses to the north and west of the site and housing towards the eastern side of the parcel with a landscape buffer between.
Elderly housing located towards the east of the site in the event an end user can be identified for one extra care facility this is where it should be located.
Clarification over the use of Higgins Lane and the use of the new internal road network in relation to HGVs.
Ensure consistency between the Local Plan and Masterplan requirements and text.
Provide a greater emphasis on public open space and play facilities.
Clarify the responsible parties for drainage and flooding.
Review areas for safeguarding in respect of the openness of Higgins Lane
Review the phasing of the site in order to achieve the requirements of SP3

5. Conclusions / Next steps

The consultation responses have highlighted that there are a small number of minor modifications to be made to the Final Masterplan.

The Council has considered the feedback relating to these issues and will ensure that as the Final Masterplan addresses these issues that require actions. This may be through the layout and design of the site, direct requirements of any development coming forward on the site or as a requirement for further supporting information at the planning application stage.

Using the comments received through the consultation process, the Masterplan has been refined and the next version, Final Masterplan, presented to Cabinet and Planning Committee for adoption in January 2015.

The Final Masterplan will be adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). This will then form part of the development plan framework and will assist in guiding applications for development on the site and decision making.

Appendix 1 – Consultation Representations and the Council’s Responses

Consultee Name: Mr John Crawford

Organisation:

Comments: This Draft Masterplan for Yew Tree Farm document is described as a framework to guide developers on the planning and design requirements when bringing forward the site for development and is therefore highly technical in its content. It further states that "this will ensure a sustainable Yew Tree Farm development is delivered that complements the environment of Burscough, strengthens the local community and contributes to the growth of the economy in West Lancashire".

- This Draft Master Plan is confusing, contradictory in parts, lacks important details and provides information on why the development should not proceed.
- This document asks the developer to undertake a number of tasks in order to have these included in their proposals when submitted. It does not say what the process and assessment system will be for determining that all proposals meet the minimum criteria. This raises issues around the process, the appeal process and whether it will be robust enough to withstand a legal challenge. How will Burscough residents know that the developers have undertaken all that is required of them to acceptable standards in plain and non-technical language when their proposals have been formally considered?
- I and many other residents fail to see how this development will strengthen the local community, when 96% of residents voted against the proposals for the site. The West Lancs council's actions in ignoring the wishes of the Burscough residents have already caused damaging resentment and this will lead to greater resentment when construction begins and problems relating to drains and transport become intolerable. I have yet to meet anyone who supports this development and I support the view shared by many people that this development will certainly not strengthen the local community and will in fact have an adverse impact due to the number of issues.
- The statement that it complements the environment of Burscough is highly debatable with many residents questioning the accuracy of this comment. The statement that it will strengthen the community in West Lancs is one that can also apply to other developments; in the case of Yew Tree Farm it is debatable and therefore also superfluous. If the development is important to West Lancs then why is a development of this size not being developed in Ormskirk or Skelmersdale?
- It has been said that one in West Lancs council will be held accountable when it goes wrong and this document states that developers need to undertake and provide information on specific tasks in relation to their proposals, therefore this suggests that the developer and other organisations would be held accountable for any problems that would subsequently occur. The council have requested information, evaluated it for acceptance and then judged and agreed the decision to proceed with a contractual agreement for the development of the site. How can the council not be held accountable for its decisions when the council have been made fully aware of the issues around this development and its impact on Burscough and its residents, in the event that the council has no responsibility then this suggests the council will have no authority or leverage for issues to be resolved.
- What is the impact on Burscough and its residents, should a developer gain approval for the site and then sell on their approval to another developer. What safeguards can West Lancs council put in place when a contract is transferred to another organisation to ensure that what the council previously approved is maintained?
- Due to issues raised in this document around waste water and transport West Lancs council need to make a clear and unambiguous statement to the residents in Burscough regarding which organisations will be responsible for the various issues that will arise resulting from the development of this site. It's the least the residents deserve for the way their views have been ignored and the way this development that been allowed to proceed.
- Having been informed by council officers that house values in the vicinity of this development will be reduced, what compensation can residents expect to receive. Again West Lancs council should be making a clear statement to local residents what the impact will be and what the council will be doing to mitigate this impact. My house has been built with the lounge looking directly over land on Yew Tree Farm and the house must have been approved in the past by the Local Authority for this to happen. I do not see any statement regarding the retention of green views for existing residents. Existing residents who are directly affected by this development have never has nay responses from West Lancs council to their issues, whether independent letters or responses to the consultations. Again it raises questions about the validity and meaningfulness of the consultations.
- Why can green field sites in Burscough be given approval for developments to take place, when proposals for other areas in the district are not considered? Why have brown field sites and the continued development of Skelmersdale not been the priority?
- I have never seen any justification why one half of Yew Tree Farm has been given protected status

until a later date for development, can someone please explain the reasons why one part was selected over the other part.

- If the residents are raising issues through the consultation process then they should receive responses to the points raised, this would show they are being taken into account or rejected with appropriate comments.
- The base line of 500 homes in phase 1 is being used by the other organisations in looking at drainage and transport issues as well as other associated issues as this figure is not confirmed and may become substantially increased then these other organisations working will then be less credible in their findings. This therefore becomes a concern with regards the consultation process. Growth The Introduction makes comment that this development will strengthen the local community, however it fails to be specific about how this will happen, this section on Growth identified the need for 4860 new homes for West Lancs however it fails to suggest how this and other developments could be maximised for the benefit for West Lancs businesses and residents. I have concerns around future development in the village as the structure of the village does not lend itself for further expansion until the road/rail network are improved. The major constraints to the village are recognised as the canal bridge and the rail bridge and it is of vital importance that these issues are resolved before further construction begins in Burscough. Solve these issues and there then becomes more land available to develop Burscough along both the routes of the canal and the railway line.
- Opportunities were lost when the Heathfields site was built. Entry to the canal pathways should have been built that would have allowed people to access the village with a degree of ease, as it stands they either have to drive or have a very long walk to the village. By having a bridge over the canal it could then have been made a feature and a pleasant walk for all Burscough residents, as it stands, unless you have a car you are now isolated in Heathfields.
- I understand that the Heathfields estate and the flats at the Quays have still not be adopted by the council, while I don't know what all the issues are I do understand that drains are an issues and would suggest that until these sites issues are resolved and are subsequently adopted.
- When I look at the proposed 850 homes for Burscough as part of the Local Plan, I'm unclear how many are being built in the first phase at Yew Tree Farm, is it a maximum of 500 or a minimum of 500, can clarity on the number of different types of homes be provided for Yew Tree Farm takes 500, we then have homes at Mill Lane under construction and potentially further homes at Abbey Lane, how accurate is this 850 homes. It's feasible that Factory closures currently in residential areas could in the next few years become available and release brown field sites that would allow substantial land to be development for housing. Will developers be allowed to come forward with more plans and be accepted which will take the future allocation beyond 850 homes. Local Highways Network and Access This section in the Draft Master Plan provides numerous points that clearly demonstrate why Yew Tree Farm site should not be developed at this point in time, due to its impact on the road network around Burscough. The proposals suggest an entry to the site from Liverpool road South at a point of entry to the site it does emphasis the difficulties that this will present to the residents of Burscough and those people who will be required to travel through Burscough and the failure to have a better route.
- I can understand why you would want to close Higgins Lane at the junction of the A59, however it is going to send more traffic along Truscott Road and this is not acceptable. It is possible to leave Higgins Lane open but only to allow an exit to the left at the point where it meets the A59?
- I also have concerns that the Yew Tree Farm site is going to send more traffic through narrow county roads and across canal bridges at Crabtree Lane and New Lane. These roads and existing housing along these roads were not designed for the increased volume of traffic about to come in their direction.
- Will heavy goods vehicles be allowed to enter the road network on Yew Tree Farm development from the A59 on Liverpool Road South?
- The Draft Plan shows that parts of the A59 already operate above capacity and other parts close to capacity, in factoring in the Yew Tree Farm site then the situation becomes worse. The situation for the future is recognised however it fails to provide adequate solutions as it out traffic before residents needs when dealing with future issues.
- I see no recognition of the annual increase in traffic that would happen anyway even if the site was not developed.
- In the statement "traffic moves freely through Burscough for the majority of time is an accurate fact but its use in this document is interpreted as misleading when it does not include volume of vehicles. The traffic does move freely between 7pm and 7:30 am to the majority of time when people are in bed, however outside these times you can expect a considerable increase in the volume of vehicles, leading to more delays and subsequent journey times. This would be damaging to the reputation of the local area, with productivity of businesses being affected by traffic congestion.
- Delays occur to volume, large vehicles, buses stopping and frequently road works, etc.; these delays have been quite considerable on the past year and are likely to continue for the foreseeable future.

- Where Yew Tree Farm joins the A59 this will become a blockage point and will need additional issues to be resolved due to the vicinity of the school and the crossing point. This could result in double yellow lines being put along the A59 for a longer area than is currently there. This will mean those houses affected will have a lower resale value due to the impact of more traffic and double yellow lines.
- The solutions put in place are likely to have further impact on homes in the vicinity as parents dropping off children at the school look for places to park. It is noticeable that parking problems also occur when events take place at the school in the evening and at weekends. It is noticeable that parents and grandparents picking up children come at least half an hour before school finishing time to secure a space close to the school, this causes further unnecessary congestion for all.
- I have previously suggested for safety reasons having an area of Yew Tree Farm set aside for parking for the parents dropping off children at the school, this has been dismissed in this document without any explanation being provided or a solution suggested. It is not right for genuine consultation to take place and points raised to be dismissed without appropriate comment and alternative solutions to issues. I can only interpret this to mean that the building of homes is of paramount importance over the concerns of Burscough residents and the safety of children and those responsible for their safety in attending school.
- It is highly possible that something will need to be undertaken at the entry of Square Lane to the A59 to help the traffic at this point; subsequently this will become another blockage point in the future.
- It will be interesting to see what delays will now happen when the new roundabout becomes operational at the junction of Pippin Street and the A59. I suspect that this will further complicate traffic issues at this junction and has the potential to hold up traffic at peak periods through queues on various roads.
- The traffic travelling along the A59 will need to overcome that many blockage points with Burscough that journey times will be considerably extended and other roads will become used, causing rat runs to be developed.
- With an increase in traffic and a further increase in the number of junctions now in Burscough the quality of air will be reduced to a lower level through the amount of standing traffic in queues at junctions. What plans do the council have to monitor the air quality along the A59, however how much does this matter to those making decisions that don't live in Burscough? Drainage The statements in the Draft Master Plan Drainage section again raise questions why this development should not proceed due to the serious issues around the existing capacity issues of the foul water drainage network in Burscough. The lack of capacity at waste water treatment works at New Lane which serves parts of the surrounding locality is a current on-going concern. Land drainage is also identified as unsatisfactory in places due to unmanaged local culverts and pinch points due to physical barriers that cause obstructions to the flow of water to the outfall at Martin Mere. There is a statement that the Council is aware that the issue of drainage is one of the key local concerns and that this development must of all that is possible to avoid worsening that situation and, where possible make improvements. The suggestion in the document do not convince me or provide me with confidence that the planned action is sufficient and safe to prevent disease and infections occurring to Burscough residents and visitors or to prevent flooding to homes and business premises. These issues are further complicated by the managing of the risks and understanding who has each responsibility; this is difficult when numerous land owners have responsibility.
- Is it possible for one body to be responsible and have overall control of all flooding and all drainage issues?
- New Lane Sewage Plant suffers currently from capacity issues in this part of the reason why the Heathfields and Quays developments have not been adopted. If Heathfields, Quays, Mill Lane and other planned and approved development are connected to New Lane Sewerage Plant before 2020 will it be able to operate effectively all the time within its safe capacity.
- If it is currently operating capacity then this is a major concern and also the important question, what risk assessment have been undertaken in case of a major breakdown and what can the residents of Burscough expect. Any vital process should only operate at fully capacity in emergency situations and be designed to have reserve capacity in case of emergency.
- Martin Mere is a major tourist attraction and any damage to its water will have a devastating impact on its operations. Its operation relies on good water quality and its fine operating water balance is affected then their ability to function effectively may be placed in a precarious situation. This is crucial balance will impact on the jobs of staff employed there but also other local businesses that rely on Martin Mere's operations.
- It is imperative that the responsibilities of the management of flooding are absolutely clear and those with responsibilities are undertaking their duties and working in partnership with others involved. A failure in this should be no offence and those with responsibilities must have insurance cover in order to meet the payments of any costs and awards to members of the public and business

who are affected through their failure.

- As it will be at least 2020 before any new capacity is available at New Lane sewage plant, it is already a concern due to it already being at capacity, currently it would not be appropriate to link in new homes to the system until its capacity issues have been resolved.
- I am not convinced that removing a volume of surface water into the natural drainage system is a satisfactory solution. Can United Utilities guarantee 100% that this water will not be contaminated with disease and human waste/detergents?
- Does this proposed option involve those with responsibilities who already do not actively look after their natural water courses?
- The suggestion that putting a Sustainable Drainage System (SuDS) is an unacceptable and dangerous system on a housing development where pets and children are expected to roam freely. These SuDS will have the potential to become stagnant water and be a source for vermin and disease. To remove all the stagnant water it will need to be pumped as the site soil is clay and holds water. There is a potential risk of contaminated water being discharged into the natural drainage network. What monitoring of the SuDS will take place to ensure they are constantly safe from disease and bacteria? It is emphasised that the surface waste water on the development must not be discharged into the Public Network is this because of either the contamination or the capacity issues for a riparian owner.
- Are these areas where the SuDS are going to be sited classed as part of the greenbelt within the site, if so then it raises serious questions in the management of the site?
- It states that an appropriate attenuation rate to mimic the existing Greenfield rate. Have you not noticed that a large part of the site will now be covered in tarmac or concrete (estimate 35%). This means that for the same area the same rain will fall but more rain water will now end up going into the drainage/ SuDs system and increase the capacity problems. How has this been accounted for?
- The Maps and the statements in the document show that the site has a vast number of areas susceptible to surface water flooding both within and adjacent to the site. It is appropriate to leave this situation totally in the control of the developer without greater controls being stated, I have yet to be convinced that this will be an acceptable and fully safe system. Biodiversity
- During late Autumn I have seen wintering birds use land on Yew tree Farm for feeding.
- In the spring, summer and autumn we have had Bats flying around numerous gardens by me for the 28 years I have lived here.
- We have also had many different forms of wildlife in our garden.
- The issue of wildlife is important and should not be overlooked; a full Habitats Regulation Assessment should be carried out before the development is given acceptance.
- It is interesting to note that an initial HRA assessment has shown that increased levels of housing and businesses can lead to reduced water quality, in another statement the waste water treatment infrastructure is vital to ensure that no negative implications arise that could impact on protected species, new building will disturb various species. These issues could arise as a result of the development of the site, therefore how will the developers/public know that appropriate consideration has been given to these issues during the planning process and how can they be measured.
- For the above important issues to be included in the Master Plan then more detailed criteria needs to be provided that will be robust to stand any legal challenge, weak statements that re abound in this document are not appropriate. Yew Tree Farm Design Objectives
- Clarity needs to be provided on the number of houses to be built in phase 2 and in the safeguarded area, it could be read that more than 500 will be built in phase 1 and a further 500 in the safeguarded area. I understand these figures to be greater than previous statements.
- What will the statement mean on promoting energy efficiency really mean, for the how site can this be more clearly detailed to standards in excess of minimum standards.
- There is no comment about protection of views for existing residents, or how to minimise problems for existing residents bordering this development. Some of the existing homes on Liverpool Road South have their long looking directly over the green belt of Yew Tree Farm and it would be helpful if houses being built on site were only end on and not square onto existing houses. This would help create some form of privacy and will offer less intrusion through the creation of larger gaps between the new houses. It would also be helpful for these houses that have windows at the side to have frosted/opaque glass. The same situation could apply for new homes being built that face onto existing properties along Higgins Lane. Vision for Yew Tree Farm
- There are some good points in the Vision statement, however it fails to highlight and deal with the issues around the flow of traffic thorough the village. There are currently roads which are required to carry an over capacity of vehicles and other key roads which will be required to carry an over capacity when the development begins.
- Importantly the Vision statement fails to recognise/state the impact that this development will have on existing residents. The added congestion, noise, poor air and water quality, increased

flooding, loss of green belt, reduction in house values and damage to the reputation of Burscough. Place Making Principles I agree with some of the principles for the development of the site; however I believe that it will fail with tree of its four principles "C" and will damage the character of Burscough through its removal of large part of Green Belt and replacing it with an urban sprawl of houses, surrounded by concrete and tarmac. Even large cities have green belt areas set aside within their locality, therefore why does Burscough need to have its green belt reduced within its community.

- Roads should be sufficiently wide enough to accommodate on street parking and to allow emergency vehicles to have access to all homes.
- The right of way onto Liverpool Road South is a wide piece of lane that will need landscaping and maintenance. Currently people walk their dogs and I have frequently seen dogs doing their business and it just being left, dogs have entered my garden and done their business. As this land will now mean more people using it what can you do to stop this happening in the future and be kept unspoilt and maintained. Suggest you consider having discussions with the residents on either side of this land to discuss various options in order to make it a more attractive place, to provide privacy yet maintain open views.
- While it may be possible to put your character proposals in place for the site how do you deal with the impact on Burscough and its residents due to this development?
- Cars will be fundamental issue for this development as there are many homes that now don't just have 2 cars they now have 3 cars and this needs to be accounted for.
- The proposed junction of Yew Tree Farm onto Liverpool Road south (A59) will be a potential bottleneck for traffic and a problem for the existing residents and, this will be made worse by the solutions to assist some flow of traffic at the vicinity of this junction.
- As a result of the multiple land ownership issues and that part of the plan to be delivered in the first phase it is not a sensible approach for the council to be flexible; it should be maintained its preferred position of having a comprehensive drainage scheme to serve the entire site. By going for an alternative temporary arrangement could mean that the temporary process will continue well beyond its projected lifespan, while Burscough Residents also continue to suffer the problems. Housing It is unclear how many homes will be built and I suspect this is likely to be vastly increased at some stage in the future, despite all future projections for the various organisations involved being based on previous plans. It raised issues about the transparency of the whole consultation process and the impact of other organisations if the process has been seen to be misleading in any way. The volumes of homes are based on document dates 2012 and 2012 and it's seriously questionable as to how these decisions were arrived at. For instance the Equality impact Assessment was only a desk based (first stage) assessment in 2010. In taking the assessment to the second stage this would have resulted in a more comprehensive and informed assessment that would have provided a more valued and informed document that many have been more current today.
- Having observed the price of new retired homes in Ormskirk, I don't believe many elderly people will be looking to buy a retirement home on the site. I feel that many elderly people wanting to size down will be looking more for affordable housing arrangements, than potentially buying an expensive new home.
- The housing market has changed quite considerably in the past few years due to high house prices and low wages which don't help young people to get on the housing market. This project should be looking at more affordable housing models for young people and those first time buyers.
- I would have wished to have seen an Equality Impact Assessment that would have priced more accurate details regarding the issues and potential solutions around the needs of young people and affordable housing. More accurate information on the needs of elderly and those people in the community who have a disability and their housing needs. This information should have shown the types of homes and bedroom requirements to fit in with the community's needs. It also failed to show the full impact on Burscough residents and subsidiary issues or to offer solutions. In not providing more detailed information on the impact on the site it raises issues whether this Equality Impact Assessment will be currently valid and meets the requirement for West Lancs borough Council Public Sector Equality Duty. Employment The previous section on Growth makes comment that this development will strengthen the local community and identifies the need for 4860 new homes for West Lancs however it fails to suggest how this could be maximised for the benefit for West Lancs Businesses and residents. Recent Projects along County Road in Ormskirk has shown contractors vans from Cheshire, Manchester and Yorkshire, these projects have therefore not maximised the full potential of these projects for the benefit of the local community and its businesses. To maximise the local business potential for this volume of construction I would suggest that the Master Plan provides information on how the development of the site should also involve local businesses and employees and requests the developers to present proposals as to how they would work with local businesses including suppliers, this should also be linked to using local labour and the recruitment of local apprentices for employment and training. It makes economic sense that nay finances coming into West Lancs continues to circulate around businesses and people in the area for as long as possible,

once it leave it means local business and its residents lose any benefit. Many Local Authorities have already developed "Partnership Working Agreements" where the council will expect investors who have a "genuine commitment" to work with the council in tackling and improving local conditions. This would entail a commitment to work positively with the various bodies involved in supporting employers and includes schools, colleges and universities to ensure that young people and adults can gain benefits in many different ways from this large construction project, the benefits are that businesses prosper with the area having a highly trained workforce through many rather than few sharing the benefits of the development of the site. It is vitally important that this project is part of an overall plan and incorporates suitable and appropriate solutions acceptable to the community and is not built in isolation of the other issues that currently or create or increase the issues and damage Burscough's reputation.

Supporting attachments

Council response:

The masterplan provides a framework for applicants and the Council to use when consider proposals for planning permission in respect of the Yew Tree Farm site. It should not be overly prescriptive nor should it provide guidance on how to carry out all of the assessments which will be required to support such an application. It is important that this document maintains a degree of flexibility so it is future proofed and that it is proportionate in respect of what is required to support applications for this site.

Additional wording will be included to given extra clarity regarding the complex responsibilities associated with waste water and flood risk.

Comments relating to objections to the principle of development at Yew Tree Farm, brownfield land and delivery of land in Skelmersdale have been addressed through the Local Plan allocation stage. Any permission that is granted for the site must be in conformity with the masterplan, the Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework. The permission and any conditions which may be used to secure a high quality development will run with the land and not the developer and so should provide comfort that the selling of parcels of land from party to party will still need to conform to the requirements of the planning permission.

The planning system has evolved to help guide development that must take place to support growth and therefore cannot be responsible for the financial losses or gains that may result where new development is located.

All comments and issues raised by local residents and submitted through each consultations are summarised, given a full response and sometimes result directly in actions and changes to the masterplan. This information is then always reported and published thereby ensuring that all residents' views are considered and answered in full.

The Council must deliver land to support housing need and in order to do so only part of the Yew Tree Farm site is required to meet the needs of this Local Plan period which currently runs until 2027. Therefore part of the site must be safeguarded until such a time as evidence suggests the remainder of the site is required. Many factors including how available and accessible land is have been considered in deciding which parts of the site to bring forward first. The overall look and feel of the development in the event the safeguarded land is brought forward in the future has also been considered in deciding which portions of the site to safeguard.

The masterplan supports improvements to the village centre to ensure access by public transport, cycling and on foot can be enhanced.

Comments regarding Heathfields are noted but fall outside of this consultation.

Yew Tree Farm should deliver a minimum of 500 homes in the first phase. This will ensure that growth in the area is met within this Local Plan period. Additional proposals on other sites across the Borough will be judged on their own merits and against the requirements of the Local Plan. However, there is no maximum allowance of housing that may be delivered or moratorium on additional numbers of dwellings that could be built.

Traffic - The masterplan allows the potential for Higgins Lane to be closed if this is felt appropriate at the time but it does not require it. It is unlikely that significant traffic volumes will travel north and west through the rural roads surrounding Burscough. However, a full traffic assessment is required to support any proposals and any increase in traffic must be to a safe level and supported by mitigation. HGVs will be allowed to pass through the site. The Council is fully aware of the localised road conditions which are noted as concern in the representation. However, the masterplan seeks to deliver the required development whilst ensuring there is no greater negative impact on the highway than already exists and where possible, improvements are made.

Land drainage is complex and planning has no control over bringing together overall responsibility to one party. However, the masterplan ensures that this issue will be dealt with and considered by all relevant parties at the planning application stage which does allow for a degree of cooperation between the parties. United Utilities have a legal obligation to upgrade the network to support development and growth. However, wording within the masterplan document will assist with the

ensuring measures are in place to help with the timing of such improvements and this wording has been supported by United Utilities. Planning cannot force land owners beyond the site with riparian responsibilities to maintain the drainage network to do so. SUDS are a standard part of most new developments and are generally shallow and well designed to look like an integral part of the development. The future management of such features will either fall to the Lead Local Flood Authority or the land owner, depending on when the development comes forward relative to the establishment of the LLFA.

The council is aware that additional development will result in increased surface water run-off and that is why the requirement to attenuate this run off to the existing greenfield rate has been included in the document.

Comments regarding ecology are noted and specific requirements to address any potential impacts are included within the document including the requirement for a HRA.

Criteria is included to ensure amenity of neighbouring properties is considered. However, it is not the role of planning to ensure views are protected for surrounding residents and this would be difficult to achieve given development anywhere on this flat site is likely to be seen from surrounding properties. Roads will be built to the required standards of the Highways Authority.

Comments regarding concerns about the impacts of the development in general, concerns about the process of developing the masterplan are noted. As are those regarding house prices, the market in general and ways to engage with business.

Consultee Name: Mr Nick Lee

Organisation:

Comments: Please see attached PDFs

Supporting attachments

Council response: Detailed traffic assessment work was carried out by the promoter of the northern part of the site in support of the Local Plan Examination and can be found on the Council's website. This work demonstrated the deliverability of this site in highways terms. In addition, LCC, as the Highways Authority, have carried out further traffic assessment work in order to consider the impacts of development of the site on the surrounding network and to inform the development of the masterplan. Whilst the use of Meadowbrook to access the site may be technically feasible, the Council is concerned with developing the optimum solution for access to the site within the masterplan. As referred to in the land owners own material 'any vehicle turning right into Meadowbrook blocks ahead traffic on the A59 Liverpool Road'. This was a key concern of both the Council and the Highways Authority when progressing the masterplan as vehicular movement along the A59, which includes public transport, is hindered by vehicles turning or parking. Therefore, in order to avoid this issue and encourage the flow of traffic on this, the most congested stretch of the A59 through Burscough, the masterplan supports access to and through the site in what is considered to be the optimum locations.

The site and landscape characteristics have been considered by the Council in developing the masterplan. However, comments regarding the need to maintain the clear views through the north west of the site to the countryside beyond have been considered and amendments will be made to the safeguarding plan within the masterplan document. Pedestrian access from the site through to the A59 is achievable in both phase one and two of the masterplan. This is through the creation of new access points marked 'a' and 'b' on the connections plan, and the enhancement of the existing footpath to the southeast of the site which is to be maintained as such linking in with the onsite green network and linear park.

In summary, the Council is satisfied that the masterplan, as presented, is deliverable and likely to

Consultee Name: Ms Tess Reddington

Organisation:

Comments:

Flawed Document The document is flawed in a number of ways

- There is no version control and it is therefore not clear to the reader which issue is being read. The Transport Review for Yew Tree Farm should have been made available at the same time as the draft masterplan.
- There is ambiguity in the wording of the document: many statements can be deemed to be misleading or contradictory . Examples are included in the text below.
- The Master Plan lists many issues but in key areas fails to offer solutions (such as parking for Lordsgate School, changes to highway, cycle and foot traffic travelling to Burscough, drainage off site, flooding off-site etc.)
- The final document may be changed subsequent to this round of consultation and therefore we will not be able to comment on the final document.
- The draft document contains a lot of technical information and this is not written in a way which lay people can understand.
- It differs substantially from Policy SP3 which for instance, states that Yew Tree Farm should deliver a new town park, and traffic mitigation measures to improve traffic flow on Liverpool Road South and protect other local roads. The Master Plan is contrary to the Local Plan in these and other aspects. On these aspects of the document alone, the Parish Council believes the plan not to be sound, and that it should be redrafted. The following paragraphs provide further details of weaknesses in the plan.

On-Street Parking P19 states that on-street parking is acceptable for some houses. The Parish Council is concerned that that means that planning applications for housing that offers no off street parking would be acceptable in planning terms, or for free movement of emergency vehicles. This would make for a poorer development and is contrary to planning policy. All housing on Yew Tree Farm must have the appropriate number of off-street parking places in line with policy guidance. Diluting requirements particularly in an area where space is not at a premium is unnecessary.

Sewage Standing orders were suspended to allow members of the public to contribute. **New Lane Upgrade.** Network capacity issues are alluded to but not explained. Replacing pipes to New Lane is not mentioned. It has been accepted that the removal of surface water from the foul water system will allow 200 houses to be built. Infrastructure improvements must be put in place before further planning approvals are granted. The Master Plan accepts that sewage systems will operate at capacity: The Parish Council would argue that no system should be planned to operate at capacity and that there should always be some space for emergency. To plan to work at capacity leaves no room at all for error and is reckless.

Drainage P11 discusses drainage in general terms. It advises that Planning Control has no control beyond the site. A number of roads are not capable of taking rainwater leading to further concerns about the impact of YTF on the existing infrastructure. It states also that “no greater impact will result in terms of flood risk” but this is not evidenced anywhere. The Parish Council remains concerned about how impact is measured, and how it will be monitored in the long term, and how existing homes will be protected downstream if in future years, calculations are found to be wanting. Any risk assessment must be independently validated and must provide details of who is responsible in the event that flooding does occur. P27 Para 2 says that any new development should not be located in areas liable to environmental risks such as flooding, but two maps contained in the Master Plan show the same areas both at risk of flooding at present and suitable for residential use. This contradiction alone makes the whole plan undeliverable. SUDS P27 discusses adequacy of SUDs system. The Parish Council is particularly concerned about the safety of SUDs that are open, and contained adjacent to open space. Ponds must be designed so as to protect young children from the dangers of deep and open water? There is no reference in the plan to Children’s safety: The plan must address these issues. SUDS must not be counted as public open space. Landscaping around them must not be counted as public open space unless it is accessible by the public. **Green space:** All pathways, barrier between industrial and residential land, attenuation ponds, footpath through site etc are shown on the plan as public open space. P37 states public open space totals 2.5 ha’s. Clarification is required regarding what green space comprises. It should not include the SUDs, footpaths and cycleways or screening. The amount of green space shown in the Master Plan is woefully insufficient. The town park that was suggested in the local plan is not shown. There is no area of useable open space where children of between 10 and 14 can engage in an informal kickabout. It is paramount that there is at least one area of open space that is large enough for a group of teenage boys to enjoy a range of informal sports without disturbing neighbours. **Higgins Lane/and protecting local residential roads/double yellow lines/Road Safety** The Parish Council does not support the closure of Higgins Lane. This is due in part because preventing access to the A59 may encourage traffic through Truscott Road and other residential areas beyond Higgins Lane area. It is important that vehicle traffic is discouraged from using existing rat runs through residential areas as short cuts and this should be clear in the Master Plan. Policy SP3 specifically refers to

protecting local roads. This plan is contrary to SP3 The Masterplan Highways and Transport Review which states that “traffic regulations orders (TROs) need to be reviewed and revised where necessary within the influenced area to better manage network operation and efficiency”. The Parish Council is concerned that this could mean that for example, where traffic is increased, double yellow lines may be used as a way to keep traffic moving along Orrell Lane, Crabtree Lane, Truscott Road estate or Higgins Lane. Burscough already has a very poor record of road safety – double yellow lines can speed up traffic on roads such as Orrell Lane, making roads less safe than they already are. P26 states that it is intended to close off Higgins Lane only when internal road network completed. This could be a long time, and would lead to the junction becoming neglected (like Pippin Street /A59 junction has been while it waited for major works) The Parish Council would prefer it not to happen, but a lengthy stay of execution is not helpful or desirable. Clarification of this and of the impact on Higgins Lane is required: It is not acceptable for it to be proposed and to never happen. It must therefore be removed from the plan before adoption. There are contrary statements with regard to Higgins Lane: P 22 states 2 x secondary vehicular access onto Higgins Lane and P25 Para 2 refers to access to Higgins Lane for HGVs. There is no mention of how Truscott Road estate will be protected from through traffic. This needs clarification before adoption of the document. Page 25 says “access will be via 3 primary accesses (Tollgate, A59 and Higgins Lane)” but P22 says that Higgins Lane has two secondary accesses. There are ambiguities here. Walking and Cycling P22 refers to footway improvements along A59 . The document says they are necessary but not what they are or how we will know when they have been achieved. The Master Plan promotes the use of sustainable transport. Most footpaths in Burscough are less than 2 meters and they do not meet guidelines for footpath width, (to make them suitable for pedestrians with buggies/wheelchairs/mobility scooters to pass). We struggle to find locations on footpaths that are wide enough to take bus shelters and there are almost no locations where bus lay-bys can be provided. Some roads are particularly narrow and riding a bike along some stretches would not be encouraged for safety reasons. Riding a bike along the A59 between the Bull and Dog and Square Lane, along Square Lane, along Pippin Street, and along other roads, seriously impedes motorised traffic and so encouraging sustainable traffic will not help capacity issues. These facts together with the consistently high road traffic accidents and deaths statistics, lead the Parish Council to believe that this aspect of the plan is not deliverable. The Master Plan sets out the aim but does not set out how that might be achieved, leaving the puzzle to the others. If the plan is to maintain that the developer will be required to provide solutions as part of any planning permission, then there must be no compromises on standards. Each element of the development requires a separate travel plan. This will lead to a lack of co-hesion within the site.

Town Centre P23 refers to improved cycle provision in Burscough Village, but no mention of improved parking for cars. For the village/town centre to thrive and grow, it is essential that it derives the maximum benefit from the Yew Tree Farm development. The Parish Council believe the key to this is car parking, for people working in the centre, for the shops, library, health centre etc, and for the trains. The master plans seeks to provide more cycle parking provision, but does not suggest more car parking provision. Significant additional car parking provision is essential. The “preferred maximum walking distance to the town centre as stated in the Highways and Transport Review is 800 meters. Most of Yew Tree Farm exceeds this therefore additional car parking in the village is essential. This must be included in the Master Plan.

A59 and Lordsgate School While the Parish Council cannot identify another access point that is better located than on the A59 opposite Lordsgate Drive, it is wholly unacceptable that the Master Plan leaves Lordsgate School without parking provision and without any solution. It must identify how and where parking can be provided, that is adequate, deliverable and safe for children coming to and from school. The Master Plan P25 identifies that changes will be required to the junction of A59 and Square Lane and at Junction Lane Traffic Lights but there is no mention or plan anywhere of what highway changes will be required. The Master Plan should provide a solution, instead of leaving that to a later time. Improvements must be incorporated at the same time as the major access. If not, Junction Lane may suffer additional traffic. The suggestion that traffic will be monitored and changes made as needed is not workable – the damage will then have been done and will be irrevocable. P 10 discusses traffic on surrounding roads. It accepts worsening congestion and does not put forward solutions other than mitigation measures that focus on sustainable transport (walking and cycling). It refers us to section on Connectivity (p20) which doesn’t provide solutions either. An acceptance of worsening congestion is not in compliance with, and is contrary to, the local plan. It should not therefore be adopted.

Housing The plan states “at least 500 houses” but does not provide a maximum number. Page 37 quotes figures which add up to between 550 and 650. The Local Plan and Master Plan quote at times “500” and at times “at least 500”. The inspector, during the examination of the local plan, was heard to confirm that the figure should be 500 in the plan period. The Master Plan must state the maximum number of houses allowed, and must explain how this will fit with the allocation of 850 for Burscough. This level of ambiguity is totally unacceptable and must be corrected. Clearly, traffic projections will be quite different for 500 than for 650, and “at least 500” could mean many many more: This makes a

nonsense of any traffic assessments which must of course be based on an actual number to be meaningful. The plan cannot be adopted without a clear maximum number being stated, and without assessments having been made on that number. The development must provide the full quota of affordable homes and must meet the current needs of the whole community. The Master Plan uses the phrase “flexible housing” which we understand to mean houses for life. The Parish Council applauds the Borough Council for setting this high standard for all homes built. Equality Impact Assessment Equality Impact Assessments undertaken have been superficial and wholly inadequate: No direct consultation appears to have been undertaken with excluded groups. Play Areas P34 discusses space for play and leisure and refers to MUGA skateboard park and play area. No site is shown. More information is required regarding the siting of a MUGA and Skateboard Park to determine whether this is suitable in this location. These are required in Burscough, but may be more appropriately located in another part of the parish. If they are to be sited in Yew Tree Farm, it is necessary to show how they are to be accommodated adjacent to housing. Sustainable Energy The Master Plan does not mention the decentralised energy network facility that is suggested in the local plan. The Parish Council would applaud the requirements for use of sustainable energy but note these are aspirational only and are not a specific requirement of development. These should be tightened up so that they are requirements. In Summary In summary, the Master Plan provides a piecemeal approach to development that may lead to work being left incomplete by developers after residents have moved in. The Quays and like Heathfields Estate remain unfinished and un-adopted. The Master Plan must be clear about how it will ensure that whole areas of development do not remain un-adopted like the Quays and Healthfields. There are several examples of the Master Plan identifying a problem, but leaving the solution to the developers to determine at a later date. It is not acceptable to leave all of these problems for others to solve. The Draft Plan expects the developer to undertake certain tasks in their plans, but fails to show the levels to be achieved or the process involved. There are very many opportunities for plans to go wrong, potentially leaving the community with an unsatisfactory outcome. The proposal that was described in the Preferred Options Paper 2012 has dramatically changed: There is no new town park, no renewable energy network facility and no highway improvements. The benefits of “improved transport” and “improved drainage” are no more and the plan accepts that there may be further pressure on existing provision. There are many ambiguities, anomalies and contradictions: Not least the glaring anomaly that P27 Para 2 says that new development should not be located in areas liable to environmental risks such as flooding but the map of areas at risk of flooding shows those areas to be the same as the ones highlighted as suitable for residential use. Other anomalies, ambiguities and contradictions have been described above. The level of ambiguities, anomalies and contradictions leaves the plan open to wide interpretation and unsound and we would request the Plan is reviewed again and “tightened up” before being approved by WLBC. Most worrying is that there appears to be no powers to hold people to account. The Parish Council believes that residents should know what remedy is available if there are negative impacts for them and their properties. We would like to suggest also, that in the development of Yew Tree Farm, and in all developments in Burscough, plans are put in place to maximise the potential for local labour to be used, providing jobs and training for local people, and particularly the apprenticeship scheme for young people.

Supporting attachments

Council response:

Additional wording will be included to give extra clarity regarding the complex responsibilities associated with waste water and flood risk.

Land drainage is complex and planning has no control over bringing together overall responsibility to one party. However, the masterplan ensures that this issue will be dealt with and considered by all relevant parties at the planning application stage which does allow for a degree of cooperation between the parties. United Utilities have a legal obligation to upgrade the network to support development and growth. However, wording within the masterplan document will assist with the ensuring measures are in place to help with the timing of such improvements and this wording has been supported by United Utilities. Planning cannot force land owners beyond the site with riparian responsibilities to maintain the drainage network to do so. SUDS are a standard part of most new developments and are generally shallow and well designed to look like an integral part of the development. The future management of such features will either fall to the Lead Local Flood Authority or the land owner, depending on when the development comes forward relative to the establishment of the LLFA.

The council is aware that additional development will result in increased surface water run-off and that is why the requirement to attenuate this run off to the existing greenfield rate has been included in the document. The masterplan supports improvements to the village centre to ensure access by public transport, cycling and on foot can be enhanced, it is not the responsibility of the Masterplan to address all parking issues in Burscough, the Masterplan however, will promote sustainable methods in to the town centre.

Consultee Name: CLLR Cynthia Dereli

Organisation:

Comments:

1. Why include so much woolly language in the plan. One example is around design of the buildings which it is said should reflect the local 'vernacular'. I would challenge anyone to identify a dominant 'style' in Burscough apart perhaps from the houses in the conservation area, and that I would suggest is more to do with their similar age. I would similarly query - 'flexible and adaptable buildings' ? ; buildings 'incorporating local form, materials and detail' ? etc Don't these phrases simply give a hostage to fortune, leaving their subject open to interpretation by any applicant for planning permission instead of insisting on best insulation materials, designing buildings for warmth etc. to which very limited references are made later. Our 'vernacular' styles, if they exist, were not built for 21st century engagement with climate change.

2. There is a tension, or even contradiction in the report between references to integrating the development into the village and referring to the creation of a separate sense of place. This runs through the sections on transport for instance. The site should be 'sustainable' with access to public transport but how is this to be achieved? The site cannot be 'taken' to the station but how are the customers to take themselves to it when the site is probably too far for many to walk to (and especially those most likely to want to use public transport namely older people). This factor needs to be taken into consideration when positioning the older people's homes within the site. I would think the present situation could be improved on. At least in this document the need to address this issue needs to be clearly raised. This tension re-emerges when the document deals with location of community facilities. Should they be provided within the site or in the village area. I think the latter would be the preferred option for most residents now, but of course the needs of new residents will also have to be considered. But then again can the development do everything? And if the masterplan does not spell out what is required it will probably do nothing. Although spaces for development of community facilities in the village area are limited, a requirement to contribute to a localised public transport scheme, which has been the aspiration of many in the village for a long time, might resolve these tensions.

3. Much is made of the potential for cycling from this site (though where the residents might be cycling to for work is not at all clear). There is no recognition of the dangers of cycling on the A59. As to using the cycling routes to be created within the site, the selling point for these is that they will link to the linear park (which does not yet exist) and so connecting the cycling residents of Burscough to Ormskirk. There is recognition p.23 that a crossing point will be needed to get the cyclists across the A59 to Abbey Lane to join the linear park. Unfortunately the map (p.21) illustrating this situation is not up-to-date and does not show the round about at Pippin Street which may not allow space for such a crossing point? P.22 It is not clear whether cycling is viewed to be an existing condition in Burscough or simply an aspiration for this site. I would argue that it is clearly not the former given the dangers of cycling on the A59 and few people venture to do this during weekdays. In this case does it make any sense to talk about new and improved junctions having to provide for cyclists 'based on an analysis of current and predicted flows'...? The conclusion from these sections on cycling and walking must be that the houses will be advertised as 'suitable for very fit people'. This is not a joke since if the residents of the new estate do not take up the fitness option then they will be generating many more car journeys and we have to wonder whether the council has really taken this on board. One illustration of this is in considering facilities in the village which make reference to cycle parking but not to the need for more parking for cars. Even a good localised bus service can't replace the car when, for instance, residents are needing to get to the health centre, yet the car parking there is already at capacity. 4Perhaps most importantly what I feel should be a major consideration and driver of the planning of the site remains an afterthought. Pp.37-8 deal with the phasing of the development site up to 2027. Here the present development site and the land safeguarded for possible use beyond the life of the plan are referred to as two separate 'development areas'. However, throughout the document 'phases' has clearly referred to these two quite separate areas in terms of timescale for development, and comments in the body of the document do not engage with the suggestions here that there should be a phasing of development within the life of the present 44 hectare site. Many of my comments below pick up this point within the various sections of the document. My queries could largely be resolved by putting the section on the need for phasing of the present plan development area at the beginning of the masterplan document and relating all comments thereafter to this 'phasing'. Given that the drainage permission with UU was providing only for a development of 200 houses, it is not unreasonable to ask that the impacts of the new housing are reassessed after this development phase and that similar phases of development should be a prerequisite on the site - eg another 200 houses or any industrial building will be seen as a phase requiring reassessment of the drainage and also highway impacts before further permissions are granted, so that there might be at least 3 or 4 phases of development before this site is completed in 2027. In its present form, leaving these comments on the phasing of development up to 2027 as an afterthought, the question is raised

as to whether an outline planning application will have to take any notice of this at all. P.24ff Highways and transport principles: 'whilst minimising the impact on the local highway network' - This is stated as a 'fact', an outcome that will be achieved. There is no engagement with the information presented by the LCC Highways already showing that sections of surrounding roads are already at capacity and above. Surely this needs to be clearly state here in introducing the highway issues. Point1: This refers to identifying the impacts of each phase. See arguments above regarding the way the term 'phasing' is used in the document. Surely here the report needs to relate to the LCC Highway capacity study. If the roads are already at capacity it would seem logical to reassess the situation after each phase; phase one being the construction of 200 houses etc. As well as the houses built on the YTF site there will also have been other development in Burscough and surrounding areas during the first few years. Surely it is important to consider the cumulative impacts of all this development before making detailed plans for more. See comments above. Interestingly, this section also refers to checking the effects of traffic from new development not just on congestion but also on air quality. Throughout the Local Plan enquiry the council refused to undertake any air quality study even though it was pointed out that air quality had been an issue when calls for a bypass had reached enquiry stage in the 1990s. Having acknowledged this as an issue, I would urge the council to undertake an air quality study in Burscough Town before finalising the Masterplan so that this information becomes a base line for future assessments of the impacts of developments at YTF. P.24 section 2. The overarching Travel Plan – note that this does acknowledge that the site will inevitably be developed in 'parcels' so why not refer to these as 'phases' after each of which an assessment of highway congestion, air quality and impacts on water flows from the site will be undertaken. The reference here to Travel Plans seems to be used as an excuse not to give clear guidance in this document on how the highway network will be implemented. This is surely another reason why an obligation on developers to reassess impacts as above needs to be enshrined in this document. Otherwise any such outcome is in danger of getting lost in the planning application stages, always being passed on to the next person/developer. The clearest indication from the Council on the need for building in assessment points in development upto 2027 is given on p.25.....'the network must be able to sustain the cumulative impact of additional movements in future years'. This is surely a strong argument in favour of building phasing and reassessment into this masterplan document. As the main route across the site has the potential to be much used by traffic circumventing Burscough Town, won't there be a need for bus lay-bys to be built in to the planning of this route? P.26 Suggestion to cul-de-sac Higgins Lane needs care as it is most likely to divert more traffic through the Truscott Estate and passed the school which is not a good thing to do. Reference in this section to the impacts on 'the external highway network' gives a very limited conception of what this might mean. It is likely that several other roads in Burscough and Scarisbrick will be used by traffic escaping the more congested areas. This might include Orrell Lane in Burscough and Smithy Lane/ Moorfield Lane and route Pippin St – Morris Dancers in Scarisbrick. When CIL/106 money is being allocated such impacts need to be considered and money provided for mitigation measure - another reason why phasing of development and reassessment of traffic impacts is vitally important. P.26 Parking: paras.3-4: The council has decided that the provision of parking for Lordsgate school will not be provided. This is very short-sighted. The school has undertaken work at the rear of the school fields to help reduce the parking on the A59, but this cannot cope with more traffic. As a result if no parking is provided near the entrance to the new site other solutions will 'emerge' with roads within the new estate or along Higgins Lane being resorted to by parents. It is not impossible I would have thought to design in housing (such as flats etc) near to the entrance to the estate for which common parking areas would be provided and which might be available for school time parking. Finally throughout the Highways section there are references to aspirations that remain vague, eg to upgrading footways off site, reassessing TROs , and making alterations to key junctions such as Square Lane. I guess that all of these would involve the Highway authority in prior major consultation with residents but it would be useful to have this consultation spelled out. P.26 : Climate The heading here is saddening: if the content of this section is all the world has to rely on for its survival, we are all doomed. The section is lacking in both conviction and detail. 'All development at the YTF site will be built to meet the latest environmental standards' does not offer any certainty of green energy being produced on site or of the latest technologies for insulation being used in design. If government do not endorse these, this surely does not mean that the BC cannot insist on these as conditions. It seems that an opportunity is being missed in terms of site lay-out and building design to create a radical response to address climate change in everyday living. The limited space given to considering green energy options suggests a lack of commitment from the council on this issue. Burscough has shown an interest in sustainability issues and renewable energy. To reflect the local context the Borough Council need to build such a commitment into the masterplan document. The comments in the section on Employment appear to give more weight to 'design to minimise energy consumption' for the industrial buildings, though again no detail. It would not be unreasonably to insist that every building on the site must have solar panels on its roof ; that the alignment of houses/ industrial buildings on

the site must ensure that south facing roofs are provided to this end and that wherever possible biomass heating is installed and so on. http://www.icax.co.uk/The_Merton_Rule.html
http://www.estif.org/fileadmin/estif/content/policies/STAP/Ireland_local_solar_regulations.pdf It is also sad to see that grey water systems only merit a passing remark ('if possible'), yet as elements in sustainable living they are important and on a site where the volume of surface water being generated is an important issue, the minimising of water used by households would seem to be an essential aspect of development design. P.27 Drainage: Again it is not clear how the plans for the drainage of the site will be developed. One paragraph says one scheme for the entire site (which entire site?) will be needed. P.28 talks about a phasing plan – but does not remind us that the agreement with UU on which the permission for this site was founded was initially for 200 houses. P.11 Comment at end of paragraph: 'However, beyond the site it [water and watercourse] becomes more complex and beyond the realms of planning control'. Yet the County Council's Flood Risk Management strategy notes its objective SFRM 2 (p.67) as being to: 'Manage development so that it reduces flood risk'. This does not say only within a development site but in general. P.28 bullet point 10 refers to potential needs for upgrade of 'off -site drainage infrastructure' but does not link this to any reassessment of the situation as the site is developed. In fact, in the introductory section references to drainage claim that anything off site is nothing to do with the planning for the site (p.10). Yet the impacts of building on this on the drainage capacity in the rest of Crossens drainage area has been a concern throughout the local plan process. I think it needs to be spelled out clearly that it is indeed something that the masterplan and any developer will need to take account of. Depending on how the water system is managed (by the EA or an IDB etc) there could be a need for the development to contribute to the maintenance of the water courses that remove the surface water to take it the Crossens pumping station. If the ditches are not maintained I gather it is possible that weed accumulations could block the pumps at the coast leading to flooding way back in the system even as far back as the YTF site itself. There are also pinch points already in the surface water system (for instance, as the ditch from YTF goes under the railway) where flooding occurs and clearly extra water from this site will be adding to the likelihood of flooding at such points. The council might bear in mind that one of the first 'riparian' owners to be affected might be themselves as housing authority since the culvert that comes from Manor estate and flows through the YTF site has been known to flood Higgins/Truscott/Furnival area. Overall comments re drainage and highways sections: No mention is made of how and when the houses /roads made ready for adoption by the Highway Authority. This is quite a crucial issue for a development which is envisaged to be completed in 12-13 years time. It is not acceptable to leave house owners with semi-made roads or lighting that is not maintained for such a period. On past experience regarding road adoptions, I am also concerned about how the council will keep control of the development to ensure that all drainage work is completed and that the roads can be adopted. Furthermore, it is now deemed by many to be crucial to modern living to have a connection to the internet at superfast speeds. The report makes no mention of how superfast will be provided on this site. At present if a road is not adopted then superfast cannot be installed. I was told by representatives of the developer at Grove Farm site that they would take the initiative and ensure superfast was installed in their site. Could this masterplan not refer to this important aspect. On p.29 in a list of items that will be included in the green infrastructure is a reference to 'Flood alleviation measures as part of SuDs to be approved by the LLFA'. The document is very repetitive but I'm not clear what this refers to and this is something the council need to clarify so that it is beyond dispute with any developer. The Masterplan's references to SuDS make no mention of the guidance that is already available on this subject. Surely the advice in the County Council's Flood Risk Management Strategy (p.46) regarding principles of surface water management following National SuDS Standards set by government need to be set as base line here? Finally there is a lot in the plan about the use of SuDS as water features in the estate. I have asked on at least two occasions how safety issues will be addressed and these concerns have been brushed aside. I was told on one occasion that this was no different from the situation in the Ormskirk park where there is a large pond and children go there etc. I think this is very different - surely there would be an assumption that parents will accompany children to the park if they are too small to be trusted near to a pond. But the Borough Council are talking about 'encouraging buildings to face on to such features' (p.19) which would mean that parents could not let their children out to play in the green space unattended. I feel strongly that this needs to be clarified in the Masterplan as the safety of children in a new development should not be left to chance. P. 32 Housing: Throughout the consultations on the Local Plan and into the Enquiry stage residents have consistently argued not only that a development of this size is not needed, but more importantly now that the housing that is needed is social housing to rent. So it is extremely depressing to see no mention of this at all in the present document. There is a vast difference between so-called affordable housing that is for sale when mortgages are so difficult to obtain, and housing to rent. To respond to the needs of the Burscough community it is absolutely vital that the masterplan spells out a requirement to provide social housing to rent as a major part if not all of the 35% requirement for affordable housing. If this is not included then it will prove all the predictions of the

pessimists to be correct – with a development prioritising developer profit over local need: residents will get more traffic and more overcrowding of vital services and little or no benefit for young people and families in our area. Use of 106/CIL money: I welcome the commitment to using this for the benefit of the community – especially to improve library provision in the village and for on-site opportunities for community food growing eg allotments, and for localised transport initiatives. I would also like to draw attention to the needs of the secondary school which I feel are rather overlooked in the plan. While the school has some space in terms of pupil numbers it also has a need for further investment in its buildings if it is to meet these needs in the longer term. I would like to log this issue as potentially relevant in relation to development within the life of the Plan, perhaps in its later stages.

Supporting attachments

Council response: The masterplan supports improvements to the village centre to ensure access by public transport, cycling and on foot can be enhanced, it is not the responsibility of the Masterplan to address all parking issues in Burscough, the Masterplan however, will promote sustainable methods in to the town centre. Traffic - The masterplan allows the potential for Higgins Lane to be closed if this is felt appropriate at the time but it does not require it. It is unlikely that significant traffic volumes will travel north and west through the rural roads surrounding Burscough. However, a full traffic assessment is required to support any proposals and any increase in traffic must be to a safe level and supported by mitigation. HGVs will be allowed to pass through the site. The Council is fully aware of the localised road conditions which are noted as concern in the representation. However, the masterplan seeks to deliver the required development whilst ensuring there is no greater negative impact on the highway than already exists and where possible, improvements are made. SUDS are a standard part of most new developments and are generally shallow and well designed to look like an integral part of the development. The future management and safety of such features will either fall to the Lead Local Flood Authority or the land owner, depending on when the development comes forward relative to the establishment of the LLFA. The delivery of affordable housing will be through a number of mechanisms as stated in policy RS2 of the Local Plan.

Consultee Name: Mrs Jilly Dougherty

Organisation:

Comments: Thank you for consulting with us on the above Supplementary Planning Document. We have considered the proposed Masterplan and wish to comment as follows: We are pleased to see that the majority of the comments that we made previously in relation to the Issues and Options consultation have been taken into account in the preparation of the proposed Masterplan. However, as stated in our previous response, the proposed location of sensitive receptors in close proximity to existing sites regulated by the Environment Agency could mean that they are subject to exposure to odour, dust or noise emissions in the future. The severity of these impacts will depend on the size of the facility, the way it is operated and managed, the nature of the regulated activities and prevailing weather conditions. The Masterplan as proposed will result in
a) residential development within 100 metres of and
b) employment uses directly adjacent to a hazardous waste transfer station regulated by the Environment Agency. We do not currently receive complaints about any nuisance from this site, but the potential impacts of the activities of the regulated site on the Yew Tree Farm site are unknown.

Supporting attachments

Council response: The Council are aware of this Waste transfer unit and residential development is not located within 100m of its boundary.

Consultee Name: Mr Marcus Hudson

Organisation: Lancashire County Council

Comments: YEW TREE FARM DRAFT MASTERPLAN SPD CONSULTATION LAND TO THE WEST OF, LIVERPOOL ROAD SOUTH, BURSCOUGH

Thank you for the opportunity for Lancashire County Council to comment on the above Draft Masterplan. I have assessed the document with regard to Lancashire County Council's plans and priorities, National and Regional Planning Policy and other material considerations and specialist advice. I summarise key points for consideration below; further detailed comments are included as appendices.

Highways and Transport Lancashire County Council (LCC) as the Local Highway Authority (LHA) is responsible for providing and maintaining a safe and reliable highway network. It is important that we are involved and consulted on all matters that may affect the integrity, structure, appearance and function of the public highway and its environment. Whilst I support the highways and transport principles of the Yew Tree Farm Draft Masterplan, I would like make the following observations which I trust will be given due consideration.

Internal Primary Road Network and Main Vehicular Access The Masterplan area is dissected by two routes that form the site's internal primary road network, connecting with the external highway network at a single primary access with the A59 Liverpool Road South and two primary accesses on Tollgate Road, to the north and south; in total 3 primary access points. The layout of the internal primary road layout should be able to facilitate the operation of potential future public transport services through the site and the route that runs in an east-west direction from the A59 to Tollgate Road should provide a direct route from the A59 into the employment area, avoiding Higgins Lane. To balance traffic movements to and through the site (north and south), it is important that the Yew Tree Farm internal highway network incorporates a suitable primary network that can be utilised by all transport modes, including large vehicles and as required by local employment situated within and beyond the site boundary. The integration of the existing external highway infrastructure with the internal primary network will need to satisfy vehicle and user requirements, such as sufficient capacity (all modes) and appropriate swept paths for large vehicles.

Internal Secondary Road Network and Minor Vehicular Access The Indicative Layout (Page 17) includes two minor vehicular accesses onto Higgins Lane. The access to the east of Higgins Lane would provide a convenient, direct route between the existing built up area and the Yew Tree Farm site. This supports the integration of the site with the surrounding urban area, and existing facilities and services. A vehicular connection to Higgins Lane in this location would allow traffic from the existing residential area to access the A59 via Yew Tree Farm's primary road network. The minor vehicular access to the west of Hesketh Road provides another route between Higgins Lane and the Yew Tree Farm site, yet avoids the 20mph zone. The inclusion of a minor vehicular access at this location should serve to minimise the levels of traffic travelling through the 20mph zone on Higgins Lane to Burscough Industrial Estate (Langley Road) and Swordfish Business Park (Swordfish Close) from Higgins Lane.

Sustainable Transport I support the inclusion of multiple dedicated pedestrian and cycle only access points that provide comprehensible safe routes through the Masterplan area to footpaths, highways, recreational areas, open space, the adjoining built up area and its amenities and, in particular, to the A59 Liverpool Road South which is a key public transport route. It is appropriate for the site's primary road network to include high quality joint pedestrian/cycle provision along both sides to encourage movement by these modes within and through the site and be delivered in line with current guidelines. It is expected that formalised controlled crossings will be provided at any point where a footpath/cycleway is interrupted by the site's primary road network. I expect that the delivery of the Yew Tree Farm Masterplan will enhance public rights of way within and beyond the site, and be of a quality that satisfies users' needs at all times of day for pedestrians, mobility impaired and cyclists.

External Highway Network The Draft Yew Tree Farm Masterplan provides a framework to guide development at the Yew Tree Farm site. It is important to recognise that, at the planning application stage, further mitigating measures may be required to offset potential adverse impacts to the existing highways network. This will include additional improvements to the local highways network that will be needed in order to achieve safe access to the site and promote sustainable movement. Yew Tree Farm's entire estate road network should be served from a limited number of vehicular accesses off the internal primary road network. Vehicular access into isolated pockets of development within the Yew Tree Farm site that can only be accessed from the external highway network is not recommended, particularly along the A59.

Suggested Amendment - Local Highway Network and Access Please note that the A59 Liverpool Road South is not a trunk road, and accordingly the wording 'and is a trunk road' should be removed from the first paragraph of this section (page 10).

Education These comments are based on the latest 2014 pupil projections, and should supersede the previous education responses provided in November 2013. As this is only at pre-application/outline application stage the dwelling bedroom information is not currently available. Therefore, the following information assumes that all dwellings will have 4 bedrooms and the 4 bedroom pupil yield has been applied. In terms of primary school provision, the information available at the time of assessment

indicates that even with the impact of the Yew Tree Farm development in 2019 and in 2024 there will be sufficient provision within existing primary schools to accommodate demand. However, a shortfall of 37 places is expected in 2029. The financial requirement for these places would be £445,095. This contribution would be sought through a Section 106 agreement, in line with West Lancashire's CIL Policy for education. In terms of secondary school provision, there is one such school in the Burscough area which will offer sufficient provision to accommodate demand up to 2024. In 2028, there is expected to be a shortfall of 6 places for which a financial contribution of £108,758 would be sought through a Section 106 agreement. Beyond 2027, at Yew Tree Farm a total of 500 dwellings are proposed. As this information is likely to change a great deal by 2027 there is limited benefit from producing pupil projections on this long term plan. Therefore a simplified indication of the future education requirements beyond 2027 has been calculated and is appended to this letter.

Public Health I am pleased to see that the plan has taken note of the health impact assessment (HIA) of the local plan that was conducted in 2012. I note the concerns around air pollution due to the possible traffic congestion on the A59 as mentioned in the sustainability appraisal. It is apparent (from the consultation) that this is also a concern amongst the local community and mitigation through sustainable transport has clearly been considered. One aspect that could also assist in supporting sustainable transport is to make clear in the plan that developers must make adequate provision for cycle storage in homes and at retail, leisure and employment sites, and specifying the level of suitable provision. The recent HIA in 2012 on the local plan recommended 50% affordable housing and as reducing health inequalities is a key priority for the Local Authority it would be preferable to see the specified housing mix closer to this figure. The plan makes clear that the existing Burscough centre will continue to function as the community hub. However, connection to near neighbours has an important impact on wellbeing. This would be strengthened if the new community has access to shared indoor public spaces within the local environment. It may be possible to specify that the retail and business spaces must open up their facilities to the local community for community events. This would have a mitigating effect on isolation and promote community connectivity. In relation to SuDS, these should be designed for amenity and combined with public spaces for multi functional use. Developers should ideally be asked to engage the community and raise public awareness of their role and safe and responsible approach to living with them. Local Flood Risk Clarification is needed as to whether there are any existing connections (other than the proposed public sewer works) into the site from current drainage systems in Burscough. Regarding ordinary watercourse maintenance and condition, it should be made clear that such watercourses are not "natural" but part of a managed network of watercourses. New development on Yew Tree Farm will inevitably be sited in areas at risk of flooding. SuDS should be designed to attenuate and direct surface water flooding away from properties and people. It is the responsibility of the developers to produce a detailed drainage strategy and, as it stands at the time of writing, the responsibility of WLBC to approve, or otherwise, any drainage strategy for the development. The Sustainability Appraisal fails to consider the Lancashire and Blackpool Local Flood Risk Management Strategy in the review of relevant sub regional plans and programmes. The Lancashire and Blackpool Local Flood Risk Management Strategy was formally adopted on 9 April 2014 and is a material consideration during the planning process.

Minerals I note the relevant commentary on page 10. It should be specified that the proposed development may have to be altered depending on the presence of minerals and their extractions. See attached PDF for Appendix

Supporting attachments

Council response: Comments noted.

Consultee Name: Mr Simon Pemberton

Organisation:

Comments: See folder for attached PDF

Supporting attachments

Council response: Noted. Land drainage is complex and planning has no control over bringing together overall responsibility to one party. However, the masterplan ensures that this issue will be dealt with and considered by all relevant parties at the planning application stage which does allow for a degree of cooperation between the parties. United Utilities have a legal obligation to upgrade the network to support development and growth. However, wording within the masterplan document will assist with the ensuring measures are in place to help with the timing of such improvements and this wording has been supported by United Utilities. Planning cannot force land owners beyond the site with riparian responsibilities to maintain the drainage network to do so.

The retail/community facilities have been located more central to the site in order not to draw any trade from the existing Burscough Town Centre, any facility on the site will only be to of a small scale nature in order to serve the new residents its is not the purpose of the masterplan to draw trade from Burscough. The access points on to Higgins Lane are not fix the masterplan is illustrative yet the principle for two access points is described within the masterplan in order to allow the site to be access for a variety of points. With regards to allowing more land to develop the initial phase one of 500 dwellings the Council have reviewed the calculations and the calculations are as follows.

Development Area One totals approximately 36 ha (gross). Of this, approximately 13 ha is allocated for employment uses which, when land for sections of both primary roads and the linear park that would need to be delivered through this area is factored in, would leave a net developable area of approximately 11 ha for employment uses. The remaining 23 ha is allocated for residential development including the accompanying highways, drainage, landscaping, linear park and public open space. It has been assumed that 75% of this gross development area for residential development would actually provide the net developable area for residential development itself (i.e. subtracting the land required for highways, drainage, landscaping, linear park and public open space). This leaves a net developable area of approximately 17 ha, which at 30 dwellings per hectare could accommodate 510 dwellings.

Consultee Name: Mr Cam Cunningham

Organisation:

Comments: Drainage – There is apparently a plan for “Sustainable Drainage Systems” shown as SUDS on the plan. The councillors had stated at the beginning that no building would take place until the drainage infrastructure was in place. At the presentation at Burscough Wharf there was apparently no knowledge of how this drainage system was to be implemented – or when it was to be in place (before, during after building has commenced?). I find this staggering in a development of this size that the developers are seemingly going to be allowed to decide when and how this to be done. My concerns were highlighted when I saw in the internet a report from Kent that a developer had been allowed to build 400 houses without putting a promised/planned drainage system in place. How is the council going to control the developer?

Wildlife – I see no consideration for the abundant wildlife on the fields where this development is to take place. The hedges will not be adequately protected as indicated by the null response to one of my questions at one of the consultation meetings - “What will happen if the developer accidentally uproots all the hedges that the council had said that they ideally should be keeping?” Access road – how is the major road into the estate going to be used – will it become a rat run for traffic trying to avoid congestion on the A59 - what measures are going to be produced to control this traffic? What consideration has been given to the already congested A59 where there will be junctions accessing the site – especially for heavy plant accessing the site during the years of construction?

Protected Views – What is this all about – when was this decided on and by whom? It certainly wasn’t mentioned at any of the meetings that I have attended. Why haven’t the views of houses on Liverpool Road South and Higgins Lane got protected views?

Literature Images – how come the images on all council plans show the dilapidated farm buildings of yew Tree Farm – as though the whole estate is going to be built on brown field – and why don’t you show the green fields that are going to be built on as well/ instead?

Supporting attachments

Council response: Land drainage is complex and planning has no control over bringing together overall responsibility to one party. However, the masterplan ensures that this issue will be dealt with and considered by all relevant parties at the planning application stage which does allow for a degree of cooperation between the parties. United Utilities have a legal obligation to upgrade the network to support development and growth. However, wording within the masterplan document will assist with the ensuring measures are in place to help with the timing of such improvements and this wording has been supported by United Utilities. Planning cannot force land owners beyond the site with riparian responsibilities to maintain the drainage network to do so. SUDS are a standard part of most new developments and are generally shallow and well designed to look like an integral part of the development. The future management of such features will either fall to the Lead Local Flood Authority or the land owner, depending on when the development comes forward relative to the establishment of the LLFA.

The council is aware that additional development will result in increased surface water run-off and that is why the requirement to attenuate this run off to the existing greenfield rate has been included in the document.

Comments regarding ecology are noted and specific requirements to address any potential impacts are included within the document including the requirement for a HRA.

Traffic - The masterplan allows the potential for Higgins Lane to be closed if this is felt appropriate at the time but it does not require it. It is unlikely that significant traffic volumes will travel north and west through the rural roads surrounding Burscough. However, a full traffic assessment is required to support any proposals and any increase in traffic must be to a safe level and supported by mitigation. HGVs will be allowed to pass through the site. The Council is fully aware of the localised road conditions which are noted as concern in the representation. However, the masterplan seeks to deliver the required development whilst ensuring there is no greater negative impact on the highway than already exists and where possible, improvements are made.

Protected views label was introduced to the masterplan in order to try and blend any development of the site at Higgins Lane where once built out will be adjacent to the new greenbelt boundary. Through out the Masterplan document various images are used of the site, however, in order to draw attention and make the document and site easy to recognise the image of the vacant farmhouse is used on much of the publicity material.

Consultee Name: Mr Robert Berks

Organisation:

Comments:

- 1) Improvements to the draft masterplan can be made if: Specific requirements concerning drainage are included. It is more sympathetic to both the surrounding area and its residents. It more adequately protects the rural area to the north from its visual impact. The negative effects of the new houses and the extra traffic are further mitigated. I also think it unwise to encourage a particular style of architecture before the design cycle has begun by including pictures of houses.
- 2) As a resident living near the site who has raw sewage backing up the through the drains onto their property I believe the draft plan has to be unambiguous and clear about drainage. The plan must affirm that the planning system will be used to ensure that prior to the commencement of development activities such as surface water removal from foul flows and the attenuation to stop extra surface water leaving the site are fully completed. Also the plan must also ensure that land ownership issues will not be allowed to compromise drainage and that development will be stopped if the best possible system of drainage is not being implemented.
- 3) Regarding Higgins Lane the plan states: This Lane should maintain its rural character where possible. The indicative plans, for example as page 17, see contradictory to this aim by suggesting vehicular access at two points along this land and encourages building close to the road. These buildings will be highly visible from the lane because the view of the estate from the lane is protected. The draft plan therefore ensure this lane will completely lose all its rural character. The urbanisation of this lane might be offset by specifying that, in addition to the existing hedges, green space is included between the new houses and the Lane by deleting all vehicular access from the new estate onto Higgins Lane.
- 4) The second paragraph on page 25 which starts with the alignment infers that HGVs are to be permitted along Higgins Lane through onto the northern east west link road. Allowing HGVs any access to any part of Higgins Lane is both wrong and a retrograde step. HGVs are effectively barred from Higgins Lane at present by the 7.5 tonne weight restriction (except for access) through the 20MPH section. Additionally, Page 25 of the plan envisages three primary access points to the new estate, one of these primary access points onto Higgins Lane as secondary. This contradicts other parts of the plan which describe the access points onto Higgins Lane as secondary. I'm afraid, as written the plan will result in Higgins Lane the secondary road marked H on the diagram on page 21 and the gateway junction at the A59 becoming a main road. It is appalling if this is the actual intention. Also, I find it totally unacceptable that the traffic from the new estate, possibly 1000 homes and an unknown amount of commercial property, being fed along Truscot road and then past Priory School onto the A59 at Junction Lane.
- 5) As the site is part of a north facing slope it means that buildings, in particular tall multi-story houses as shown on page 15 and 19 of the plan, will be fully visible from the lower lying rural land to the north. This might be ameliorated if the maximum height of building was reduced from that quoted so that town house style of property pictures was specifically excluded. Planting trees as a visual barrier would help soften the view of the estate from the countryside and would be in keeping with the lightly wooded character for the surrounding countryside.
- 6) According to the plan new houses can be built close to existing houses on the perimeter of the site. The leaflet (download file name stitched leaflet red) stated that: many wanted new housing sited away from much of the existing residential areas. Perhaps adding limitations to housing density and type and the addition of green space between the existing and new developments might lessen the impact on the estate onto the people who live around the site. It might also help blend the new and the old architecture.
- 7) Has road layout been influenced and possibly limited by land ownership issues? It seems strange that a short length of the southern link road is to be left undeveloped at this stage. Ideally the northern link road would be designed as an estate road not a main road. The southern link road if completed as part of the first phase could be used as the primary route from the gateway from the industrial estate. Traffic, especially HGVs could be encouraged to use this route away from the phase 1 residential areas. If the safeguarded area was then not required for development this would be a lasting improvement. Additionally the transport authority review (download file name YTF Mplan Highways Transport Review) shows both link roads, the lack of the second link road must effect the validity of this review.
- 8) Currently access to a primary school is gained opposite the proposed Gateway to the site at the north eastern corner. Road safety at this location must be a concern and perhaps inspiring drivers passing school entrances with development and landscaping isn't sensible. It might be more realistic to imagine that the amount of traffic management at this location being the overriding visual effect. The design will be constrained by the junction with the A59 which will be at or over capacity. Obviously this part of the estate will be domain of the car and maybe even HGVs. It might be better to plan to insist on architectural and landscaping excellence throughout the new estate.

Supporting attachments

Council response: Land drainage is complex and planning has no control over bringing together overall responsibility to one party. However, the masterplan ensures that this issue will be dealt with and considered by all relevant parties at the planning application stage which does allow for a degree of cooperation between the parties. United Utilities have a legal obligation to upgrade the network to support development and growth. However, wording within the masterplan document will assist with the ensuring measures are in place to help with the timing of such improvements and this wording has been supported by United Utilities. Planning cannot force land owners beyond the site with riparian responsibilities to maintain the drainage network to do so. SUDS are a standard part of most new developments and are generally shallow and well designed to look like an integral part of the development. The future management of such features will either fall to the Lead Local Flood Authority or the land owner, depending on when the development comes forward relative to the establishment of the LLFA.

The council is aware that additional development will result in increased surface water run-off and that is why the requirement to attenuate this run off to the existing greenfield rate has been included in the document.

Traffic - The masterplan allows the potential for Higgins Lane to be closed if this is felt appropriate at the time but it does not require it. It is unlikely that significant traffic volumes will travel north and west through the rural roads surrounding Burscough. However, a full traffic assessment is required to support any proposals and any increase in traffic must be to a safe level and supported by mitigation. HGVs will be allowed to pass through the site. The Council is fully aware of the localised road conditions which are noted as concern in the representation. However, the masterplan seeks to deliver the required development whilst ensuring there is no greater negative impact on the highway than already exists and where possible, improvements are made.

Criteria is included to ensure amenity of neighbouring properties is considered. However, it is not the role of planning to ensure views are protected for surrounding residents and this would be difficult to achieve given development anywhere on this flat site is likely to be seen from surrounding properties.

Consultee Name: Mr an Barry Farrington

Organisation:

Comments: I am most concerned about the discharge of traffic onto the A59. when looking at the map, it seems that the obvious thing to do would be to continue Square Lane into the site from the curved T junction with the A59. This would improve traffic flow at busy times. The plan to put the new road opposite Lordsgate Drive will cause congestion, especially around the school. Times I have concerns about the implications for the safety of the school children. Also, I hope that the mature trees along the A59 border of the site will not be disturbed. I am concerned about the amount of traffic discharging on to the A59. I would also hope that the mature trees that front the A59 onto Higgins Lane are protected along with any others on the site.

Supporting attachments

Council response: Traffic - The masterplan allows the potential for Higgins Lane to be closed if this is felt appropriate at the time but it does not require it. It is unlikely that significant traffic volumes will travel north and west through the rural roads surrounding Burscough. However, a full traffic assessment is required to support any proposals and any increase in traffic must be to a safe level and supported by mitigation. HGVs will be allowed to pass through the site. The Council is fully aware of the localised road conditions which are noted as concern in the representation. However, the masterplan seeks to deliver the required development whilst ensuring there is no greater negative impact on the highway than already exists and where possible, improvements are made.

Consultee Name: Mr Campbell Cunningham

Organisation:

Comments:

West Lancashire Draft MASTER PLAN Consultation Response

Drainage – There is apparently a plan for “Sustainable Drainage Systems” shown as SUDS on the plan. The councillors had stated at the beginning that no building would take place until the drainage infrastructure was in place. At the presentation at Burscough Wharf there was apparently no knowledge of how this drainage system was to be implemented – or when it was to be in place (before, during after building has commenced?). I find this staggering in a development of this size that the developers are seemingly going to be allowed to decide when and how this to be done. My concerns were highlighted when I saw in the internet a report from Kent that a developer had been allowed to build 400 houses without putting a promised/planned drainage system in place. How is the council going to control the developer?

Wildlife – I see no consideration for the abundant wildlife on the fields where this development is to take place. The hedges will not be adequately protected as indicated by the null response to one of my questions at one of the consultation meetings - “What will happen if the developer accidentally uproots all the hedges that the council had said that they ideally should be keeping?” Access road – how is the major road into the estate going to be used – will it become a rat run for traffic trying to avoid congestion on the A59 - what measures are going to be produced to control this traffic? What consideration has been given to the already congested A59 where there will be junctions accessing the site – especially for heavy plant accessing the site during the years of construction?

Protected Views – What is this all about – when was this decided on and by whom? It certainly wasn’t mentioned at any of the meetings that I have attended. Why haven’t the views of houses on Liverpool Road South and Higgins Lane got protected views?

Literature Images – how come the images on all council plans show the dilapidated farm buildings of yew Tree Farm – as though the whole estate is going to be built on brown field – and why don’t you show the green fields that are going to be built on as well/ instead?

Supporting attachments

Council response:

Land drainage is complex and planning has no control over bringing together overall responsibility to one party. However, the masterplan ensures that this issue will be dealt with and considered by all relevant parties at the planning application stage which does allow for a degree of cooperation between the parties. United Utilities have a legal obligation to upgrade the network to support development and growth. However, wording within the masterplan document will assist with the ensuring measures are in place to help with the timing of such improvements and this wording has been supported by United Utilities. Planning cannot force land owners beyond the site with riparian responsibilities to maintain the drainage network to do so. SUDS are a standard part of most new developments and are generally shallow and well designed to look like an integral part of the development. The future management of such features will either fall to the Lead Local Flood Authority or the land owner, depending on when the development comes forward relative to the establishment of the LLFA.

The council is aware that additional development will result in increased surface water run-off and that is why the requirement to attenuate this run off to the existing greenfield rate has been included in the document.

Comments regarding ecology are noted and specific requirements to address any potential impacts are included within the document including the requirement for a HRA.

Consultee Name: Mr Owen Barton

Organisation:

Comments: I agree with the phasing of the site: putting the first phase nearest the village centre makes sense and the newly built up area would be fringed by the existing rights of way that would retain an open outlook. The retention of the tall hedgerows is a big plus, but if these are in back gardens, expect them to disappear fast. They should form part of the street scene or green infrastructure network. The siting of the community facilities in the centre of the site makes sense to me too – it makes it easiest to access from all of the new houses. The east-west ‘primary road’ linking Liverpool Road South should be able to take traffic serving the existing / expanded industrial estate as well as local traffic. This way it would save lorries etc going to / from the north of Burscough having to drive the full length of the settlement via Liverpool Road South before finally turning on to Pippin St / Tollgate Lane. If you’re aiming to keep sending industrial estate traffic right through Burscough as at present, you should have a re-think; your own masterplan identifies Liverpool Road South as being ‘over capacity’ at certain times in the week, so the Yew Tree Farm development should be taking the brunt of the traffic it generates away from Liverpool Road South. I am disappointed that the time I spent commenting on the previous draft of this has been wasted. In your response to my comments and in the revised masterplan there is no mention of design review or the use of a design code to achieve a high quality, locally distinctive design – both of which I thought were constructive suggestions that would strengthen your arm when it came to negotiating proposals for the site. I can only conclude that every reference to quality design, sense of place, character or local distinctiveness are not real issues as far as West Lancs is concerned. Instead we get this wishy-washy ‘overarching’ wish list that most developers will simply ignore due to its lack of teeth, even more so that in the long list of ‘required Supporting Information’ (pages 44-45) does not ask for a design statement or rationale. Reading through the list of design aspirations on pages 18-19 it suggests you don’t really know what you want – it’s too vague and doesn’t point the reader towards anything to aspire to. There’s all this talk about local distinctiveness and character, but nowhere does the SPD tell a potential developer what Burscough’s character is and what is locally distinctive about it and therefore what is expected of their proposals. By not doing this you’ll have little ammunition to criticise standard housing schemes being proposed here, and let’s face it that is what you will get. The weakness of your entire approach to design is exemplified by the direct quoting of the NPPF (page 42) rather than setting out something specific. West Lancs has employed these same NPPF policies to give us the placeless pattern book housing at ‘the Carriages’ and the characterless disaster-in-waiting at Abbey Lane. These same policies landed us with palisade fencing on the main road in the town centre, complemented by a giant internally illuminated sign (this is at the new fencing business immediately north of ‘Spar’ on Liverpool Road North). With this level of design awareness and acumen in your offices I cannot but help but fear the worst. Finally, judging by your response, it seems my comments on the previous draft were perhaps a bit too nuanced for a planner. I don’t really care who the developer is - whether it’s someone local or the likes of the volume house builders. The question that didn’t seem to register with you was “how will this masterplan avoid standard pattern book housing and uncomposed streets, stultifying layouts and streetscapes?” Reading through this document I’m none the wiser.

Supporting attachments

Council response: Comments noted.
The retail/community facilities have been located more central to the site in order not to draw any trade from the existing Burscough Town Centre, any facility on the site will only be to of a small scale nature in order to serve the new residents its is not the purpose of the masterplan to draw trade from Burscough.

Consultee Name: Mr Tim Hammond

Organisation:

Comments: I am acting as Planning Agent to PHS Group. PHS Group wishes to provide a consultation response to the Council's Masterplan proposals for the Yew Tree Farm site at Burscough. Unfortunately PHS Group only recently became aware of the proposals and consultation process associated with the Masterplan and have not had the opportunity to consider them in detail. We would therefore like to request the opportunity of engaging more fully with the Council on the Masterplan, albeit we appreciate that this will need to take place after your stated consultation close date of today 21 November 2014. PHS Group operate a licensed waste transfer facility including the transfer of hazardous wastes at Unit 3, Tollgate Crescent on Burscough Industrial Estate. These operations are located immediately to the west of the Masterplan site and are in part surrounded by the proposed development areas. PHS Group also has proposals to expand these operations which it intends to discuss with the Planning Authority soon. We understand that the Masterplan area has been part of the SP3 Strategic Development Site in the West Lancashire Local Plan for some time. We also appreciate that the purpose of the Masterplan proposals is intended to add an extra layer of detail to what has previously been adopted as Council policy in the local plan and provide details on the specific development types and uses of land. PHS Group has particular concerns about the proposed proximity of certain sensitive land uses to an established industrial area on the Burscough Industrial Estate. In particular we would wish to question the proximity of the proposed Safeguarded School Area and whether or not this might be better placed closer to the centre of Burscough and further away from Tollgate Crescent and the wider industrial premises on Tollgate Road and Ringtail Road. It may also be appropriate to reconsider the configuration of the proposed Employment Areas so that they better relate to the pattern of established uses. We would like to have the opportunity to provide further details regarding our concerns and, if appropriate, arrange a meeting with the relevant council planning officers to discuss these further.

Supporting attachments

Council response: Comments noted. The location of the school and residential development have been assessed in relation to the proximity of the wate transfer station.

Consultee Name: Mr Marcus France

Organisation:

Comments: On behalf of the governing body of Lordsgate Township CE Primary School, I would like to take this opportunity to share our concerns over a number of issues with regard to the development of Yew Tree Farm. The greatest area of concern is around road safety and parking because of the proposed main entrance into the development being directly opposite Lordsgate Drive. The school has already recognised that the volume of traffic during peak school times causes a risk to the safety of children arriving for and leaving school. The school has taken a number of steps to try and alleviate the problems caused on the A59 near to Lordsgate Drive, but the problems around parking and safety to children still exist. The other areas that parents have been encouraged to use to park are already at saturation point. With the best will in the world, not every parent can walk their children to school. According to the Highways & Transport Review published in April 2014, it is proposed that a signalised junction at the A59/Yew Tree Farm access should incorporate Lordsgate Drive which is the access road to the school. This will undoubtedly involve a large junction at this point, removing parking space along the A59 that is currently used by parents whilst dropping off at and picking up from school. There is already a lack of parking space in the area – making less roadside parking available will only increase this problem. The knock on effect of this is that parents will have to park further away from school and in areas that are not managed by a crossing patrol. Furthermore, in the review, it is stated that the inclusion of a dedicated parking and drop off point within the Yew Tree Farm site for school is not considered appropriate, and that alternative parking provision at convenient locations should be considered. We are not aware of any other ‘convenient locations’ that could be used that would provide parking to give safe access to the school and be convenient for parents. Therefore, we would ask that this recommendation be reconsidered and that the inclusion of a dedicated parking point be included in the plans. It is felt that the building of a crossroads at the A59/Lordsgate Drive junction will compromise the safety of Lordsgate’s children on their way to and from school. We would therefore seek more clarification on what measures will be put into place to ensure safety and convenience for children and their parents. It is understood that the proposed new entrance opposite Lordsgate Drive would also be used as an access road to the new retail park. Any traffic coming into Burscough heading for the retail park from Rufford or Parbold direction would surely use this new road as access rather than the existing access at the A59/Pippin Street junction. As well as an increase in the volume of traffic, it would mean an increase in the volume of heavy goods vehicles in the vicinity of the school – again, causing concern over the safety of children. The report suggests that Burscough schools have capacity to cope with the additional places that would undoubtedly be needed following any large residential development. This may or may not be the case, but what is certain is that an increase in pupil numbers can only increase the volume of traffic at peak times and cause further parking problems. The school would like to see further assurances regarding plans to resolve drainage issues. The school field already suffers with drainage problems making the field only available for use for a small part of the year. If any drainage problems, regardless of how small, were to have an impact on the school field, it would cause it to be unusable for the vast majority of the year.

Supporting attachments

Council response: Traffic - The masterplan allows the potential for Higgins Lane to be closed if this is felt appropriate at the time but it does not require it. It is unlikely that significant traffic volumes will travel north and west through the rural roads surrounding Burscough. However, a full traffic assessment is required to support any proposals and any increase in traffic must be to a safe level and supported by mitigation. HGVs will be allowed to pass through the site. The Council is fully aware of the localised road conditions which are noted as concern in the representation. However, the masterplan seeks to deliver the required development whilst ensuring there is no greater negative impact on the highway than already exists and where possible, improvements are made.

Consultee Name: Ms Michelle Blair

Organisation:

Comments:

1. The masterplan context incorrectly describes Burscough as the third largest settlement and uses inappropriately persuasive prose. Burscough is not the third but the fourth largest settlement after Aughton according to http://www.westlancs.gov.uk/media/94833/LDF_SP_Ormskirk.pdf. The 2011 quoted population of Burscough of 9182 is clearly less than the 2001 Aughton population of 9551 quoted. The masterplan uses this incorrect description of Burscough's comparative size to set the context for what development is acceptable in the community and to justify being dismissive of Burscough residents' perception of Burscough as a 'village'. Given the documents purpose as a useful framework for development such inaccuracies and disparagement of local identity is not appropriate.
2. The masterplan implies that Burscough is not an agricultural area. The masterplan repeatedly describes Burscough as 'originally an agricultural area' then goes on to describe industrial development. It should be emphasised that Burscough is still very much an agricultural area both in terms of its economy, function and community; the development imposed on the village on productive agricultural land obviously seeks to change that situation against the wishes of 96.3% of a representative selection of the community. Given the documents purpose as a useful framework for development the masterplan should emphasise the local perception of Burscough's identity and not the Marketing ephemera of the development lobby.
3. The context map needs to be updated. The map needs to be updated to show the closure of a supermarket and public house. Given the downturn in facilities it would be appropriate to tone down the description of Burscough's vibrancy!
4. The context makes no mention of the problems with development. The traffic and sewer/surface water flooding issues continue to be of massive concern to residents and officials. Given the document's purpose as a useful framework for development, these issues, which will inevitably influence the development, need to be highlighted so that developers can fully engage with them.
5. The context makes no mention of development in other areas of Burscough. Since the adoption of the local plan numerous building sites have appeared all over Burscough like a rash. Given the traffic, sewage and flooding issues, the number of houses planned for Burscough in the local plan and the desire of residents to retain a rural aspect to the village, the masterplan should seek to explain how exponential growth will be controlled.
6. The masterplan fails to mention a grade II listed property on the site and fails to give guidance to developers with regard to all the listed properties. Number 172 Liverpool Road South opposite Yew Tree House forms part of a listed group with Yew Tree House; its presence should be noted because of its proximity and especially as one of the legally defined "ordinary watercourses" on the site runs under both these listed properties. Given the documents purpose as a useful framework for development further description should be provided to help developers understand the care they should take with the curtilage, character and context of heritage assets.
7. The masterplan does not identify the three legally defined "ordinary watercourses" on the site. The site characteristics section describes field demarcation drainage ditches as 'not protected' this is clearly wrong as there are three legally defined "ordinary watercourses" on the site which contribute to the drainage ditches. Residents need protection from builders and landowners diverting, culverting, blocking or accidentally damaging the watercourses, creating an increased risk of fluvial flooding for residents. The masterplan must emphasise that any proposed change to the watercourses requires the prior written Consent from the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) in line with the requirements of the Land Drainage Act 1991 as amended by the FWMA 2010. It must also emphasise that any future changes to the flows in these watercourses will require further prior Consent from the LLFA.
8. The masterplan undervalues aspects of biodiversity that have local importance. The protection of species of relevant to the SSSI Martin Mere is highlighted in this and in the HRA, but the mitigation of impacts on a few high profile species will not adequately protect other species and habitats on YTF. Throughout the local plan consultation representations have been made identifying species in residence. Given the documents purpose as a useful framework for development the masterplan should identify the current status of the site with reference to the local knowledge and expert opinion that have already been communicated to the WLBC in addition to the HRA; it should outline the exact issues and matters which require specific mitigation measures and it should include a requirement that planning applications must state how a development will achieve a net gain in biodiversity.
9. The masterplan does not detail where and how much surface water flow will be diverted into the watercourses and does not state that these changes will require prior written consent from the LLFA. Any future changes to the flows in the watercourses will require further prior written consent from the LLFA. This is required because the local plan intends that surface water flows from some houses in the surrounding estates will be diverted into one or all (this is not clear) of the three ordinary watercourses that run across YTF, downstream of YTF. The masterplan must state that any change in

flow for the ordinary watercourses require prior written consent from the LLFA.

10. The masterplan incorrectly states that there are no areas of land at risk from fluvial flooding. The flood risk section needs amending to include the data from the Environment Agency's 'Risk of Flooding from Rivers and Sea' interactive map which clearly shows a fluvial flooding risk on this land, note also that the three legally defined "ordinary watercourses" protected by Land Drainage Act 1991 as amended by the FWMA 2010 are shown. http://watermaps.environment-agency.gov.uk/wiyby/wiyby.aspx?lang=_e&topic=floodmap&layer=default&scale=11&x=344499&y=411499#x=344499&y=411499&scale=11

11. The masterplan does not prioritise the construction of new sewer network capacity. The lack of sewer network capacity is already the primary cause of poor drainage causing surface water flooding and sewer overflows of foul water in Burscough. Any additional development in Burscough or Ormskirk will increase the discharges into this network and therefore exacerbate these existing problems. This masterplan must contain information about United Utilities' plans for the sewer network investment in Burscough. For instance it needs to show where the new sewer infrastructure will be installed and when it will be completed, so it can easily be incorporated into the site plans.

12. The masterplan does not state that house building must be stopped if the construction of a new sewer network capacity has not been completed. The local plan allows 200 houses to be built at YTF before the increased sewer network capacity is finished, this means that Burscough will be at risk of more frequent and severe flooding. The masterplan should clearly state that building on YTF must be stopped at 200 homes if the construction of sewers has not been completed.

13. The masterplan does not acknowledge that the traffic problems in Burscough will be made worse by the YTF development and the wider developments in Burscough. There seems to be an lot of conflicting waffle in the masterplan on traffic with a subtext that traffic orders may be able to resolve the additional traffic congestion resulting from YTF. It is important that the masterplan clearly states the current situation and the effect that YTF and the wider developments in Burscough will have on the traffic. Instead of waffle, the masterplan should use the conclusions of the experts, extracted by FOI: "A meeting has been held with LCC and a database assessment has been produced which indicates that the development [YTF] could not easily be accommodated without resulting in major traffic issues. . . . The main problem is the road network surrounding Burscough and its strategic location in terms of connecting to major roads and motorways . . DC confirmed that the size of the development could be changeable and the development phased." Planning Officer Gillian Whitfield to Hurlston Brook Ltd E-mail dated 25 June 2010.

14. The masterplan does not outline a phased approach to building to monitor and limit the traffic problems in Burscough as suggested by LCC. The LCC traffic study, released by FOI after the local plan was adopted, recommended a phased approach to building at YTF in order to monitor the effect on local highways. This was reiterated by a LCC traffic engineer during the stakeholder meetings earlier this year. The masterplan should outline how house building at YTF will be phased whilst measuring its effect on the road network, the first phase to coincide with the completion of the first 200 houses on YTF and the new sewer network planned by United Utilities.

15. The masterplan does not reflect the limit of 500 houses in this plan period. The housing numbers 550 to 650 for phase 1 are incorrect they should state 500 maximum. Currently the masterplan numbers are 10 to 30% above the 500 maximum stated by the planning inspector at the local plan hearings. It is an extremely cynical waste of the public's time when a crucial detail of the local plan decided by the planning inspector in a public hearing, is later radically altered and no public explanation provided. The masterplan should reflect the limit of 500 houses in this plan period.

16. The masterplan does not address the housing need in Burscough. Burscough needs more low cost social housing to rent, it is not sufficient to include a woolly reference to 'affordable housing' open to interpretation by developers. The masterplan needs to clearly state what percentage of the housing planned is affordable by whom and prioritise housing to accommodate those residents already on the housing waiting list.

17. The masterplan does not safeguard the 'safeguarded land' for development post 2027 as outlined in SP3. The local plan outlines part of the site as being 'safeguarded from development until 2027 at least' yet the masterplan is vague about how long the land is to be safeguarded by stating that it should 'be available for potential future development needs'. The masterplan must be robust in its wording and clearly indicate the size and boundaries of the safeguarded land and that the land is protected from development in this plan period.

Supporting attachments

Council response:

Comments noted. The character section of the document details the characteristics and explains the mixture of Burscough's identity as the town has grown over time. Land drainage is complex and planning has no control over bringing together overall responsibility to one party. However, the masterplan ensures that this issue will be dealt with and considered by all relevant parties at the planning application stage which does allow for a degree of cooperation between the parties. United

Utilities have a legal obligation to upgrade the network to support development and growth. However, wording within the masterplan document will assist with the ensuring measures are in place to help with the timing of such improvements and this wording has been supported by United Utilities. Planning cannot force land owners beyond the site with riparian responsibilities to maintain the drainage network to do so. SUDS are a standard part of most new developments and are generally shallow and well designed to look like an integral part of the development. The future management of such features will either fall to the Lead Local Flood Authority or the land owner, depending on when the development comes forward relative to the establishment of the LLFA.

The council is aware that additional development will result in increased surface water run-off and that is why the requirement to attenuate this run off to the existing greenfield rate has been included in the document.

Comments regarding ecology are noted and specific requirements to address any potential impacts are included within the document including the requirement for a HRA.

Yew Tree Farm should deliver a minimum of 500 homes in the first phase. This will ensure that growth in the area is met within this Local Plan period. Additional proposals on other sites across the Borough will be judged on their own merits and against the requirements of the Local Plan. However, there is no maximum allowance of housing that may be delivered or moratorium on additional numbers of dwellings that could be built.

Consultee Name: Mrs T Burscough Parish Council

Organisation:

Comments:

Flawed Document The document is flawed in a number of ways

- There is no version control and it is therefore not clear to the reader which issue is being read. The Transport Review for Yew Tree Farm should have been made available at the same time as the draft masterplan.
- There is ambiguity in the wording of the document: many statements can be deemed to be misleading or contradictory . Examples are included in the text below.
- The Master Plan lists many issues but in key areas fails to offer solutions (such as parking for Lordsgate School, changes to highway, cycle and foot traffic travelling to Burscough, drainage off site, flooding off-site etc.)
- The final document may be changed subsequent to this round of consultation and therefore we will not be able to comment on the final document.
- The draft document contains a lot of technical information and this is not written in a way which lay people can understand.
- It differs substantially from Policy SP3 which for instance, states that Yew Tree Farm should deliver a new town park, and traffic mitigation measures to improve traffic flow on Liverpool Road South and protect other local roads. The Master Plan is contrary to the Local Plan in these and other aspects. On these aspects of the document alone, the Parish Council believes the plan not to be sound, and that it should be redrafted. The following paragraphs provide further details of weaknesses in the plan.

On-Street Parking P19 states that on-street parking is acceptable for some houses. The Parish Council is concerned that that means that planning applications for housing that offers no off street parking would be acceptable in planning terms, or for free movement of emergency vehicles. This would make for a poorer development and is contrary to planning policy. All housing on Yew Tree Farm must have the appropriate number of off-street parking places in line with policy guidance. Diluting requirements particularly in an area where space is not at a premium is unnecessary.

Sewage Standing orders were suspended to allow members of the public to contribute. **New Lane Upgrade.** Network capacity issues are alluded to but not explained. Replacing pipes to New Lane is not mentioned. It has been accepted that the removal of surface water from the foul water system will allow 200 houses to be built. Infrastructure improvements must be put in place before further planning approvals are granted. The Master Plan accepts that sewage systems will operate at capacity: The Parish Council would argue that no system should be planned to operate at capacity and that there should always be some space for emergency. To plan to work at capacity leaves no room at all for error and is reckless.

Drainage P11 discusses drainage in general terms. It advises that Planning Control has no control beyond the site. A number of roads are not capable of taking rainwater leading to further concerns about the impact of YTF on the existing infrastructure. It states also that “no greater impact will result in terms of flood risk” but this is not evidenced anywhere. The Parish Council remains concerned about how impact is measured, and how it will be monitored in the long term, and how existing homes will be protected downstream if in future years, calculations are found to be wanting. Any risk assessment must be independently validated and must provide details of who is responsible in the event that flooding does occur. P27 Para 2 says that any new development should not be located in areas liable to environmental risks such as flooding, but two maps contained in the Master Plan show the same areas both at risk of flooding at present and suitable for residential use. This contradiction alone makes the whole plan undeliverable. **SUDS** P27 discusses adequacy of SUDs system. The Parish Council is particularly concerned about the safety of SUDs that are open, and contained adjacent to open space. Ponds must be designed so as to protect young children from the dangers of deep and open water? There is no reference in the plan to Children’s safety: The plan must address these issues. SUDs must not be counted as public open space. Landscaping around them must not be counted as public open space unless it is accessible by the public.

Green space: All pathways, barrier between industrial and residential land, attenuation ponds, footpath through site etc are shown on the plan as public open space. P37 states public open space totals 2.5 ha’s. Clarification is required regarding what green space comprises. It should not include the SUDs, footpaths and cycleways or screening. The amount of green space shown in the Master Plan is woefully insufficient. The town park that was suggested in the local plan is not shown. There is no area of useable open space where children of between 10 and 14 can engage in an informal kickabout. It is paramount that there is at least one area of open space that is large enough for a group of teenage boys to enjoy a range of informal sports without disturbing neighbours.

Higgins Lane/and protecting local residential roads/double yellow lines/Road Safety The Parish Council does not support the closure of Higgins Lane. This is due in part because preventing access to the A59 may encourage traffic through Truscott Road and other residential areas beyond Higgins Lane

area. It is important that vehicle traffic is discouraged from using existing rat runs through residential areas as short cuts and this should be clear in the Master Plan. Policy SP3 specifically refers to protecting local roads. This plan is contrary to SP3 The Masterplan Highways and Transport Review which states that “traffic regulations orders (TROs) need to be reviewed and revised where necessary within the influenced area to better manage network operation and efficiency”. The Parish Council is concerned that this could mean that for example, where traffic is increased, double yellow lines may be used as a way to keep traffic moving along Orrell Lane, Crabtree Lane, Truscott Road estate or Higgins Lane. Burscough already has a very poor record of road safety – double yellow lines can speed up traffic on roads such as Orrell Lane, making roads less safe than they already are. P26 states that it is intended to close off Higgins Lane only when internal road network completed. This could be a long time, and would lead to the junction becoming neglected (like Pippin Street /A59 junction has been while it waited for major works) The Parish Council would prefer it not to happen, but a lengthy stay of execution is not helpful or desirable. Clarification of this and of the impact on Higgins Lane is required: It is not acceptable for it to be proposed and to never happen. It must therefore be removed from the plan before adoption. There are contrary statements with regard to Higgins Lane: P 22 states 2 x secondary vehicular access onto Higgins Lane and P25 Para 2 refers to access to Higgins Lane for HGVs. There is no mention of how Truscott Road estate will be protected from through traffic. This needs clarification before adoption of the document. Page 25 says “access will be via 3 primary accesses (Tollgate, A59 and Higgins Lane)” but P22 says that Higgins Lane has two secondary accesses. There are ambiguities here. Walking and Cycling P22 refers to footway improvements along A59 . The document says they are necessary but not what they are or how we will know when they have been achieved. The Master Plan promotes the use of sustainable transport. Most footpaths in Burscough are less than 2 meters and they do not meet guidelines for footpath width, (to make them suitable for pedestrians with buggies/wheelchairs/mobility scooters to pass). We struggle to find locations on footpaths that are wide enough to take bus shelters and there are almost no locations where bus lay-bys can be provided. Some roads are particularly narrow and riding a bike along some stretches would not be encouraged for safety reasons. Riding a bike along the A59 between the Bull and Dog and Square Lane, along Square Lane, along Pippin Street, and along other roads, seriously impedes motorised traffic and so encouraging sustainable traffic will not help capacity issues. These facts together with the consistently high road traffic accidents and deaths statistics, lead the Parish Council to believe that this aspect of the plan is not deliverable. The Master Plan sets out the aim but does not set out how that might be achieved, leaving the puzzle to the others. If the plan is to maintain that the developer will be required to provide solutions as part of any planning permission, then there must be no compromises on standards. Each element of the development requires a separate travel plan. This will lead to a lack of co-hesion within the site. Town Centre P23 refers to improved cycle provision in Burscough Village, but no mention of improved parking for cars. For the village/town centre to thrive and grow, it is essential that it derives the maximum benefit from the Yew Tree Farm development. The Parish Council believe the key to this is car parking, for people working in the centre, for the shops, library, health centre etc, and for the trains. The master plans seeks to provide more cycle parking provision, but does not suggest more car parking provision. Significant additional car parking provision is essential. The “preferred maximum walking distance to the town centre as stated in the Highways and Transport Review is 800 meters. Most of Yew Tree Farm exceeds this therefore additional car parking in the village is essential. This must be included in the Master Plan.

A59 and Lordsgate School While the Parish Council cannot identify another access point that is better located than on the A59 opposite Lordsgate Drive, it is wholly unacceptable that the Master Plan leaves Lordsgate School without parking provision and without any solution. It must identify how and where parking can be provided, that is adequate, deliverable and safe for children coming to and from school.

The Master Plan P25 identifies that changes will be required to the junction of A59 and Square Lane and at Junction Lane Traffic Lights but there is no mention or plan anywhere of what highway changes will be required. The Master Plan should provide a solution, instead of leaving that to a later time. Improvements must be incorporated at the same time as the major access. If not, Junction Lane may suffer additional traffic. The suggestion that traffic will be monitored and changes made as needed is not workable – the damage will then have been done and will be irrevocable.

P 10 discusses traffic on surrounding roads. It accepts worsening congestion and does not put forward solutions other than mitigation measures that focus on sustainable transport (walking and cycling). It refers us to section on Connectivity (p20) which doesn't provide solutions either. An acceptance of worsening congestion is not in compliance with, and is contrary to, the local plan. It should not therefore be adopted.

Housing The plan states “at least 500 houses” but does not provide a maximum number. Page 37 quotes figures which add up to between 550 and 650. The Local Plan and Master Plan quote at times “500” and at times “at least 500 ”. The inspector, during the examination of the local plan, was heard

to confirm that the figure should be 500 in the plan period. The Master Plan must state the maximum number of houses allowed, and must explain how this will fit with the allocation of 850 for Burscough. This level of ambiguity is totally unacceptable and must be corrected. Clearly, traffic projections will be quite different for 500 than for 650, and “at least 500” could mean many many more: This makes a nonsense of any traffic assessments which must of course be based on an actual number to be meaningful. The plan cannot be adopted without a clear maximum number being stated, and without assessments having been made on that number. The development must provide the full quota of affordable homes and must meet the current needs of the whole community. The Master Plan uses the phrase “flexible housing” which we understand to mean houses for life. The Parish Council applauds the Borough Council for setting this high standard for all homes built. Equality Impact Assessment Equality Impact Assessments undertaken have been superficial and wholly inadequate: No direct consultation appears to have been undertaken with excluded groups .

Play Areas P34 discusses space for play and leisure and refers to MUGA skateboard park and play area. No site is shown. More information is required regarding the siting of a MUGA and Skateboard Park to determine whether this is suitable in this location. These are required in Burscough, but may be more appropriately located in another part of the parish. If they are to be sited in Yew Tree Farm, it is necessary to show how they are to be accommodated adjacent to housing.

Sustainable Energy The Master Plan does not mention the decentralised energy network facility that is suggested in the local plan. The Parish Council would applaud the requirements for use of sustainable energy but note these are aspirational only and are not a specific requirement of development. These should be tightened up so that they are requirements.

In Summary In summary, the Master Plan provides a piecemeal approach to development that may lead to work being left incomplete by developers after residents have moved in. The Quays and like Heathfields Estate remain unfinished and unadopted. The Master Plan must be clear about how it will ensure that whole areas of development do not remain unadopted like the Quays and Heathfields. Leaving the detail to the Developer There are several examples of the Master Plan identifying a problem, but leaving the solution to the developers to determine at a later date. It is not acceptable to leave all of these problems for others to solve. The Draft Plan expects the developer to undertake certain tasks in their plans, but fails to show the levels to be achieved or the process involved. There are very many opportunities for plans to go wrong, potentially leaving the community with an unsatisfactory outcome. The proposal that was described in the Preferred Options Paper 2012 has dramatically changed: There is no new town park, no renewable energy network facility and no highway improvements. The benefits of “improved transport” and “improved drainage” are no more and the plan accepts that there may be further pressure on existing provision. There are many ambiguities, anomalies and contradictions: Not least the glaring anomaly that P27 Para 2 says that new development should not be located in areas liable to environmental risks such as flooding but the map of areas at risk of flooding shows those areas to be the same as the ones highlighted as suitable for residential use. Other anomalies, ambiguities and contradictions have been described above. The level of ambiguities, anomalies and contradictions leaves the plan open to wide interpretation and unsound and we would request the Plan is reviewed again and “tightened up” before being approved by WLBC. Most worrying is that there appears to be no powers to hold people to account. The Parish Council believes that residents should know what remedy is available if there are negative impacts for them and their properties. We would like to suggest also, that in the development of Yew Tree Farm, and in all developments in Burscough, plans are put in place to maximise the potential for local labour to be used, providing jobs and training for local people, and particularly the apprenticeship scheme for young people.

Supporting attachments

Council response:

The masterplan provides a framework for applicants and the Council to use when consider proposals for planning permission in respect of the Yew Tree Farm site. It should not be overly prescriptive nor should it provide guidance on how to carry out all of the assessments which will be required to support such an application. It is important that this document maintains a degree of flexibility so it is future proofed and that it is proportionate in respect of what is required to support applications for this site. Green space is defined by the definition set out within the Open Space and Recreation in new development SPD.

Additional wording will be included to given extra clarity regarding the complex responsibilities associated with waste water and flood risk. The masterplan supports improvements to the village centre to ensure access by public transport, cycling and on foot can be enhanced. Yew Tree Farm should deliver a minimum of 500 homes in the first phase. This will ensure that growth in the area is met within this Local Plan period. Additional proposals on other sites across the Borough will be judged on their own merits and against the requirements of the Local Plan. However, there is no maximum allowance of housing that may be delivered or moratorium on additional numbers of dwellings that could be built.

Traffic - The masterplan allows the potential for Higgins Lane to be closed if this is felt appropriate at the time but it does not require it. It is unlikely that significant traffic volumes will travel north and west through the rural roads surrounding Burscough. However, a full traffic assessment is required to support any proposals and any increase in traffic must be to a safe level and supported by mitigation. HGVs will be allowed to pass through the site. The Council is fully aware of the localised road conditions which are noted as concern in the representation. However, the masterplan seeks to deliver the required development whilst ensuring there is no greater negative impact on the highway than already exists and where possible, improvements are made.

Land drainage is complex and planning has no control over bringing together overall responsibility to one party. However, the masterplan ensures that this issue will be dealt with and considered by all relevant parties at the planning application stage which does allow for a degree of cooperation between the parties. United Utilities have a legal obligation to upgrade the network to support development and growth. However, wording within the masterplan document will assist with the ensuring measures are in place to help with the timing of such improvements and this wording has been supported by United Utilities. Planning cannot force land owners beyond the site with riparian responsibilities to maintain the drainage network to do so. SUDS are a standard part of most new developments and are generally shallow and well designed to look like an integral part of the development. The future management of such features will either fall to the Lead Local Flood Authority or the land owner, depending on when the development comes forward relative to the establishment of the LLFA.

The council is aware that additional development will result in increased surface water run-off and that is why the requirement to attenuate this run off to the existing greenfield rate has been included in the document.

Comments regarding ecology are noted and specific requirements to address any potential impacts are included within the document including the requirement for a HRA.

Consultee Name: Mrs Christine Haigh

Organisation:

Comments: I currently rent out a property on Pickles Drive and am very concerned about the impact this development will have on a number of issues.

- a) the future value of my property
- b) how the lack of sufficient drainage will effect the surrounding area
- c) Burscough's infastructure is already creaking and I have grave doubts whether it will be able to sustain future developments.
- d) Traffic at peak times is already gridlocked.

Supporting attachments

Council response: Traffic - The masterplan allows the potential for Higgins Lane to be closed if this is felt appropriate at the time but it does not require it. It is unlikely that significant traffic volumes will travel north and west through the rural roads surrounding Burscough. However, a full traffic assessment is required to support any proposals and any increase in traffic must be to a safe level and supported by mitigation. HGVs will be allowed to pass through the site. The Council is fully aware of the localised road conditions which are noted as concern in the representation. However, the masterplan seeks to deliver the required development whilst ensuring there is no greater negative impact on the highway than already exists and where possible, improvements are made.

Land drainage is complex and planning has no control over bringing together overall responsibility to one party. However, the masterplan ensures that this issue will be dealt with and considered by all relevant parties at the planning application stage which does allow for a degree of cooperation between the parties. United Utilities have a legal obligation to upgrade the network to support development and growth. However, wording within the masterplan document will assist with the ensuring measures are in place to help with the timing of such improvements and this wording has been supported by United Utilities. Planning cannot force land owners beyond the site with riparian responsibilities to maintain the drainage network to do so. SUDS are a standard part of most new developments and are generally shallow and well designed to look like an integral part of the development. The future management of such features will either fall to the Lead Local Flood Authority or the land owner, depending on when the development comes forward relative to the establishment of the LLFA.

The council is aware that additional development will result in increased surface water run-off and that is why the requirement to attenuate this run off to the existing greenfield rate has been included in the document.

Consultee Name: Ms Katie Wheeler

Organisation: Natural England

Comments: Thank you for your consultation on the above which was received by Natural England on 07 October 2014.

Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development. Natural England provided comments at the previous options consultation stage via correspondence dated 18 March 2014, reference 112016, where we provided recommendations on Green Infrastructure (GI), we now welcome the references to GI in the SPD but notice that the ANGSt standards have not been included, this is something we strongly recommend is included. A robust framework for GI design and planning should be incorporated into the SPD to ensure that the development creates accessible GI that is high quality, this can help alleviate some recreational pressure on nearby designated sites, such as Martin Mere where this may be an issue as well as have other benefits as detailed in the previous correspondence.

Master plan This Master plan document confirms the amount and type of development to be delivered within the Yew Tree Farm site, as set out in West Lancashire Local Plan Policy SP3. As stated in the plan it is critical that the Yew Tree Farm site must deal with land drainage from the site itself as well as surface water drainage from the new development and surface water drainage to be extracted from the existing network in order to assist with the management of flows through the wider network. Natural England agree that as part of any outline planning application for the Yew Tree Farm site an overall drainage strategy is required.

Biodiversity Natural England agrees with the detailed requirements that must be met. HRA The HRA has identified: Increased levels of housing and business can lead to reduced water quality. New buildings have the potential to disturb species outside of the SPA and RAMSAR site. Waste water treatment infrastructure is vital to ensure that no negative implications arise that could impact on protected species. Natural England agrees with the conclusions reached that the SPD does currently include a commitment that land promoters will work in partnership to address drainage issues on site. As previously stated it is recommended that this text be expanded to state that a similar approach will be committed to in order to address waste water treatment also, and that development may not proceed until solutions are confirmed in line with commitments in the West Lancashire Local Plan. Natural England agree you must ensure the production of a detailed ornithological survey report takes place as soon as possible before the masterplan advances, and to the exploration and provision of firstly avoidance then if necessary mitigation measures that may arise.

Sustainability Appraisal In part 10 the Sustainability Matrix the Summary of Impacts show that two negative impacts have been identified. The Sustainability Appraisal states that these factors could be monitored and mitigation could be implemented in order to address the negative issues through the Annual Monitoring Report (AMR). Natural England agrees with this conclusion, however recommend that some additional wording be put on place to explain what will happen if these issues continue or worsen.

Supporting attachments

Council response: No comments required.

Consultee Name: Mr Paul Simpson

Organisation:

Comments: The issues that I wish to raise are listed below: The masterplan does not identify the three legally defined "ordinary watercourses" on the site. Residents need protection from builders and landowners diverting, culverting, blocking or accidentally damaging the watercourses, creating an increased risk of fluvial flooding for residents. The masterplan must emphasise that any proposed change to the watercourses requires the prior written Consent from the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) in line with the requirements of the Land Drainage Act 1991 as amended by the FWMA 2010. It must also emphasise that any future changes to the flows in these watercourses will require further prior Consent from the LLFA. The masterplan does not detail where and how much surface water flow will be diverted into the watercourses and does not state that these changes will require prior written consent from the LLFA. Any future changes to the flows in the watercourses will require further prior written Consent from the LLFA. This is required because the local plan intends that surface water flows from some houses in the surrounding estates will be diverted into one or all (this is not clear) of the three ordinary watercourses that run across YTF, downstream of YTF. The masterplan must state that any change in flow for the ordinary watercourses require prior written Consent from the LLFA. The masterplan does not prioritise the construction of new sewer network capacity. The lack of sewer network capacity is already the primary cause of poor drainage causing surface water flooding and sewer overflows of foul water in Burscough. Any additional development in Burscough or Ormskirk will increase the discharges into this network and therefore exacerbate these existing problems. This masterplan must contain information about United Utilities' plans for the sewer network investment in Burscough. For instance it needs to show where the new sewer infrastructure will be installed and when it will be completed, so it can easily be incorporated into the site plans. The masterplan does not state that house building must be stopped if the construction of a new sewer network capacity has not been completed. The local plan allows 200 houses to be built at YTF before the increased sewer network capacity is finished, this means that Burscough will be at risk of more frequent and severe flooding. The masterplan should clearly state that building on YTF must be stopped at 200 homes if the construction of sewers has not been completed. The masterplan does not acknowledge that the traffic problems in Burscough will be made worse by the YTF development and the wider developments in Burscough. There seems to be an lot of conflicting waffle in the masterplan on traffic with a subtext that traffic orders may be able to resolve the additional traffic congestion resulting from YTF. It is important that the masterplan clearly states the current situation and the effect that YTF and the wider developments in Burscough will have on the traffic. Instead of waffle the masterplan should use the conclusions of the experts, extracted by FOI: "A meeting has been held with LCC and a database assessment has been produced which indicates that the development [YTF] could not easily be accommodated without resulting in major traffic issues. . . . The main problem is the road network surrounding Burscough and its strategic location in terms of connecting to major roads and motorways . . DC confirmed that the size of the development could be changeable and the development phased." Planning Officer Gillian Whitfield to Hurlston Brook Ltd E-mail dated 25 June 2010. The masterplan does not outline a phased approach to building to monitor and limit the traffic problems in Burscough as suggested by LCC. The LCC traffic study, released by FOI after the local plan was adopted, recommended a phased approach to building at YTF in order to monitor the effect on local highways. This was reiterated by a LCC traffic engineer during the stakeholder meetings earlier this year. The masterplan should outline how house building at YTF will be phased whilst measuring its effect on the road network, the first phase to coincide with the completion of the first 200 houses on YTF and the new sewer network planned by United Utilities. The masterplan does not reflect the limit of 500 houses in this plan period. The housing numbers 550 to 650 for phase 1 are incorrect they should state 500 maximum. Currently the masterplan numbers are 10 to 30% above the 500 maximum stated by the planning inspector at the local plan hearings. It is an extremely cynical waste of the public's time when a crucial detail of the local plan decided by the planning inspector in a public hearing, is later radically altered and no public explanation provided. The masterplan should reflect the limit of 500 houses in this plan period. The masterplan does not address the housing need in Burscough. Burscough needs more low cost social housing to rent, it is not sufficient to include a woolly reference to 'affordable housing' open to interpretation by developers. The masterplan needs to clearly state what percentage of the housing planned is affordable by whom and prioritise housing to accommodate those residents already on the housing waiting list. The masterplan does not safeguard the 'safeguarded land' for development post 2027 as outlined in SP3. The local plan outlines part of the site as being 'safeguarded from development until 2027 at least' yet the masterplan is vague about how long the land is to be safeguarded by stating that it should 'be available for potential future development needs'. The masterplan must be robust in its wording and clearly indicate the size and boundaries of the safeguarded land and that the land is protected from development in this plan period.

Council response:

Land drainage is complex and planning has no control over bringing together overall responsibility to one party. However, the masterplan ensures that this issue will be dealt with and considered by all relevant parties at the planning application stage which does allow for a degree of cooperation between the parties. United Utilities have a legal obligation to upgrade the network to support development and growth. However, wording within the masterplan document will assist with the ensuring measures are in place to help with the timing of such improvements and this wording has been supported by United Utilities. Planning cannot force land owners beyond the site with riparian responsibilities to maintain the drainage network to do so. SUDS are a standard part of most new developments and are generally shallow and well designed to look like an integral part of the development. The future management of such features will either fall to the Lead Local Flood Authority or the land owner, depending on when the development comes forward relative to the establishment of the LLFA.

The council is aware that additional development will result in increased surface water run-off and that is why the requirement to attenuate this run off to the existing greenfield rate has been included in the document.

Yew Tree Farm should deliver a minimum of 500 homes in the first phase. This will ensure that growth in the area is met within this Local Plan period. Additional proposals on other sites across the Borough will be judged on their own merits and against the requirements of the Local Plan. However, there is no maximum allowance of housing that may be delivered or moratorium on additional numbers of dwellings that could be built.

Traffic - The masterplan allows the potential for Higgins Lane to be closed if this is felt appropriate at the time but it does not require it. It is unlikely that significant traffic volumes will travel north and west through the rural roads surrounding Burscough. However, a full traffic assessment is required to support any proposals and any increase in traffic must be to a safe level and supported by mitigation. HGVs will be allowed to pass through the site. The Council is fully aware of the localised road conditions which are noted as concern in the representation. However, the masterplan seeks to deliver the required development whilst ensuring there is no greater negative impact on the highway than already exists and where possible, improvements are made.

Consultee Name: Mrs Helen Davies

Organisation:

Comments: The proposed master does not address in any of my main concerns. The increase in traffic by the development has been acknowledged but there are do not appear to be any measures in place to address this. No real indication of public transportation improvements are evident despite an amount of accommodation for the elderly being built. I can also see no incentives to effectively discourage car use. The junction with Higgins lane will quickly become yet another bottle neck in the village. Draining and flooding is a big concern. The council is well aware of these local issues but is still willing to allow this development without written guarantee that this will be addressed. The main sewerage system is overloaded and regularly backs up, the increased surface water and sewerage outfall may actually create the same issues further down the line, again there appears to be no definite action plan for this inevitable scenario. The facilities provided in the local area including doctors, schools and dentists are already at capacity, how this is to be addressed is not made clear. Yet again the answer to the council's plans appears to have been left in the hands of the developers ie, remedial works to drainage, traffic, schools. I seem to recall the same format being applied to Heathfields and the carriages. Certainly they were not delivered as part of the Heathfields development but there was no evidence of this being chased up and resolved by the council. There are too many vagaries attached to this masterplan that have not been addressed, left in the hands of developers it is inevitable that they will remain unresolved. I trust my points will be considered as those of a concerned resident.

Supporting attachments

Council response: Traffic - The masterplan allows the potential for Higgins Lane to be closed if this is felt appropriate at the time but it does not require it. It is unlikely that significant traffic volumes will travel north and west through the rural roads surrounding Burscough. However, a full traffic assessment is required to support any proposals and any increase in traffic must be to a safe level and supported by mitigation. HGVs will be allowed to pass through the site. The Council is fully aware of the localised road conditions which are noted as concern in the representation. However, the masterplan seeks to deliver the required development whilst ensuring there is no greater negative impact on the highway than already exists and where possible, improvements are made.

The masterplan supports improvements to the village centre to ensure access by public transport, cycling and on foot can be enhanced.

Land drainage is complex and planning has no control over bringing together overall responsibility to one party. However, the masterplan ensures that this issue will be dealt with and considered by all relevant parties at the planning application stage which does allow for a degree of cooperation between the parties. United Utilities have a legal obligation to upgrade the network to support development and growth. However, wording within the masterplan document will assist with the ensuring measures are in place to help with the timing of such improvements and this wording has been supported by United Utilities. Planning cannot force land owners beyond the site with riparian responsibilities to maintain the drainage network to do so. SUDS are a standard part of most new developments and are generally shallow and well designed to look like an integral part of the development. The future management of such features will either fall to the Lead Local Flood Authority or the land owner, depending on when the development comes forward relative to the establishment of the LLFA.

The council is aware that additional development will result in increased surface water run-off and that is why the requirement to attenuate this run off to the existing greenfield rate has been included in the document.

Consultee Name: Mr John Herbe Scarisbrick Parish Cou

Organisation: Scarisbrick Parish Council

Comments: Scarisbrick Parish Council wishes to comment on the Yew Tree Farm Draft Masterplan with regard to drainage and highway issues.

Drainage: The Environment Agency's decision to withdraw funding for satellite pumping operations and watercourse maintenance in the Alt-Crossens catchment is perhaps the most important issue facing the Parish and its residents at the present time. The Environment Agency will be serving notice on pumping operations in the near future and the Parish Council remains deeply concerned at the current stand-off between WLBC and central government with regard to funding a solution to this issue. A local solution put forward by the Alt-Crossens Advisory Group is not supported by either central or local government, neither of whom will commit to funding a local drainage board. There is considerable uncertainty as to the future, with the valuable agricultural area of Martin Mere being under threat. The Parish Council strongly believes that this is a Borough-wide issue and should not be perceived as a problem for the Western Parishes alone; ultimately this is everybody's water. WLBC is quite correct in pointing out that the lack of a modelling exercise means that the extent of any potential problem is unknown. The Parish Council is therefore very alarmed that a major development is being planned for Yew Tree Farm without full knowledge of the effects of ceasing drainage operations on Martin Mere, and indeed the catchment in general. The two issues clearly require to be linked. This Council's alarm is compounded by comments made in the Draft Masterplan that responsibility for the problem lies elsewhere with United Utilities, the LLFA, and riparian landowners. This is tantamount to the Planning Authority solving its own housing problems but abdicating responsibility for the consequences. This is the antithesis of planning. United Utilities seeks to solve its immediate waste water capacity problem by diverting surface water out of its existing system through Yew Tree Farm, where it will be stored and released into "natural drainage" at greenfield run-off rates. This is another example of an authority passing on the problem. Not only will the local catchment be taking water from Yew Tree Farm but also diverted water from the Ormskirk and Burscough areas. The use of the term "natural drainage" in this context serves to amplify this Council's concerns. Land drainage across the Parish is far from natural. The watercourses are man-made and require constant attention in order to function properly, an area from which the Environment Agency intends to withdraw. Riparian landowners have competing priorities and are currently actively encouraged to allow various types of weed growth in order to promote biodiversity. Such growth inevitably leads to slower flows. Notwithstanding the need for constant maintenance, flow through the watercourses is dependent upon the action of satellite pumping stations. These currently deliver water to the main facility at Crossens and thence to the sea. Such stations not only require maintenance but also an input of energy and money. It is therefore inappropriate to describe drainage of the area as "natural". It is the funding for these operations that is to be withdrawn and to which WLBC is reluctant to make any contribution. Much reliance is attached to the concept of greenfield run-off rates in the Draft Masterplan. This is not a precise science and attracts controversy. The development implements a Sustainable Urban Drainage System (SUDS) to control the rate of run-off to watercourses from impervious areas. However, SUDS do not reduce the increase in run-off volume caused by the impervious area of the development. Different techniques are available to calculate run-off rates and results can vary significantly. The Institute of Hydrology Report 124 (IH 124) is often applied to define the natural greenfield run-off from a site. Many consider the method to be crude with a tendency to underestimate flood flows. The catchment being considered in this case is far from natural and is significantly influenced by pumping. This introduces a potential source of inaccuracy in run-off calculations. This can result in the flow capacity of watercourses close to the development being exceeded with flooding in adjacent urban areas.

Highways: Lancashire County Council states that sections of the A59 have capacity issues even without the development. It is anticipated that, without intervention, the new development will exacerbate the problem and cause redistribution of traffic onto the smaller rural roads. Although the Draft Masterplan suggests that network problems can be solved by off-site mitigation measures, Lancashire County Council (as the Highway Authority) considers that there are many complex issues to be solved. They also imply that the necessary data to address these issues is incomplete, citing the need for a further detailed Transport Assessment. Scarisbrick Parish Council believes that it is vitally important that such assessments include the network beyond the highway boundary of Yew Tree Farm. The B5242 traverses Scarisbrick from the A570 to the A59/Pippin Street junction at the periphery of the proposed development. It is already a busy road which is not constructed for the heavy traffic it carries. It is not unusual for HGVs to mount the pavement in order to pass. Cycling, and indeed simply walking the pavements, can be treacherous activities. This Council's concern is that there should be no further redistribution of traffic onto this road and its tributaries. To this end the Council feels it is important that the wider strategic context is taken into account. The A570 is already a very busy road. The junction of the A570 with the A59 (County Road) is known to cause manoeuvring

problems for HGVs which is undoubtedly responsible for some of the increased traffic on the B5242. A major residential and commercial development is proposed by Sefton Borough Council at Kew which has the potential for increasing congestion on the A570 and redistributing even more traffic onto the moss roads and the B5242. The recent announcement that proposals for an Ormskirk bypass are to be scrapped is also noted in this regard. This Council believes it is vitally important that sufficient research is performed to ensure potential solutions are sound and deliverable. It is concerned that this is not yet the case. Scarisbrick Parish Council is grateful for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Masterplan and trusts that the above comments will be given due consideration.

Supporting attachments

Council response:

Traffic - The masterplan allows the potential for Higgins Lane to be closed if this is felt appropriate at the time but it does not require it. It is unlikely that significant traffic volumes will travel north and west through the rural roads surrounding Burscough. However, a full traffic assessment is required to support any proposals and any increase in traffic must be to a safe level and supported by mitigation. HGVs will be allowed to pass through the site. The Council is fully aware of the localised road conditions which are noted as concern in the representation. However, the masterplan seeks to deliver the required development whilst ensuring there is no greater negative impact on the highway than already exists and where possible, improvements are made.

Land drainage is complex and planning has no control over bringing together overall responsibility to one party. However, the masterplan ensures that this issue will be dealt with and considered by all relevant parties at the planning application stage which does allow for a degree of cooperation between the parties. United Utilities have a legal obligation to upgrade the network to support development and growth. However, wording within the masterplan document will assist with the ensuring measures are in place to help with the timing of such improvements and this wording has been supported by United Utilities. Planning cannot force land owners beyond the site with riparian responsibilities to maintain the drainage network to do so. SUDS are a standard part of most new developments and are generally shallow and well designed to look like an integral part of the development. The future management of such features will either fall to the Lead Local Flood Authority or the land owner, depending on when the development comes forward relative to the establishment of the LLFA.

The council is aware that additional development will result in increased surface water run-off and that is why the requirement to attenuate this run off to the existing greenfield rate has been included in the document.

Consultee Name: Mr Stephen McCloskey

Organisation:

Comments:

- 1) The Council prepared Masterplan is seriously flawed and should be revisited and prepared correctly. The Council states that it has taken account of the views made through the representations and of the Stakeholder group; made up of representatives from local residents, local businesses etc. Yet it is my understanding that residents and residents' groups walked out of the Masterplanning Stakeholder Group because it was clear that their views and input was being stifled and the events were designed to suppress any kind of meaningful content from being obtained from said groups. How can the Council therefore claim to have meaningfully and correctly engaged in the local community?
- 2) The proposed development of Yew Tree Farm site will potentially increase the size and population of Burscough by 25-40% and yet the Council fails to outline how the associated increase in traffic and parking can be sustained within the provision of existing roads and car parks. The truth of the matter is that it can not. Therefore YTF development should be limited accordingly.
- 3) The map showing Site Constraints and Features is inappropriately limited, and incomplete. With regard to areas susceptible to surface water flooding, the map fails to show all such locations. Such locations on the viewable map area include (but are not limited to) the junction of Square Lane and Liverpool Road South, areas of Furnival Drive not currently shown, Abbey Lane and parts of Liverpool Road South. Other locations not viewable due to the restrictive nature of the map on page 17 include (but again are not limited to) the length of Pippin Street, Junction Lane, Square Lane, Trevor Road, the junction of Trevor Road and Liverpool Road North, Liverpool Road North near the Spar shop, Moss Lane, Red Cat Lane etc. The massive nature of the Yew Tree Farm proposed development is such that the wider map of areas susceptible to surface water flooding MUST be considered, and a TRUE picture of flooding problems be accepted, in order to begin to accurately acknowledge the nature of flooding problems.
- 4) The Indicative Layout map on page 20 shows a primary road leading to a junction with Liverpool Road South directly opposite Lordsgate Drive and the associated Primary School there. This is a highly inappropriate location for such a junction, and places primary school children and other pedestrians at that location in unacceptable risk. Not only during school hours is the Lordsgate Drive area busy, but also in the evenings when other events are held there.
- 5) The Council now exposes itself as having been deceptive and misleading with regards to house numbers on Yew Tree Farm site. For over 2 years the council has referred to "500 Houses" in all associated literature and yet now at this concluding stage it refers to "AT LEAST 500 houses" for Phase 1 and on page 37 seems to provide a figure of up to 650. For this reason, and also due to the fact that during the Examination in Public the planning Inspector acknowledged that a housing limit be placed at 500, this limit should be acknowledged.
- 6) A high percentage, if not all houses to be built on Yew Tree Farm should be designed with low or renewable energy in mind, eg be fitted with solar panels etc
- 7) Yew Tree Farm site if safeguarded land not developed- Page 44. This area should be retained for agricultural use as has been the case historically, should the land not be developed in the future, as opposed to being changed to "Green space".
- 8) In all dialogue and literature to date, Council has stated that "no development" would take place without ensuring adequate drainage was put in place. However, this assurance appears to have been significantly 'watered down' within the Masterplan document, and as such the masterplan does not prioritise the construction of new sewer network capacity. Is this yet another council deception? It is essential that this masterplan contains information of United Utilities' plans for sewer network investment in Burscough. Such plans must then be compatible with the development plans for Yew Tree Farm.
- 9) The masterplan does NOT address the housing need in Burscough. Vague references to "Affordable Housing" must, at this stage, be accurately be addressed and stipulated to the Developer, and not be left open to 'interpretation'.
- 10) The masterplan does not outline a phased approach to building to monitor and limit the traffic problems in Burscough as suggested by Lancashire County Council. The LCC traffic study recommended a phased approach to building at YTF in order to monitor the effect on local highways. This was reiterated by a LCC traffic engineer during the stakeholder meetings earlier this year. The masterplan should outline how house building at YTF will be phased whilst measuring its effect on the road network, the first phase to coincide with the completion of the first 200 houses on YTF and the new sewer network planned by United Utilities.
- 11) The masterplan does not acknowledge that the traffic problems in Burscough will be made worse by the YTF development and the wider developments in Burscough. The Council has a duty to ensure that the Yew Tree Farm proposed development does not adversely affect the safety to pedestrians, cyclists and other road users that such a huge increase in traffic would create.

12) The masterplan does not identify the three legally defined "ordinary watercourses" on the site. Residents need protection from builders and landowners diverting, culverting, blocking or accidentally damaging the watercourses, creating an increased risk of fluvial flooding for residents. The masterplan must emphasise that any proposed change to the watercourses requires the prior written Consent from the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) in line with the requirements of the Land Drainage Act 1991 as amended by the FWMA 2010. It must also emphasise that any future changes to the flows in these watercourses will require further prior Consent from the LLFA.

13) The masterplan does not detail where and how much surface water flow will be diverted into the watercourses and does not state that these changes will require prior written consent from the LLFA. Any future changes to the flows in the watercourses will require further prior written Consent from the LLFA. This is required because the local plan intends that surface water flows from some houses in the surrounding estates will be diverted into one or all (this is not clear) of the three ordinary watercourses that run across YTF, downstream of YTF. The masterplan must state that any change in flow for the ordinary watercourses require prior written Consent from the LLFA. In general, this Masterplan is astonishingly devoid of strict and unambiguous detail. It is low quality and it is essential that it contains clear detail.

Supporting attachments

Council response:

All comments and issues raised by local residents and submitted through each consultations are summarised, given a full response and sometimes result directly in actions and changes to the masterplan. This information is then always reported and published thereby ensuring that all residents' views are considered and answered in full.

The Council must deliver land to support housing need and in order to do so only part of the Yew Tree Farm site is required to meet the needs of this Local Plan period which currently runs until 2027. Therefore part of the site must be safeguarded until such a time as evidence suggests the remainder of the site is required. Many factors including how available and accessible land is have been considered in deciding which parts of the site to bring forward first. The overall look and feel of the development in the event the safeguarded land is brought forward in the future has also been considered in deciding which portions of the site to safeguard. Land drainage is complex and planning has no control over bringing together overall responsibility to one party. However, the masterplan ensures that this issue will be dealt with and considered by all relevant parties at the planning application stage which does allow for a degree of cooperation between the parties. United Utilities have a legal obligation to upgrade the network to support development and growth. However, wording within the masterplan document will assist with the ensuring measures are in place to help with the timing of such improvements and this wording has been supported by United Utilities. Planning cannot force land owners beyond the site with riparian responsibilities to maintain the drainage network to do so. SUDS are a standard part of most new developments and are generally shallow and well designed to look like an integral part of the development. The future management of such features will either fall to the Lead Local Flood Authority or the land owner, depending on when the development comes forward relative to the establishment of the LLFA.

The council is aware that additional development will result in increased surface water run-off and that is why the requirement to attenuate this run off to the existing greenfield rate has been included in the document. Yew Tree Farm should deliver a minimum of 500 homes in the first phase. This will ensure that growth in the area is met within this Local Plan period. Additional proposals on other sites across the Borough will be judged on their own merits and against the requirements of the Local Plan. However, there is no maximum allowance of housing that may be delivered or moratorium on additional numbers of dwellings that could be built.

Consultee Name: Mrs Susan Ryan

Organisation:

Comments: I live on Liverpool Rd South near to the old farm house - I believe directly behind our fences at the back of the house , is earmarked for residential housing in Phase 1. As we are the only row of houses whose gardens directly border on to the fields, could we not have been afforded some consideration ? Perhaps the allotments or the allocated old peoples housing could have been built behind our houses. We all bought our houses for the magnificent view, and the houses were built with the lounges at the back and the kitchens at the front because of the view. Could the planning dept not have taken us into consideration ? Also the majority of these houses have all had drainage pipes fitted in the gardens because we all had problems with flooding. The water level is high, so how does this leave us if the drainage is not sorted out properly? If our houses suffer because of the building work, what comeback do we have? How does the build affect our current Council Tax, are they going to reduce the Banding?Will there be fencing erected between us and the new builds? We are all devastated that we are going to lose a beautiful view and all the wildlife that goes with it. we are in a recession, people cannot afford mortgages because they cannot afford the deposits. There are currently over 70 houses for sale in Burscough, if these are not being sold what makes you think that the new houses will all be sold ? And what effect will the building have on the house value of our properties, I feel that you simply don't care, and that is not the way for Burscough to go forward

Supporting attachments

Council response: Comments regarding concerns about the impacts of the development in general, concerns about the process of developing the masterplan are noted. Criteria is included to ensure amenity of neighbouring properties is considered. However, it is not the role of planning to ensure views are protected for surrounding residents and this would be difficult to achieve given development anywhere on this flat site is likely to be seen from surrounding properties. Land drainage is complex and planning has no control over bringing together overall responsibility to one party. However, the masterplan ensures that this issue will be dealt with and considered by all relevant parties at the planning application stage which does allow for a degree of cooperation between the parties. United Utilities have a legal obligation to upgrade the network to support development and growth. However, wording within the masterplan document will assist with the ensuring measures are in place to help with the timing of such improvements and this wording has been supported by United Utilities. Planning cannot force land owners beyond the site with riparian responsibilities to maintain the drainage network to do so. SUDS are a standard part of most new developments and are generally shallow and well designed to look like an integral part of the development. The future management of such features will either fall to the Lead Local Flood Authority or the land owner, depending on when the development comes forward relative to the establishment of the LLFA.

Consultee Name: Mr an K Formby

Organisation:

Comments: The main concerns relate to the fact that: Burscough is a village, despite a high percentage of local people voting against the development 90%+, the masterplan is still going ahead. Since publication of the masterplan, there are still ongoing concerns relating to the viability of such a development of this scale, the drainage and flooding difficulties the community faces already without the addition of extra houses and development on the YTF development are huge. What will be done to support this and reduce the risk of any further flooding for the future? How will the development affect local school provision - many schools are at capacity and places are a premium already? The main entrance to the development is directly opposite Lordsgate Drive. We believe that this will create an additional major safety hazard to children and parents as the A59 around Lordsgate Drive is already and will potentially become an even busier major junction. Parents currently use the A59 for dropping off/picking up. There has already been a child knocked over on this stretch of road within the last 12 months. With proposed development work and the main entrance being here where will parents park, drop off, and children cross safely? The park off junction lane is used by a limited number of families and is at capacity however this junction is a safety hazard when trying to pull out as the visibility for cars to pull out is extremely limited, so not a viable alternative. Many families walk to school reducing the need to drive but some families need to drive owing to work commitments. The walk via Junction Lane and over the bridge is already a hazard. The lorries, buses and vans come very close to pedestrians walking over the bridge, especially if too larger vehicles meet on the bridge. Have you walked this stretch recently to see how frightening it is? A pedestrian crossing has been added at the bottom of the bridge, the first sign warning drivers of this is at the top of the bridge - this is too late. The speed of vehicles going over the bridge is too fast and it is only a matter of time before someone is seriously injured walking over the bridge or at the crossing, - this will be too late. School have done what they can to make getting there safe for families but there is also a responsibility of the council. To add this development directly opposite the entrance to school does not help matters. It is noted that the plan has stated - when factoring in the additional traffic associated with the Yew Tree Farm development until 2027, it is anticipated that the impact of the growth will result in this stretch of the A59 operating above capacity during both AM and PM peaks. In addition, the section of the A59 between Square Lane and Higgins Lane may also, in parts, be operating above capacity during the AM peak hour only - These operate above capacity NOW, never mind during additional development. What will be done to reduce this? This stretch is already additionally busy on a parents evenings, school events. Higgins lane also already takes a lot of the high school traffic for Priory High School including buses and cars - this too will be affected. Although traffic moves freely through Burscough for the majority of the time (unless there are roadworks which has been a frequent case over the past few years), new housing and employment development in the area will inevitably lead to traffic increases and network capacity pressures at both AM and PM peak travel times, as noted above. However, LCC have indicated that there is no single solution for this and that the focus for mitigation measures must be on improvements to sustainable transport measures and targeted highway improvements to the wider network. I agree that if his development goes ahead, any implementation of a signalised junction at the A59/Yew Tree Farm access should incorporate Lordsgate Drive which is the access road to Lordsgate Township CE School. However parking is therefore likely to be restricted on this approach so where will parents park to get their children safely to school. They can't park down lordsgate drive it simply isn't big enough. The inclusion of a dedicated parking and drop off point within the Yew Tree Farm site for Lordsgate Township CE School is not considered appropriate. WHY?? What alternative opportunities will be provided for parking provision?

Supporting attachments

Council response: Traffic - The masterplan allows the potential for Higgins Lane to be closed if this is felt appropriate at the time but it does not require it. It is unlikely that significant traffic volumes will travel north and west through the rural roads surrounding Burscough. However, a full traffic assessment is required to support any proposals and any increase in traffic must be to a safe level and supported by mitigation. HGVs will be allowed to pass through the site. The Council is fully aware of the localised road conditions which are noted as concern in the representation. However, the masterplan seeks to deliver the required development whilst ensuring there is no greater negative impact on the highway than already exists and where possible, improvements are made. Land drainage is complex and planning has no control over bringing together overall responsibility to one party. However, the masterplan ensures that this issue will be dealt with and considered by all relevant parties at the planning application stage which does allow for a degree of cooperation between the parties. United Utilities have a legal obligation to upgrade the network to support

development and growth. However, wording within the masterplan document will assist with the ensuring measures are in place to help with the timing of such improvements and this wording has been supported by United Utilities. Planning cannot force land owners beyond the site with riparian responsibilities to maintain the drainage network to do so. SUDS are a standard part of most new developments and are generally shallow and well designed to look like an integral part of the development. The future management of such features will either fall to the Lead Local Flood Authority or the land owner, depending on when the development comes forward relative to the establishment of the LLFA.

Consultee Name: Mrs Elaine Lea

Organisation:

Comments: I do not agree with the building proposed at Yew Tree Farm because there appears to be no thoughts that there will be increased traffic congestion, potential for localised flooding and the fact that Burscough does not have the required levels of infrastructure to cope.

Supporting attachments

Council response: Traffic - The masterplan allows the potential for Higgins Lane to be closed if this is felt appropriate at the time but it does not require it. It is unlikely that significant traffic volumes will travel north and west through the rural roads surrounding Burscough. However, a full traffic assessment is required to support any proposals and any increase in traffic must be to a safe level and supported by mitigation. HGVs will be allowed to pass through the site. The Council is fully aware of the localised road conditions which are noted as concern in the representation. However, the masterplan seeks to deliver the required development whilst ensuring there is no greater negative impact on the highway than already exists and where possible, improvements are made.

Land drainage is complex and planning has no control over bringing together overall responsibility to one party. However, the masterplan ensures that this issue will be dealt with and considered by all relevant parties at the planning application stage which does allow for a degree of cooperation between the parties. United Utilities have a legal obligation to upgrade the network to support development and growth. However, wording within the masterplan document will assist with the ensuring measures are in place to help with the timing of such improvements and this wording has been supported by United Utilities. Planning cannot force land owners beyond the site with riparian responsibilities to maintain the drainage network to do so. SUDS are a standard part of most new developments and are generally shallow and well designed to look like an integral part of the development. The future management of such features will either fall to the Lead Local Flood Authority or the land owner, depending on when the development comes forward relative to the establishment of the LLFA.

Consultee Name: Mr Roy Webster

Organisation:

Comments: I have always been STRONGLY AGAINST all plans for building houses on Yew Tree Farm. We ALL know that our DRAINS simply CANNOT take the extra stress of all those planned houses plus the fact that the building plans will put houses right next to the now very busy Guys Industrial Estate where not that long ago there was a Industrial Fire at one of the local businesses which gave off poison fumes and gases. It saddens me that the truth of the fact is that these plans are are will eventually be passed because it is worth a fantastic amount of MONEY not only to the land owner but also to the Council, money talks regardless of any objections. The talk is about there being 500 x Houses and maybe even more but you cannot get away from the FACTS that our SCHOOLS are all bursting at the seams regardless if they build a School on Yew Tree Farm it won't be anywhere near enough for all those families and children!! then we have the SEWERS it only has to rain for 20 x minutes or so in and around Burscough and Roads and Gutters Flood on EVERY Occasion like the Sewers can cope now' Not a Chance. What about the ROADS in and around Burscough they are Disgraceful Pot Hole after Pot Hole the Council can't keep control of them now never mind before any new housing ideas, just 'HOW MUCH NOTICE' is being taken of the Burscough RESIDENTS Now!!! Is anyone actually listening or are everyone just blinded by the £££££ signs that is not meant to offend it is a SERIOUS Question, are those making the Decisions about Plans being Stopped or Going Ahead actually from BURSCOUGH ??? It should be THE PEOPLE of BURSCOUGH deciding if we want this housing estate not the Council or a local Business Person. Look around Burscough and tell me exactly what there is to do for the local Youth ?? Why not Spend some money on this instead of wasting Money and Wasting Green Land i'm sorry but I personally think Yew Tree Farm Building Plans are a Total DISGRACE and A Plight on the Local area and If it is allowed to come down to FINANCES then this is even more of a DISGRACE!! and I ask those who make these decisions to look at themselves in the mirror and Ask DO THE PEOPLE OF BURSCOUGH WANT THIS HOUSING ESTATE or VILLAGE Well I can tell you "NO" Absolutely "NO"

Supporting attachments

Council response: Land drainage is complex and planning has no control over bringing together overall responsibility to one party. However, the masterplan ensures that this issue will be dealt with and considered by all relevant parties at the planning application stage which does allow for a degree of cooperation between the parties. United Utilities have a legal obligation to upgrade the network to support development and growth. However, wording within the masterplan document will assist with the ensuring measures are in place to help with the timing of such improvements and this wording has been supported by United Utilities. Planning cannot force land owners beyond the site with riparian responsibilities to maintain the drainage network to do so. SUDS are a standard part of most new developments and are generally shallow and well designed to look like an integral part of the development. The future management of such features will either fall to the Lead Local Flood Authority or the land owner, depending on when the development comes forward relative to the establishment of the LLFA.

The council is aware that additional development will result in increased surface water run-off and that is why the requirement to attenuate this run off to the existing greenfield rate has been included in the document. The linear park will act as a buffer to separate employment from residential uses. Provision has been made in the masterplan for the safeguarding of land for a primary school if needed within the next plan period.

Consultee Name: Mr an Joseph and Suggett

Organisation:

Comments: We said no to Yew Tree Farm Masterplan. To many houses being built in Burscough and we do not need another road and junction coming out of Lordsgate Drive road widening and mature trees destroyed when no need for it. Pippin Street junction is big and wide enough for any new traffic from Booths etc on to main road. Also there is the school and children to be considered, we really don't feel that the people of Burscough are being listened to, or considered.

Supporting attachments

Council response: The Council is fully aware of the localised road conditions which are noted as concern in the representation. However, the masterplan seeks to deliver the required development whilst ensuring there is no greater negative impact on the highway than already exists and where possible, improvements are made.

Consultee Name: Mrs Michelle Bull

Organisation:

Comments: I have been a resident in burscough for the majority of my life, I have seen the village grown with the development of vicarage gardens, heathfields, the mill lane site, Tesco and expansion of the industrial estate. Having spent my childhood playing in the fields of yew tree farm I agree the site is an eyesore and something needs to be done! But with all the developments there has been no consideration of over crowding of schools, waiting list for dentist, over flowing doctors surgerys, traffic flow on junction lane and Liverpool road which is already awful, parking in the village especially at school pick up and drop off times, (most people moving into the area will have at least one vehicle per family) the disrepair of the roads, flooding(always an issue following rain fall) sewage issues (old pipes being tapped into) and the lack of green space (Richmond and pickles park areas being swallowed up with development) lack of facilities for children and teens. Before throwing up another 500 houses which will invite at least 1000 new people to the area consideration to the current issues should be addressed so that we are ready to embrace the changes.

Supporting attachments

Council response: Provision has been made in the masterplan for the safeguarding of land for a primary school if needed within the next plan period. The Council is fully aware of the localised road conditions which are noted as concern in the representation. However, the masterplan seeks to deliver the required development whilst ensuring there is no greater negative impact on the highway than already exists and where possible, improvements are made. Land drainage is complex and planning has no control over bringing together overall responsibility to one party. However, the masterplan ensures that this issue will be dealt with and considered by all relevant parties at the planning application stage which does allow for a degree of cooperation between the parties. United Utilities have a legal obligation to upgrade the network to support development and growth. However, wording within the masterplan document will assist with the ensuring measures are in place to help with the timing of such improvements and this wording has been supported by United Utilities. Planning cannot force land owners beyond the site with riparian responsibilities to maintain the drainage network to do so. SUDS are a standard part of most new developments and are generally shallow and well designed to look like an integral part of the development. The future management of such features will either fall to the Lead Local Flood Authority or the land owner, depending on when the development comes forward relative to the establishment of the LLFA.

The council is aware that additional development will result in increased surface water run-off and that is why the requirement to attenuate this run off to the existing greenfield rate has been included in the document. Green space will be delivered on site in accordance with the Open Space and Recreation in new residential development SPD.

Consultee Name: Mr Michael Bull

Organisation:

Comments: I think in general the plans are ill thought out and really do nothing but increase the current problems that Burscough as a Village is suffering from. Burscough is effectively gridlocked for large parts of the day with the amount of traffic flow currently moving through the Village, this is a best case scenario assuming that there are no roadworks or accidents making this situation even worse. I have been a resident of Burscough for around 13 years now and can not even contemplate the effect an influx of new residents will have on key local services such as Doctors, Dentists and other local health care services, which will in turn have a knock on effect regarding hospitals. I have already seen a huge increase on waiting times to even get an appointment at the doctors in the 13 years I have been in the village. Schools from primary through to the one and only secondary / high school are already full to capacity, where will all these new children go to school if there are already no places available? Where are the leisure / community facilities to support an increase in population? Local transport links are already very poor with minimum bus and train services (particularly on the Ormskirk and Liverpool line) Michael Bull (Burscough)

Supporting attachments

Council response: Traffic - The masterplan allows the potential for Higgins Lane to be closed if this is felt appropriate at the time but it does not require it. It is unlikely that significant traffic volumes will travel north and west through the rural roads surrounding Burscough. However, a full traffic assessment is required to support any proposals and any increase in traffic must be to a safe level and supported by mitigation. HGVs will be allowed to pass through the site. The Council is fully aware of the localised road conditions which are noted as concern in the representation. However, the masterplan seeks to deliver the required development whilst ensuring there is no greater negative impact on the highway than already exists and where possible, improvements are made.

Consultee Name: Mrs Renee Bligh

Organisation:

Comments: Will the development support sustainable design, renewable energy and improved drainage. The first plan, when originally presented to the public, included United Utilities to be responsible for the extra drainage that would be needed. There was a 5 yr time delay before the work could be completed. Residents were informed, on more than one occasion, that building would not be starting until 2020. However, the developers were eager to start as soon as possible and produced the faster and less expensive option. This present plan suggests that the this 'natural drainage option "should' help to solve the drainage of surface water. The Environment Agency map, of Yew Tree Farm, indicating areas of high, medium, and low risk flooding shows that it does not solve the present natural drainage problem. When the 40 year old soil drains have collapsed and farming ceases, there will be a further increase in flooding. Who would want to buy a house ,on a flood plain ,where the drainage depends on natural drainage? The energy efficient new development that has minimal impact on climate change whilst taking advantage of appropriate renewable technology. This new edition of what was formerly known as a Sewage farm is an improvement on the old system. However it's not perfect and is only being constructed after 200 houses are built. Needless to say the sewage is going to be directed to the overloaded present sewage system. Therefore it's not sustainable and also a possible future health hazard. To ensure, through good design, that the residential environment is not dominated by cars The construction of two traffic islands and the idea that encouraging the residents to walk and cycle may have a small impact on the flow of traffic but does nothing to combat the volume of traffic ,particularly at peak time. Every pedestrian is exposed to high levels of pollution during peak periods. Improvements for the local environment and wildlife Wildlife, that is sustained by the present variety of crops grown on the farm,will no longer be attracted. Bats, barn owls and raptors will have moved away to the few farms that are now in existence in the area. Educational Needs 'A school will be built if needed' is included in the plan. Meanwhile it has been suggested that there will be 48 spare places for the children ,who will arrive ,when 200 houses are built. This will mean there will be over populated classrooms and portables in the future for the local children. This will have a direct impact on the educational development of local children.

Supporting attachments

Council response: Provision has been made in the masterplan for the safeguarding of land for a primary school if needed within the next plan period Traffic - The masterplan allows the potential for Higgins Lane to be closed if this is felt appropriate at the time but it does not require it. It is unlikely that significant traffic volumes will travel north and west through the rural roads surrounding Burscough. However, a full traffic assessment is required to support any proposals and any increase in traffic must be to a safe level and supported by mitigation. HGVs will be allowed to pass through the site. The Council is fully aware of the localised road conditions which are noted as concern in the representation. However, the masterplan seeks to deliver the required development whilst ensuring there is no greater negative impact on the highway than already exists and where possible, improvements are made. Land drainage is complex and planning has no control over bringing together overall responsibility to one party. However, the masterplan ensures that this issue will be dealt with and considered by all relevant parties at the planning application stage which does allow for a degree of cooperation between the parties. United Utilities have a legal obligation to upgrade the network to support development and growth. However, wording within the masterplan document will assist with the ensuring measures are in place to help with the timing of such improvements and this wording has been supported by United Utilities. Planning cannot force land owners beyond the site with riparian responsibilities to maintain the drainage network to do so. SUDS are a standard part of most new developments and are generally shallow and well designed to look like an integral part of the development. The future management of such features will either fall to the Lead Local Flood Authority or the land owner, depending on when the development comes forward relative to the establishment of the LLFA. The council is aware that additional development will result in increased surface water run-off and that is why the requirement to attenuate this run off to the existing greenfield rate has been included in the document. Comments regarding ecology are noted and specific requirements to address any potential impacts are included within the document including the requirement for a HRA.

Consultee Name: Mr Robert Berks

Organisation:

Comments: I make the following observations: 1. The main access to site at

Supporting attachments

Council response: Traffic - The masterplan allows the potential for Higgins Lane to be closed if this is felt appropriate at the time but it does not require it. It is unlikely that significant traffic volumes will travel north and west through the rural roads surrounding Burscough. However, a full traffic assessment is required to support any proposals and any increase in traffic must be to a safe level and supported by mitigation. HGVs will be allowed to pass through the site. The Council is fully aware of the localised road conditions which are noted as concern in the representation. However, the masterplan seeks to deliver the required development whilst ensuring there is no greater negative impact on the highway than already exists and where possible, improvements are made.

Consultee Name: Mr Francis Bligh

Organisation:

Comments: Like most of the residents I recognise that this development is going ahead - regardless of our heartfelt dread as to the future! I refer particularly to the obvious unsuitability of the A59 and the question of future parking etc. All I want to know is the name (or names) of qualified individuals who will tell me the FACTS about drainage provision for this initial construction of 500 (?) houses! I would be most grateful if you will arrange to let me have this information!

Supporting attachments

Council response: Traffic - The masterplan allows the potential for Higgins Lane to be closed if this is felt appropriate at the time but it does not require it. It is unlikely that significant traffic volumes will travel north and west through the rural roads surrounding Burscough. However, a full traffic assessment is required to support any proposals and any increase in traffic must be to a safe level and supported by mitigation. HGVs will be allowed to pass through the site. The Council is fully aware of the localised road conditions which are noted as concern in the representation. However, the masterplan seeks to deliver the required development whilst ensuring there is no greater negative impact on the highway than already exists and where possible, improvements are made.

Land drainage is complex and planning has no control over bringing together overall responsibility to one party. However, the masterplan ensures that this issue will be dealt with and considered by all relevant parties at the planning application stage which does allow for a degree of cooperation between the parties. United Utilities have a legal obligation to upgrade the network to support development and growth. However, wording within the masterplan document will assist with the ensuring measures are in place to help with the timing of such improvements and this wording has been supported by United Utilities. Planning cannot force land owners beyond the site with riparian responsibilities to maintain the drainage network to do so. SUDS are a standard part of most new developments and are generally shallow and well designed to look like an integral part of the development. The future management of such features will either fall to the Lead Local Flood Authority or the land owner, depending on when the development comes forward relative to the establishment of the LLFA.

The council is aware that additional development will result in increased surface water run-off and that is why the requirement to attenuate this run off to the existing greenfield rate has been included in the document.

Consultee Name: Mr Andrew Cobham

Organisation:

Comments: The plans for yew tree farm simply cannot work given the road and services infrastructure that Burscough has. The road system is already badly overloaded, with serious delays suffered for journeys through the village. Additionally whilst the two rail stations are well positioned, services through Burscough Bridge are inadequate for the Burscough population as it stands and it would be difficult to see how an influx of residents would be served. The services infrastructure for Burscough and schools in particular is certainly not suitable for greater volumes of residents. Whilst the Primary Schools would in all likelihood be able to handle greeter numbers, the one secondary school clearly could not. Therefore new residents and current residents would struggle to obtain suitable schooling for a key future residents of the village. Finally, the area of YewTreeFarm adds a valuable aesthetic to the village of Burscough. The area has over recnt years become more and more house bound, with many anchormen being built too close together in the area. This move would exacerbate the situation, removing the spacious and country feeling that Burscough has always had. Rather than attracting residents to a well laid out village, Burscough would become a small town, with little in the way of amenities, and sprawling across West Lancashire without thought to the general overall impact to the current or future population.

Supporting attachments

Council response: Traffic - The masterplan allows the potential for Higgins Lane to be closed if this is felt appropriate at the time but it does not require it. It is unlikely that significant traffic volumes will travel north and west through the rural roads surrounding Burscough. However, a full traffic assessment is required to support any proposals and any increase in traffic must be to a safe level and supported by mitigation. HGVs will be allowed to pass through the site. The Council is fully aware of the localised road conditions which are noted as concern in the representation. However, the masterplan seeks to deliver the required development whilst ensuring there is no greater negative impact on the highway than already exists and where possible, improvements are made.

Consultee Name: Mr Bernie Maginn

Organisation:

Comments: First of all I am not a NIMBY. However, with these plans, someone is putting the cart before the horse. Before anyone starts any expansion of residential and particularly industrial units we need to sort out the roads (and a don't mean a set a traffic lights here or a roundabout there). There needs to be a proper by-pass so that all of the lorries bound to and from the motorway network can get there easily. There also needs to be a north/south by-pass taking traffic away from the centre of the village. It is chaos at Pippin street/A59 junction as work progresses on the Booths site. Has anyone been to the centre of the village when a lorry is attempting a delivery during the day, or even if a bus stops of an extended period of time. It's chaos. Can someone please have some common sense and do things the correct way around (for a change)!!!!

Supporting attachments

Council response: The Council is fully aware of the localised road conditions which are noted as concern in the representation. However, the masterplan seeks to deliver the required development whilst ensuring there is no greater negative impact on the highway than already exists and where possible, improvements are made.

Consultee Name: Mr Stephen Watson

Organisation:

Comments: I am concerned about two aspects of the plan. 1. Traffic. The village cannot cope at peak times now with the level of traffic and any road works in the village brings the area to a stand still. The A59 is a major route especially if there is an issue on the M6. 2. Drainage. The site is 74ha. Overall 51.1 ha will be built on. Assuming 60% is covered with tarmac, houses concrete then 30.66ha will be covered and the rainfall on this will run off immediately. Local average rainfall is 824mm = 824 litres/m². Annual rainfall on 30.66ha = 252638000 litres. A 25mm rainfall event = 7995000 litres. I don't think the drainage system and ponds will cope with this water and the current level of flooding will be increased.

Supporting attachments

Council response: The Council is fully aware of the localised road conditions which are noted as concern in the representation. However, the masterplan seeks to deliver the required development whilst ensuring there is no greater negative impact on the highway than already exists and where possible, improvements are made. Land drainage is complex and planning has no control over bringing together overall responsibility to one party. However, the masterplan ensures that this issue will be dealt with and considered by all relevant parties at the planning application stage which does allow for a degree of cooperation between the parties. United Utilities have a legal obligation to upgrade the network to support development and growth. However, wording within the masterplan document will assist with the ensuring measures are in place to help with the timing of such improvements and this wording has been supported by United Utilities. Planning cannot force land owners beyond the site with riparian responsibilities to maintain the drainage network to do so. SUDS are a standard part of most new developments and are generally shallow and well designed to look like an integral part of the development. The future management of such features will either fall to the Lead Local Flood Authority or the land owner, depending on when the development comes forward relative to the establishment of the LLFA.
The council is aware that additional development will result in increased surface water run-off and that is why the requirement to attenuate this run off to the existing greenfield rate has been included in the document.

Consultee Name: Mr Derek Huyton

Organisation:

Comments: Access to the site should NOT be from the A59 especially at the junction with Lordsgate Drive which is the entrance to Lordsgate School. There should be NO access to and from Higgins Lane to prevent traffic using this as a short cut onto the A59 Access to the site should ONLY be via Tollgate Road, this would prevent Industrial & Commercial traffic using the site road to access the A59 and would force them to use the new purpose made junction at Pippin St / High Lane The Siteing of the Primary School next to the Industrial Estate is not ideal and is too far from the village, the main population.

Supporting attachments

Council response: Traffic - The masterplan allows the potential for Higgins Lane to be closed if this is felt appropriate at the time but it does not require it. It is unlikely that significant traffic volumes will travel north and west through the rural roads surrounding Burscough. However, a full traffic assessment is required to support any proposals and any increase in traffic must be to a safe level and supported by mitigation. HGVs will be allowed to pass through the site. The Council is fully aware of the localised road conditions which are noted as concern in the representation. However, the masterplan seeks to deliver the required development whilst ensuring there is no greater negative impact on the highway than already exists and where possible, improvements are made.

Consultee Name: Mrs M Connolly

Organisation:

Comments: I am very disappointed that the proposed park area has been replaced by a 'Residential Gateway'. However my main concern is the proposal to close off the access from A59 into Higgins Lane. Most motorists living on the right hand side of Higgins Lane are unlikely to drive into the new estate and join Liverpool Road South at the traffic lights on the new road. When travelling north they are more likely to turn down Truscott road and Trevor Road. Truscott Road is already very difficult to drive down because of the number of parked cars and Trevor Road has problems with school traffic. I feel strongly that Higgins Lane access from A59 should remain as it is.

Supporting attachments

Council response: Traffic - The masterplan allows the potential for Higgins Lane to be closed if this is felt appropriate at the time but it does not require it. It is unlikely that significant traffic volumes will travel north and west through the rural roads surrounding Burscough. However, a full traffic assessment is required to support any proposals and any increase in traffic must be to a safe level and supported by mitigation. HGVs will be allowed to pass through the site. The Council is fully aware of the localised road conditions which are noted as concern in the representation. However, the masterplan seeks to deliver the required development whilst ensuring there is no greater negative impact on the highway than already exists and where possible, improvements are made. The previous options consultation was seeking the residents views on various possibilities for the site no land designations were fixed during this consultation. The 'Residential Gateway' to the site offers an opportunity to create a high quality design on the entrance of the A59 extending in towards the site.

Consultee Name: Ms Rachael Bust

Organisation: The Coal Authority

Comments: Thank you for consulting The Coal Authority on the above. Having reviewed your document, I confirm that we have no specific comments to make on it at this stage.

Supporting attachments

Council response: Noted. No Council response required.

Consultee Name: Mrs C Dean

Organisation: Highways Agency

Comments: Thank you for your email of 9 October 2014 consulting the Highways Agency on the above document. We welcome the opportunity to review the document and would make the following comments. The main highway route through Burscough is the A59 which is the responsibility of Lancashire County Council. The only section of the strategic road network (SRN) in the area which may experience impact as a consequence of the proposed development would be junction 3 and the Switch Island interchange at the westerly end of the M58. However link flows on the M58 are relatively light in comparison to other NW motorways and any impact is unlikely to be significant. We welcome the objectives to create a sustainable development, reduce the need to travel by car and deliver sustainable public transport links and network. Improvements to public transport facilities and provision of additional public transport services would be necessary as the proposed development is likely to generate pressure on the local highway, which potentially may extend to the SRN. Similarly we support the principle of Connectivity and the encouragement of sustainable transport modes, ensuring that Yew Tree Farm will provide a range of transport choices which includes walking and cycling facilities. The Agency is keen to encourage and facilitate cycle routes and we are working with Sustrans to look at opportunities throughout the NW including the M58. Once the phases of the development materialise, as part of the planning process the Agency would expect to be consulted on each planning application in order to understand any potential impacts on the SRN. I trust the above is of assistance and we look forward to future consultations in connection with the Yew Tree Farm site. Please let me know if you have any queries.

Supporting attachments

Council response: Comments welcomed.

Consultee Name: Mr Christophe Clandon

Organisation:

Comments: Masterplan - more like shambles This whole development is a disgrace and WLBC should be utterly ashamed of their role in this. WLBC have sold out the people of Burscough. I have lived here my entire 39 years. I was born to a village and that's how we want to remain. This development will make us a town none of us want it. Did the 96% of people from Burscough who voted against this not give the (offensive word removed) of WLBC any kind of understanding how bitterly opposed the people of our village are to this development, or does money and greed outweigh all these days? No one in Burscough now believes a word of the propaganda being issues by WLBC - There wont be any infrastructure improvements to the roads and drains - there wont be anything, its all lies and (offensive word removed). Burscough will slowly grind to a halt - more traffic longer waiting times - less parking spaces, more flooding, complete overwhelming of the drainage system. Shame on WLBC, disgrace!!

Supporting attachments

Council response: The Council is fully aware of the localised road conditions which are noted as concern in the representation. However, the masterplan seeks to deliver the required development whilst ensuring there is no greater negative impact on the highway than already exists and where possible, improvements are made.

Land drainage is complex and planning has no control over bringing together overall responsibility to one party. However, the masterplan ensures that this issue will be dealt with and considered by all relevant parties at the planning application stage which does allow for a degree of cooperation between the parties. United Utilities have a legal obligation to upgrade the network to support development and growth. However, wording within the masterplan document will assist with the ensuring measures are in place to help with the timing of such improvements and this wording has been supported by United Utilities. Planning cannot force land owners beyond the site with riparian responsibilities to maintain the drainage network to do so. SUDS are a standard part of most new developments and are generally shallow and well designed to look like an integral part of the development. The future management of such features will either fall to the Lead Local Flood Authority or the land owner, depending on when the development comes forward relative to the establishment of the LLFA.

The council is aware that additional development will result in increased surface water run-off and that is why the requirement to attenuate this run off to the existing greenfield rate has been included in the document.

Consultee Name: Ms Gillian Laybourn

Organisation: English Heritage

Comments: Thank you for consulting English Heritage on the above document. At this stage we have no comments to make on its content.

Supporting attachments

Council response: No response required.

Consultee Name: Mr B Sillett

Organisation:

Comments: I am having some difficulty making any meaningful comment, positive or negative, on the draft Masterplan. A question posed in the 4Cs section, for example, asks if people can move around the site easily. There being no criteria against which to test the question, what is the value of any response? I'm afraid that the same applies across the whole document and I fear that having ticked the box "local people consulted", you can rest easy. I have some questions on the draft phase 1 leaflet itself. a)What does "affordable and elderly housing" look like? b)What is the Residential Gateway (the area coloured dark brown)? What will that look like? c)What do the red dotted lines on the phase 1 map signify? They are not in the key box. d)What are the green rectangles running from the site entrance, past Higgins Lane and onward off the map? Are they part of the development? The siting of the major junction onto the site from the east deserves some comment. It is a mere 50 yards from an existing road (Higgins Lane) which could be used for access, it would be the 4th turning on that side on to the A59 in less than 200 yards, it is directly opposite a cul-de-sac leading to a 300 pupil primary school and would cause the felling of several mature trees. Did anyone from the Highways authority actually visit the site? It is clear from the plan that the new junction at Pippin Street, now well under construction, will feed traffic to and from the YTF development. Maybe someone needs to be reminded that Tollgate Road is already there which would accommodate the heavy site traffic during the construction stages. Perhaps the developers can be persuaded not to begin on the easternmost corner but to consider starting elsewhere to avoid the building of yet another major junction at high cost to the taxpayer and at a time when cost cutting is still important. I am sorry that my response is not very supportive. In mitigation I attaché a short appendix which identifies a few issues which influenced my comment on the Phase 1 draft. 1.David Cameron's interview on Countryfile 8th Jan 2012 contained, among other quotes, that he "would no more put the countryside at risk than he would his own family" and "he will "give communities much more say and control over building" – control being the significant word here. This interview also touched on the reform to planning rules which poses a dichotomy, making it easier to build on greenbelt land despite local opposition. 2.Local community opposition to the Local Plan found out that the great judgement of Government, country and borough councils and vested interests could safely diminish the impact of local objections by "managing" public consultations. It happened. 3.We know that "final" plans can be changed for the convenience of developers. There was a prime example at Heathfields, for those who remember when the end result differed from approved plans. 4.The lack of detail in the Phase 1 leaflet means specific comment cannot be made, giving the planner and developers carte blanche to re-define, add or delete features.

Supporting attachments

Council response: The 'Residential Gateway' to the site offers an opportunity to create a high quality design on the entrance of the A59 extending in towards the site. The masterplan allows the potential for Higgins Lane to be closed if this is felt appropriate at the time but it does not require it. It is unlikely that significant traffic volumes will travel north and west through the rural roads surrounding Burscough. However, a full traffic assessment is required to support any proposals and any increase in traffic must be to a safe level and supported by mitigation. HGVs will be allowed to pass through the site. The Council is fully aware of the localised road conditions which are noted as concern in the representation. However, the masterplan seeks to deliver the required development whilst ensuring there is no greater negative impact on the highway than already exists and where possible, improvements are made.

Consultee Name: Ms Angela Gemmill

Organisation: Marine Management Organisation

Comments: Thank you for inviting the Marine Management Organisation (MMO) to comment on the above consultation. I can confirm that the MMO has no comments to submit in relation to this consultation.

Supporting attachments

Council response: Noted. No Council response required.

Consultee Name: MR DUNCAN SAVAGE

Organisation:

Comments: I don't understand the thinking behind the whole idea you say we need more homes i very much doubt young local people will get mortgages to buy these properties and if they are lucky enough to get a mortgage on minimum rate wages they will be lucky to keep them , I am a postman in Burscough and have been for 30 years and the estates built while i have been delivering in Burscough are full of more and more people from outside the Burscough / Ormskirk areas which makes Burscough less of a friendly Northern village where people know and look out for each other and make it more and more of a problem town (now as the local police station has closed) , the roads are not equipped for the traffic that travels down the A59 now infact at peak times it grinds to a stand still some mornings it can take up to 20 minutes to travel from Higgins lane to the village i rather doubt adding up to 1000 more cars is going to improve this , infact they are adding a roundabout at Pippin street now because of the amount of traffic travelling through Burscough, the village is nearly dead now the only shops opening are bookies, charity shops and hairdressers because of some bright sparks idea to ruin the village by plonking a big Tesco there not happy with that you are now adding another supermarket (which isnt needed) . A large amount of the folk who live in Burscough are oaps and I'm sure their safety and security hasnt been taken into account with the extra youngsters and traffic that will be coming to the area , the young people of Burscough have nothing to do now (except hanging around street corners) adding to that more young will make it worse which in itself will bring the associated problems Drugs etc which I know now is a problem , I know of oaps now that wont go to the village when it gets dark because they feel unsafe I dont think adding more to the problem will help , Jobs: as I said earlier i am a postman an whilst delivering around the area i see the extra jobs being created with building sites etc and believe me i dont recognise any people from this area being employed my own son has to travel to Southport and back every day to work. My idea for Burscough would be put more money into the existing problems in the area instead of just adding to them by making it bigger , Ive been here 45 years and Burscough wont be a village anymore it will be another Skelmersdale and I for one hope i wont be around to see the bright sparks ruin what is at the moment a lovely place to live.

Supporting attachments

Council response: Noted.
Lancashire County Council, as the local Highways Authority have carried out initial strategic traffic modelling at the Local Plan site allocation stage, more localised traffic counts and modelling within Burscough, alongside the Masterplan process and have provided the Borough Council with their professional view in terms of the requirements of the Masterplan and how the site interacts with the highway, and both vehicular and sustainable transport. In addition, the Masterplan will require that all applications for development are supported by a full Transport Assessment and Travel Plan, the scope of which should be agreed with the Highways Authority in advance of submission. The Council is satisfied that the principles set out within the Masterplan, along with the additional detailed work required at planning application stage, will ensure measures are delivered to help mitigate the impacts of traffic on the local highway network and to encourage cycling and walking over car use.

Consultee Name: MRS ANN LEA

Organisation:

Comments: I note it says potential location for elderly housing in the plan. As someone who has lived in Burscough for over 46 years and would really like to stay in Burscough, I have been looking for a bungalow for a couple years and now find because of lack of suitable bungalows in the area I am having to look in other areas for one. The ones that already are built here are not enough to cater for the aging population in Burscough and I know at least 10 people who feel the same as us. If more Bungalows were built here on this site it would free up our 3 Bedroomed Semi Detached and detached houses for young people and families throughout Burscough. Also I feel Bungalows should be built in a different area to Family homes in a cul-de-sac so it can be a place of peace without children playing football outside in the street.

Supporting attachments

Council response: Noted. No Council response required.

Consultee Name: Mr Geoff Barker

Organisation:

Comments: I have read through the brochure that you kindly sent about the Masterplan. I am most concerned with the development of both phases, particularly the mention of 1000 homes and Industrial development, that there is nowhere in your statement does it mention how the foul (which would be quite considerable) is going to be dealt with. The station at New Lane cannot cope at this present time, with such a large increase and I am anxious to know, where the foul is going to go and why it hasn't been mentioned in your brochure.

Supporting attachments

Council response: Noted. There is a detailed section with the Draft Masterplan pages 27-28 detailing the drainage expectations of the Yew Tree Farm site. However, it will ultimately be the responsibility of United Utilites to upgrade the waste water treatment works at New Lane.

Consultee Name: Mr George Pratt

Organisation:

Comments: The area designated as for older person accommodation is huge, at between 15%-20% of the site. This would tend to form an old peoples' ghetto, and become a target for crime. Why not disperse the elderly accommodation throughout the site to allow more of a community to develop? In addition to the ghetto problem, it is situated on the wrong side of the access road. Elderly and/or infirm people would be forced to cross a major road to get to the rest of the village, which creates an unnecessary risk. The options as originally presented all included a new park with many facilities to be managed by a team of residents and Council Staff. This seems to be replaced with a 'Linear Park', which is another name for a wide footpath. The largest green space on the plan has been reserved for a future school, which is fine, but the loss of such a major leisure facility is to the disadvantage of all residents. There is an area marked as 'Residents' Gateway' at the entrance to the site. What is the purpose of the area, and why is it so large?

Supporting attachments

Council response: Comments noted.
The allocation and delivery of the amount of open space on the Yew Tree Farm site is and will be in accordance with the Councils' "Provision of Public Open Space in New Residential Developments" Supplementary Planning Document.

The 'Residential Gateway' to the site offers an opportunity to create a high quality design on the entrance of the A59 extending in towards the site.

Consultee Name: Mr David Birch

Organisation:

Comments: I feel the entrance road on to the A59 is inappropriate and completely situated in the wrong place as direct opposite a very busy school is not a good idea. You also state you will be providing green spaces, however the site is currently one large green space which you will allow building on thus reducing the green space.

Supporting attachments

Council response: Lancashire County Council, as the local Highways Authority have carried out initial strategic traffic modelling at the Local Plan site allocation stage, more localised traffic counts and modelling within Burscough, alongside the Masterplan process and have provided the Borough Council with their professional view in terms of the requirements of the Masterplan and how the site interacts with the highway, and both vehicular and sustainable transport. In addition, the Masterplan will require that all applications for development are supported by a full Transport Assessment and Travel Plan, the scope of which should be agreed with the Highways Authority in advance of submission. The Council is satisfied that the principles set out within the Masterplan, along with the additional detailed work required at planning application stage, will ensure measures are delivered to help mitigate the impacts of traffic on the local highway network and to encourage cycling and walking over car use.

The site is not currently a public green space, it currently functions as agricultural land and is within private ownership. The rights to access the land are on the footpaths only and the masterplan retains the public footpaths. The overall amount of publically available green space will be provided in line with the Councils' "Provision of Public Open Space in New Residential Developments" Supplementary Planning Document.
