

Core Strategy Consultation 2011: Summary of Representations and Responses

cspo-1	Mrs Shirley O'Hara		
Plan Ref	-	Preface	Object
Summary	Objection to broad areas of plans, including housing and provision of facilities.(S)		
Response	<p>3,000 new homes are targeted for Skelmersdale for several reasons, including the need to generate investment in the town to support regeneration proposals for the town and the fact that as the Borough's largest town it has most key services and these will be improved the proposals for the town centre (Policy CS2). In addition, there is land available in Skelmersdale for new development, whereas much of the rest of the Borough has limited land available within towns and villages and so even more development would need to be provided in the Green Belt than is currently proposed in the Core Strategy if development was diverted from Skelmersdale to areas such as Ormskirk and Burscough. Based on discussions with the PCT, they have no plans to change current hospital service provision in the Borough in light of the Core Strategy's proposals. The Core Strategy supports the provision of a range of new facilities and infrastructure in Skelmersdale and the town centre proposals (Policy CS2) set out these improvements, including a new bus station, new retail and leisure facilities and improvements to the Tawd Valley for recreation. The Core Strategy also supports a new rail link for Skelmersdale (Policy CS12) but this is not something the Council can deliver and there may be difficulties gaining funding for such a proposal. Policy CS8 on affordable housing sets out that 20% of housing in developments of 15 or more dwellings in Skelmersdale will be affordable (including social housing), with this figure reduced to 10% within the town centre area. The affordable housing which is to be social housing will be managed by Registered Social Landlords. The Core Strategy is a key document in helping to deliver the Vision for West Lancashire as set out in the Sustainable Community Strategy, and is setting a coherent spatial strategy for development across the Borough. It will replace the Local Plan adopted in 2006 under the old planning system. In relation to Skelmersdale specifically, the proposals within the Core Strategy builds upon the plans already put forward in the masterplan for the town centre. While the delivery of this masterplan has been delayed due to the current economic climate, the Council is confident it can still be delivered, with the proposed slight modifications in Policy CS2, within the Core Strategy period.</p>		
Recommendation	No Action Required		
cspo-12	Mr R E Twiss		
Plan Ref	-	Preface	Object
Summary	Opposed to the release of green belt and concerned about the impact on traffic in Ormskirk and Burscough. (S)		
Response	<p>Green Belt and impact on countryside and agricultural land - there is insufficient land within existing towns and villages that is suitable for new development, therefore a small portion of Green Belt will be needed to meet development needs. Any development on Green Belt will need to be designed in such a way as to minimise any impact on the countryside beyond it. While the loss of agricultural land is never ideal, the preferred options have been selected because much of the land involved in these options is not the highest quality agricultural land. Traffic Impacts - the Council are aware of the potential impacts of proposals on the highway network and traffic levels and are undertaking ongoing work to better understand this. Any new development will be required to do all it can to mitigate for traffic impacts that it creates and measures will be needed to prevent rat-running. The Council will also support strategic improvements to the highway network (e.g. Ormskirk Bypass) if funding can be found and will support improvements to public transport to encourage people to use this rather than the car. Edge Hill University - Policy CS6 provides a policy to manage any expansion of the University if expansion is required during the Core Strategy period. Any expansion will also need to address issues of traffic, car parking and student accommodation associated with the University. Employment land - comments noted</p>		
Recommendation	No Action Required		
cspo-13	Ms June Iddon		
Plan Ref	-	Preface	Object
Summary	Green belt and agricultural land should not be used for development, but rather to encourage agriculture. Future homes should only be allowed in built up areas and should be in accordance with need. (S)		
Response	<p>Agricultural land - The Council acknowledges the importance of agriculture in West Lancs and indeed promotes it through Policy CS5. However, in order to meet development needs, a very small percentage will have to be developed. The quality of the agricultural land will be one aspect that informs the decision on which option is brought forward in the next stage of the plan. Built-up area vs Green Belt - all suitable land for development within the built-up areas of existing settlements will be developed over the Core Strategy period, still leaving a deficit which would need delivering on Green Belt in order to meet development needs. Affordable and under-occupied housing - there is a serious shortage of affordable housing in West Lancs and so the Core Strategy (Policy CS8) seeks to deliver more affordable housing and in all parts of the Borough. Changing household trends have influenced the need for new housing and the Council are aware of the issue of under-occupation. By providing more high quality accommodation for the elderly, it is hoped that this will release more existing family housing onto the market for purchase or rent by families who will fully occupy the property.</p>		
Recommendation	Amend residential and affordable housing development policies to include a requirement that 20% of units in developments of 15 units or more be designed specifically for the elderly.		

cspo-163	Mrs Elizabeth-Anne Broad		
Plan Ref	- Preface		Observations
Summary	There should be no Green Belt release in Parbold and more general development should also be limited. (S)		
Response	Comments noted. There are no plans to release Green Belt in the Parbold area for housing. The residential development policy allows for infill and garden development, as this source of housing land supply helps minimise the need for Green Belt release. However, such development would only be permitted if it satisfies a number of criteria, and close attention is paid to the amenity of neighbours.		
Recommendation	No further action.		
cspo-194	Mr Brian Sheasby	Principal Planning Review and Planning Contributions Officer Lancashire County	
Plan Ref	- Preface		Observations
Summary	That Smithy Farm, Broad Lane, Downholland be designated for residential development as part of the Borough Council's strategy to provide housing and residential development sites to meet the Borough's needs for the period of the plan. (S)		
Response	Comments noted regarding the site, which was also submitted by LCC in the West Lancashire SHLAA. However, it is not the function of the Core Strategy to designate individual small sites. The comments on this site are more suited to the Site Allocations DPD.		
Recommendation	No further action.		
cspo-198	Mrs Stephanie Hopkin		
Plan Ref	- Preface		Object
Summary	Is the consultation process correct (and legal)? Do people need more time / information? Can we sustain a development of this size? (S) Let's be smarter with our proposals and minimise greenbelt decimation.		
Response	It is considered that the consultation material has made clear that views are being sought on the Ormskirk option, and that this is the Council's non-preferred option. Comments regarding Ormskirk have been noted.		
Recommendation	No further action.		
cspo-199	Mrs Anne-Sophie Bonton	planning officer Lancashire County Council	
Plan Ref	- Preface		Observations
Summary	It is felt that much more importance should be made to broadband, both its significance and more importantly how improved telecoms can be realised across the whole borough. There are several references to pre-2010 General Election policy and no references to new policy of the Coalition Government. This should be updated and Local Enterprise Partnerships referred to. (S)		
Response	The National Planning Policy Framework emphasises that advanced, high quality communications infrastructure is essential for economic growth and that the development of high speed broadband technology and other communications networks also plays a vital role in enhancing the provision of local community facilities and services. An overview of the provision of digital infrastructure is set out within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Comments regarding the wider National Framework are noted and when the next stage of the Core Strategy is prepared it will be updated to reflect the current and most up to date Government policy. At this stage a preferred option was not known to the Council and it was important whilst we continue to work on the evidence base to inform the final document, to engage the public and Elected Members in this selection process.		
Recommendation	Included as a requirement in the local infrastructure policy, all development to make provision for communications / digital infrastructure. Update the document to include the most up-to-date government policy. At the next stage of consultation indicate a		
cspo-20	Mr John Doug		
Plan Ref	- Preface		Object
Summary	I consider all the proposals made by West Lancs for the LDF to be totally unnecessary and out of character for Ormskirk. (S)		
Response	Views Noted		
Recommendation	No Action Required		
cspo-234	Paul Cotterill		
Plan Ref	- Preface		Observations
Summary	Comments on various aspects of the LDF, including the view that the document should be re-written and consulted upon again, given its serious flaws. (S)		
Response	The representation has been split and is dealt with in the appropriate sections of the document.		
Recommendation	No action required.		

cspo-266	Anne-Sophie Bonton	Planning Officer Lancashire County Council - Strategic Planning Group	
Plan Ref	-	Preface	Object
Summary	Summary of comments made individually elsewhere only.		
Response	All comments have been addressed individually at the relevant consultation point within the document.		
Recommendation	No action required		
<hr/>			
cspo-322	Ms Diana Jolly		
Plan Ref	-	Preface	Object
Summary	I request the Borough Council Cabinet extend the Consultation Plans with all three options available on an equal footing. Thus allowing all residents to have their say. (F)		
Response	The Ormskirk option, albeit Non-Preferred by the council is included in all promotional material for the consultation and the Core Strategy itself. Thus encouraging the public to make representations and have their say regarding the Ormskirk Option.		
Recommendation	No action required.		
<hr/>			
cspo-490	Mr B Howard	Clerk of the Council Newburgh Parish Council	
Plan Ref	-	Preface	Observations
Summary	There is little mention of the implications of schools in the document. There are concerns about the impact of large residential developments and potential for change in the availability of customary choices, based on established relationships with particular schools.		
Response	The LDF team has been working with a wide variety of stakeholders when drafting the Core Strategy. This has included discussions with education providers and an assessment of where school provision is weaker. On this basis, site specific aspirations set out within the Core Strategy, such as those areas for Green Belt release, have had regard for capacity within schools and identified where further provision is needed. As the remainder of the Core Strategy is more general, it sets broad aims of the plan only. Policy CS13 deals with ensuring that local social and community services (including education) are in place to meet development proposals. Further details will be provided in other LDF documents.		
Recommendation	No action.		
<hr/>			
cspo-542	Mrs Margaret Wiltshire	Planning Volunteer, Treasurer CPRE (West Lancs Group)	
Plan Ref	-	Preface	Observations
Summary	The Core Strategy Document should be updated to include changes at the regional level and also adapt to LTP3- the County's Strategy for Lancashire, which is currently replacing LTP2. (s)		
Response	Comments Noted with reference to updating document to include LTP3 and LEP's. However at the time publication LTP3 had not been published and the Lancashire LEP had not been finalised		
Recommendation	Update the document to including reference to LTP3 and LEP's within Appendix C.		
<hr/>			
cspo-6	Neil Ainsworth		
Plan Ref	-	Preface	Support with conditions
Summary	Agree with broad principles of development, with particular support for Ormskirk non-preferred option. However, strongly opposes Green Belt development (S).		
Response	Support for non-preferred option noted. While the Council are reluctant to consider development on Green Belt themselves, there is not enough land for new development within existing towns and villages in the Borough to accommodate the need for new housing and employment to 2027. Therefore, the Council are having to consider development on a small portion of Green Belt to meet these needs. In addition, in order to deliver improvements such as a Sports Village (in the case of the non-preferred option), other development, particularly housing, is required to fund those improvements. Without contributions from new development, improvements to facilities such as Sports Clubs are unlikely to be delivered.		
Recommendation	No Action Required		
<hr/>			
cspo-640	Skelmersdale Limited Partnership		
Plan Ref	-	Preface	Observations
Summary	The representations we are submitting to the Core Strategy take account of national planning policy guidance within PPS1, PPS4 and PPS12 and the Regional Spatial Strategy for the North West (RSS) which, among other things include an underlying requirement to protect existing centres and ensure their vitality and viability.		
Response	Comments noted		
Recommendation	No action required		

cspo-677	Jason and Marcus Bleasdale		
Plan Ref	-	Preface	Observations
Summary	Jason and Marcus Bleasdale own Little Moor Hall Farm, a 25.38 hectare (62.72 acre) parcel of land situated south of Parrs Lane in Aughton, which they wish to bring forward for a high-quality residential-led mixed-use development as part of an urban extension to the established settlement of Aughton. Any development proposal for Little Moor Hall Farm could also potentially incorporate some additional land located adjacent to the site, north of Parrs Lane		
Response	Comments noted		
Recommendation	No action required		
<hr/>			
cspo-86	Mr Ian Yates		
Plan Ref	-	Preface	Observations
Summary	I am opposed to Option 3 (the "non-preferred option") as put forward in the leaflet distributed by the Borough Council. Green Belt release should only take place in exceptional circumstances, and where there is a direct social benefit to the adjacent community. RSS housing figures should be reviewed and revised.		
Response	Comments regarding the options and Green Belt are noted. It is agreed that development densities should be "sensible". There is likely to be a policy on density in a forthcoming Development Management Policies document. With regard to housing figures, following a Court of Appeal ruling in May 2011, the intention to abolish RSS cannot be taken into account when Councils are considering the adoption of new Development Plan Documents such as Core Strategies, until such time as a Strategic Environmental Assessment of RSS abolition has been concluded. Thus the Council is obliged to use the 300 dwellings per annum housing requirement at present in the Core Strategy.		
Recommendation	No action required.		
<hr/>			
cspo-94	Mrs Carolyn Cross	Clerk to the Council	Wrightington Parish Council
Plan Ref	-	Preface	Observations
Summary	The Core Strategy should contain policies to improve bridleway and multi-purpose rights of way for use by horse riders, cyclists and disabled users. The Green Belt should be preserved except in extreme circumstances. (S)		
Response	Comments noted. Bridleways will be specifically mentioned in an appropriate part of the Plan Transport and Green Infrastructure		
Recommendation	Additional reference to bridleways will be added to CS 12 Enabling Sustainable Transport and CS16 Preserving and Enhancing Green Infrastructure & Biodiversity to creating multi-use pathways.		
<hr/>			
cspo-31	Mr Tony McAteer	McAteer Associates Ltd	
Plan Ref	Chapter 1	Introduction	Observations
Summary	Disappointing that after setting the evidence and background to the need for elderly accommodation (Chapters 1-3), the only reference to housing for the elderly thereafter is a small section in Policy CS7. (S)		
Response	The Core Strategy makes clear, as stated by the Objector, that providing for the accommodation needs of an ageing population is an important issue. The Core Strategy generally avoids detailed policies, but provides the 'hook' for the basis of detailed policies in other LDF documents. The evidence base at present does not indicate what proportion of housing developments should be elderly persons' accommodation, and the appropriate amount is likely to vary on a case-by-case basis. 2008-based Household Projections have been investigated, and a requirement that 20% of units in developments of 5 units or more be designed specifically for the elderly is now proposed for the new emerging residential development policy.		
Recommendation	Policy CS7 Residential Development to be amended to include a requirement that 20% of homes in the development of 15 units or more be designed specifically for the elderly.		
<hr/>			
cspo-72	The Coal Authority		
Plan Ref	Chapter 1	Introduction	Observations
Summary	The Coal Authority is keen to ensure that coal resources are not unduly sterilised by new development. In instances where this may be the case, The Coal Authority would be seeking prior extraction of the coal. The West Lancashire area has been subjected to coal mining which will have left a legacy. Whilst most past mining is generally benign in nature potential public safety and stability problems can be triggered and uncovered by development activities. It is important that new development delivered through the Local Development Framework, recognises the problems and how they can be positively addressed. (S)		
Response	Comments noted. The Council is aware that there are issues in certain areas relating to past mining and the possible existence of coal deposits, and that these need to be taken into account when considering the amount of development that can be assigned to each area, and to the allocation of specific sites. The Council will consult /is consulting with the Coal Authority at all stages, including this Preferred Options stage, and importantly, when considering the allocation of specific sites, as well as when assessing planning applications. (Consultation with The Coal Authority has already taken place with regard to specific sites proposed for allocation in the next stage of the Plan's preparation.)		
Recommendation	No change to Plan itself, but maintain ongoing consultation as the Plan is progressed.		

cspo-73	The Coal Authority		
Plan Ref	Chapter 1	Introduction	Support with conditions
Summary	The Core Strategy needs to set out how the Lancashire Minerals and Waste DPD needs to be taken into account in West Lancashire. New wording for inclusion in the introduction proposed. (S)		
Response	Comments noted. It is agreed that the Core Strategy needs to specify how it takes account of the Lancashire Minerals and Waste DPD, and thus consideration will be given to inserting the suggested wording (or very similar) into the Core Strategy.		
Recommendation	Add wording suggested by Coal Authority to the Core Strategy's introduction:"Lancashire County Council has responsibility for identifying sites and policies for Minerals and Waste Development in the County. Therefore Minerals and Waste Issues are not cove		
cspo-102	Mr Steven Hopkin		
Plan Ref	1.1	The West Lancashire Local Development Framework	Object
Summary	NO to 4,500 homes NO to building on green belt NO to 600 Houses in Ormskirk as this would be disasterous for Character of town, green belt, traffic congestion, pollution to name but a few NO more expansion to Edge Hill university, especially on green belt. The monster that is Edge Hill needs taming. WLDC to be strong against the likes of greedy businessmen like Ormskirk2027 and Edge Hill University Finally, as Councillor Martin Forshaw says,"West Lancashire has a wonderful mix of vibrant towns and picturesque villages, and boasts some of the most beautiful countryside in the UK." Quite right. Thank you Councillor Forshaw. LET'S KEEP IT THIS WAY!		
Response	Comments noted. With regard to specific points raised: 1. Housing needs figures take account not only of birth rates, but a range of factors including changes in family profiles (e.g. more divorces), single person households, migration, etc. The Council considers 300 dwellings per annum is appropriate for West Lancashire. In any case, the Council is currently legally obliged to use the Regional Spatial Strategy figure of 300 dwellings per annum. 2. It is agreed that wherever possible, the rural character of West Lancashire should be maintained. However, not being able to accommodate the whole of the Borough's housing need in suitable non-Green Belt sites means that Green Belt has to be considered. 3. Problems associated with Burscough option noted. 4. Comments on Dispersal option noted. 5. Comments regarding non-preferred option noted. 6. Skelmersdale is considered the appropriate place for the majority of the Borough's new housing given its range of services and the capacity of its infrastructure to accommodate new development. 7. Comments regarding Edge Hill University noted. Unfortunately, it is not possible to meet all the University's building requirements within the current campus area, hence the need for more land. The Council is aware of the impacts associated with the University. 8. Comments on affordable housing noted, although it is considered that the Objector misunderstands what constitutes affordable housing. 9. Comments regarding the consultation events and voting forums noted.		
Recommendation	No further action.		
cspo-189	Mrs EA Broad	Parish Clerk Lathom South Parish Council	
Plan Ref	1.1	The West Lancashire Local Development Framework	Observations
Summary	Consultation period is too short (S)		
Response	Comments noted. It is considered that six weeks is an adequate amount of time to read and comment on documents. This consultation is beyond the requirements of government plan-making Regulations. Whilst Sefton and Knowsley had longer consultation periods, unlike West Lancashire they did not carry out "Options" consultation (2009 in West Lancs). The Sefton and Knowsley periods also span the holiday season (July /August).		
Recommendation	No further action		
cspo-348	Mr Robert W. Pickavance		
Plan Ref	1.1	The West Lancashire Local Development Framework	Observations
Summary	1.1.5: I would like our site (adjacent to New Road, Rufford) to be included in the DPD and the DMP and I am willing to discuss the site to ensure it is in-keeping with the developments in the surrounding area.(F)		
Response	Comments noted		
Recommendation	No action required		
cspo-710	Mr Greg Mitten	West Lancs Council for Voluntary Services	
Plan Ref	1.2	Preparing the Core Strategy	Observations
Summary	The consultation has been well carried out but could be improved by posting leaflets by royal mail rather than in free papers. Also by having more one to one meeting with community groups. When developing the selected preferred option, issues to be addressed include ensuring the development of access to services including transport links, the targeting of employment and skills opportunities, particularly in deprived areas and encouraging entrepreneurial activity including business start-up (S)		
Response	Comments noted with reference to the consultation process. With regards to access to services including transport links the Core Strategy seeks to encourage economic growth across the Borough and in particular to support the regeneration of Skelmersdale.		
Recommendation	No Further Action		

cspo-99	Mr David W Cheetham		
Plan Ref	1.3	Technical Assessments of the Core Strategy	Observations
Summary	Report does not consider health impacts of some areas of the Core Strategy. (S)		
Response	Comments noted. The Core Strategy does not address site allocations and instead provides broad areas of search. Consequently, the HIA cannot specifically address issues raised in this comment. However, comments will be acknowledged and investigated in later stages of the LDF.		
Recommendation	Additional investigation will be done with regard to the HIA in future stages of the Core Strategy.		
cspo-200	Mrs Anne-Sophie Bonton	Planning Officer	
Plan Ref	Chapter 2	Spatial Portrait and Key Issues for West Lancashire	Observations
Summary	Support for recognising a different approach to Skelmersdale compared to the rest of the Borough. More emphasis could be made on the need for better transport links to and from Skelmersdale. (S)		
Response	Comments noted relating to the lack of accessible public transport in Skelmersdale. Reference in the document to the Bypass is caveated with a statement to confirm that probability of this being delivered is low.		
Recommendation	Additional wording to make reference to the internal transport network within Skelmersdale and also transport links with Liverpool will be added.		
cspo-324	Mr Roger Clayton		
Plan Ref	Chapter 2	Spatial Portrait and Key Issues for West Lancashire	Observations
Summary	Boundary of Lathom Parish needs amending on Fig 2.2 (S)		
Response	The Council acknowledges that the Blaguegate Lane and Firwood Road area are identified as falling within the parish of Lathom South. However, the Core Strategy must identify functional spatial areas, for the purpose of the document the area identified as Skelmersdale includes these areas and must be identified as one spatial entity.		
Recommendation	No action.		
cspo-371	Ms Kathleen M Prince		
Plan Ref	Chapter 2	Spatial Portrait and Key Issues for West Lancashire	Observations
Summary	The only conclusion which can be drawn is that development must be confined to non flood-risk areas. (s)		
Response	If any new development is to go ahead in Banks, it will be directed to areas outside of flood risk areas as a priority and in accordance with the PPS25 sequential test.		
Recommendation	No action.		
cspo-374	Ms Kathleen M Prince		
Plan Ref	Chapter 2	Spatial Portrait and Key Issues for West Lancashire	Observations
Summary	Concerns over the number and type of housing proposed in the Core Strategy - would like to see more low occupation density housing suitable for an ageing population.		
Response	The dispersal and nature of new housing development is something that has been given and will continue to be given a great deal of attention in order that supply meets demand within the Borough.		
Recommendation	No action.		
cspo-395		Wirral to Wyre Team Natural England	
Plan Ref	Chapter 2	Spatial Portrait and Key Issues for West Lancashire	Observations
Summary	Natural England would like more detail on the key issues .		
Response	Comments noted.		
Recommendation	Minor changes to be made within the document to reflect these comments.		
cspo-422	Ms Judith Nelson	English Heritage	
Plan Ref	Chapter 2	Spatial Portrait and Key Issues for West Lancashire	Observations
Summary	The spatial portrait for West Lancashire highlights the importance of the historic environment and the Vision identifies the need to retain local character and conserve heritage assets. I suggest, however, that the Vision could be extended to cover investment in and enhancement of historic places, including the public realm. The Borough has a number of heritage assets at risk and I am surprised that this and the need for investment in the historic environment is not included as a Key Issue. (s)		
Response	Comments noted.		
Recommendation	No change. The Vision provides an overview. The policies provide more details on how this can be achieved.		

cspo-432	Mr Andrew Thorley	Strategic Land Manager Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd	
Plan Ref	Chapter 2	Spatial Portrait and Key Issues for West Lancashire	Observations
Summary	Spatial portrait should refer to the role that housing can play in boosting employment and supporting the local economy. (S)		
Response	Comments noted.		
Recommendation	No change.		
<hr/>			
cspo-450	Mr Roger Bell		
Plan Ref	Chapter 2	Spatial Portrait and Key Issues for West Lancashire	Observations
Summary	data inaccuracies in relation to West Lancashire residents travel to work patterns in spatial portrait. (s)		
Response	Comments noted.		
Recommendation	Data inaccuracies checked and corrected.		
<hr/>			
cspo-51		Church Commissioners For England	
Plan Ref	Chapter 2	Spatial Portrait and Key Issues for West Lancashire	Observations
Summary	The importance of small scale development should be acknowledged and supported in rural settlements and in locations with good access to services and facilities. (S)		
Response	Comments noted. It is agreed that an appropriate amount of development should be permitted in rural areas with a reasonable number of facilities and services. The Core Strategy allows for residential development in the Western Parishes area.		
Recommendation	No action.		
<hr/>			
cspo-517	Mr Alan Hubbard	Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust	
Plan Ref	Chapter 2	Spatial Portrait and Key Issues for West Lancashire	Observations
Summary	Key features section for Rufford should make specific reference to Rufford Old Hall. (S)		
Response	Comments noted.		
Recommendation	Change made.		
<hr/>			
cspo-532	Hesketh Estate		
Plan Ref	Chapter 2	Spatial Portrait and Key Issues for West Lancashire	Support
Summary	Aughton forms a vital part of the second largest population in the Borough and we consider it to be an important key service centre.		
Response	Comments noted.		
Recommendation	No action.		
<hr/>			
cspo-737	Crompton property developments		
Plan Ref	David Crompton	Spatial Portrait and Key Issues for West Lancashire	Observations
Summary	Various observations on the Spatial Portrait. (s)		
Response	Comments Noted		
Recommendation	Minor amendments addressed.		
<hr/>			
cspo-139	Mr Philip Carter	Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency	
Plan Ref	2.1	A Spatial Portrait of West Lancashire	Object
Summary	If Option B is selected a Level 2 SFRA would be required (S)		
Response	Comments Noted		
Recommendation	Comment acknowledged. A Stage 2 SFRA report is currently being prepared.		

cspo-165	Mr Martyn Coy	Planner British Waterways	
Plan Ref	2.1	A Spatial Portrait of West Lancashire	Object
Summary	The Millenium Ribble Link should be recognised within the Spatial Portrait. This connects the Lancaster Canal to the Leeds and Liverpool Canal and the wider inland waterway network. (S)		
Response	Comments noted. The diagram at Fig. 2.2 shows the Rufford Branch of the Canal joining the River Douglas at Tarleton, which is a correct representation of reality (Tarleton Lock). This is not considered to need amendment. In terms of recognising the Ribble Link, the following phrase can be added to the end of the sentence at Line 5: "... and branches off northwards towards the Lancaster Canal via the Ribble Link."		
Recommendation	The following has been added to the end of the third sentence (line 5) of paragraph 2.1.6 "... and branches off northwards towards the Lancaster Canal via the Ribble Link".		
cspo-190	Mrs EA Broad	Parish Clerk Lathom South Parish Council	
Plan Ref	2.1	A Spatial Portrait of West Lancashire	Object
Summary	Under the description of a spatial portrait of West Lancashire, Blaguegate Lane and Firswood Road been grouped into Skelmersdale without acknowledging the area of Lathom at all. This area must be recorded in this document as Lathom. (S)		
Response	The Council recognises the results of the 2005 Local Plan Inquiry, and the boundaries of Lathom South Parish. However, the land was safeguarded in the Local Plan with the intention of meeting Skelmersdale's development needs, if necessary, in the longer-term. If this land were to be developed, the development would count towards Skelmersdale's totals, and the resulting urban land would for all intents and purposes form part of the Skelmersdale Urban Area, notwithstanding the Parish boundary.		
Recommendation	No change.		
cspo-217	Mr Shaun Taylor	Planning Associate Director G L Hearn Property Consultants	
Plan Ref	2.1	A Spatial Portrait of West Lancashire	Object
Summary	The Spatial Portrait should mention market housing and links between supply, green belt release and delivery of affordable housing.		
Response	The Spatial Portrait contains a section on housing (paragraphs 2.1.11 - 2.1.12) which, whilst it does not include the word 'market', does refer to owner-occupied housing. It is recognised that the housing requirement (the majority of which will be market housing) results in the need for Green Belt release, and links to delivery of affordable housing and economic growth, but it is not considered necessary to list this as a Key Issue in the Spatial Portrait.		
Recommendation	No change.		
cspo-219	Mr D Rimmer		
Plan Ref	2.1	A Spatial Portrait of West Lancashire	Observations
Summary	Development in Bank should not be discarded on flood risk alone. There may be suitable sites. Transport (HGV) movements are likely to increase in settlements. The agricultural sector should be supported throughout the document. Questions the strength of Skelmersdales housing market to support 3000 new homes.		
Response	The Core Strategy does not discount Banks for development based on flood risk and even identifies some land to the south of the settlement as a possible area of search within Option 2 which was presented to the public during this consultation exercise. Comments noted regarding trasnport and HGV'S. Farm diversification is encouraged within Policy CS5. Focusing economic development around Skelmersdale is the necessary approach in order for the Council to begin to tackle some of the deprivation issues associated with Skelmersdale.		
Recommendation	No action required.		
cspo-284	Mrs Jo Robison	Associate Smiths Gore	
Plan Ref	2.1	A Spatial Portrait of West Lancashire	Support
Summary	Support the reference to Aughton as a single town, amalgamated with Ormskirk (s)		
Response	Comments noted		
Recommendation	No action required		
cspo-349	Mr Robert W. Pickavance		
Plan Ref	2.1	A Spatial Portrait of West Lancashire	Support
Summary	I fully support this point, Rufford has excellent transport links, North, South, East and West and also has an excellent rail service. (F)		
Response	Acknowledged		
Recommendation	No action.		

cspo-468	Mr Marcus Bleasdale	Bleasdale Investments Ltd	
Plan Ref	2.1	A Spatial Portrait of West Lancashire	Object
Summary	Aughton should be recognised as a potential self-sustaining settlement in its own right, and not a single settlement with Ormskirk. (S)		
Response	Given the scale and nature of Aughton, it clearly forms part of the Ormskirk urban area. To state otherwise may open the area up to more development and we need to ensure that development of a suitable scale is directed to such locations.		
Recommendation	No action.		
cspo-509	Mr Alan Hubbard	Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust	
Plan Ref	2.1	A Spatial Portrait of West Lancashire	Support with conditions
Summary	Support for identification of Rufford Old Hall as a major tourism attraction, however it should be recognised as a key heritage asset in West Lancashire within para 2.1.8. (S)		
Response	Comments noted.		
Recommendation	Amendment made as suggested.		
cspo-549	Mrs Margaret Wiltshire	Planning Volunteer, Treasurer CPRE (West Lancs Group)	
Plan Ref	2.1	A Spatial Portrait of West Lancashire	Observations
Summary	2.1.31 Are not the bus-routes worth some mention here?		
Response	Although Bus routes are not specifically mentioned in relation to Ormskirk and Aughton under 2.1.31 they are mentioned under section 2.1.19 which looks at public transport on a borough level.		
Recommendation	No Further Action		
cspo-650	Mr Simon Artiss	Planning Manager Bellway Homes Ltd	
Plan Ref	2.1	A Spatial Portrait of West Lancashire	Observations
Summary	Para 2.1.31 - usefully acknowledges that Ormskirk has the second largest population in the Borough and provides a full range of facilities whilst also confirming that the present probability of a bypass being provided remains low. The Paragraph also records how important the Town is in terms of employment, including the Council, hospital and Edge Hill University. Ormskirk is therefore clearly a sustainable location for new development, along with Skelmersdale (even without a train station) and Burscough, being the other 2 major settlements		
Response	Comments Noted		
Recommendation	No Further Action Required		
cspo-678	Jason and Marcus Bleasdale		
Plan Ref	2.1	A Spatial Portrait of West Lancashire	Observations
Summary	Consider that Aughton has the potential to flourish as a self-sustaining settlement in its own right. The Little Moor Hall Farm site provides a significant opportunity to improve the current offer of facilities within Aughton and help achieve this vision for example by adding to the local retail and service offer and through the provision of new community services, as part of a wider residential-led redevelopment of the site. (s)		
Response	Comments Noted		
Recommendation	No Further Action		
cspo-433	Mr Andrew Thorley	Strategic Land Manager Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd	
Plan Ref	2.2	Key Issues in West Lancashire	Observations
Summary	Taylor Wimpey UK Limited considers that the "Affordable Housing"™ Key Issues in West Lancashire Table (p.23) fails to mention the need to ensure that the provision of affordable housing is also viable and based on an up-to-date SHMA and Viability Study and this should be reflected in the revised document. (F)		
Response	Comments noted.		
Recommendation	No change. Accepted that SHMA and Viability Study are necessary evidence base for affordable housing and does not need to be explicitly stated.		
cspo-470	Mr Marcus Bleasdale	Bleasdale Investments Ltd	
Plan Ref	2.2	Key Issues in West Lancashire	Observations
Summary	Concern regarding the expansion of Edge Hill University and impact on the town. Welcome acknowledgement that tightly defined Green Belt limits options for future development. (S)		
Response	Comments noted.		
Recommendation	No action.		

cspo-523	Mr Alan Hubbard	Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust	
Plan Ref	2.2	Key Issues in West Lancashire	Observations
Summary	It is surprising that environmental issues do not figure more prominently in the Key Issues section. (S)		
Response	Comments noted - agricultural land and Green Belt are identified as key issues within the Borough within the key issues section. There are also many other non-environmental issues which need to be addressed and it is considered that the level of detail in this list is appropriate. However, it may be useful to add heritage to this list.		
Recommendation	Reference to heritage assets added.		
cspo-679	Jason and Marcus Bleasdale		
Plan Ref	2.2	Key Issues in West Lancashire	Observations
Summary	Edge Hill University's desire to expand is identified as one of the key issues in West Lancashire. Jason and Marcus Bleasdale wish to register their concern about the potential adverse effects that any expansion of the university might have on the character of the historic market town of Ormskirk. The Green Belt is identified as one of the other key issues in West Lancashire. Jason and Marcus Bleasdale welcome the Council's acknowledgement that the tightly defined Green Belt boundaries that currently exist within the Borough limit the options available for future development.		
Response	Comments Noted		
Recommendation	No Further Action		
cspo-81	Mrs MARIA RIDING		
Plan Ref	2.2	Key Issues in West Lancashire	Object
Summary	Object to Burscough option and development in Banks. Development should be located close to the motorway at Ormskirk or Bickerstaffe. (S)		
Response	Comments noted. One reason why Burscough was chosen and not Scarisbrick or Haskayne is the good level of facilities and services in Burscough, plus its good public transport links. The same reasoning would preclude land in Bickerstaffe.		
Recommendation	No action.		
cspo-83	Mr Ian Yates		
Plan Ref	2.2	Key Issues in West Lancashire	Observations
Summary	The impact Edge Hill has on the local community of Ormskirk needs to be better accounted for. (S)		
Response	Comments noted		
Recommendation	No change.		
cspo-141	Mr Philip Carter	Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency	
Plan Ref	Chapter 3	A Vision for West Lancashire 2027 and the Spatial & Strategic Objectives	Object
Summary	Wording in the vision regarding flood risk and mitigation is inappropriate and should be changed to reflect National Policy Guidance		
Response	Comments noted. Wording will be amended for next drafting of the document.		
Recommendation	Wording amended as per EA objections.		
cspo-325	Mr Roger Clayton		
Plan Ref	Chapter 3	A Vision for West Lancashire 2027 and the Spatial & Strategic Objectives	Object
Summary	Reference to RSS is probably out of date and unnecessary. Target for BfL inconsistent with earlier sections of document. (S)		
Response	Acknowledged. RSS still to be considered at this stage.		
Recommendation	No action required.		
cspo-423	Ms Judith Nelson	English Heritage	
Plan Ref	Chapter 3	A Vision for West Lancashire 2027 and the Spatial & Strategic Objectives	Observations
Summary	Objective 7 This objective covers the protection of heritage assets. PPS5 sets out the Government's aim for the 'conservation' of the historic environment and heritage assets where well-managed change which sustains significance and heritage interest is acceptable. You may wish to consider substituting conservation for protection in the document.		
Response	Comments noted.		
Recommendation	Replaced 'protect' with 'conserve' in relation to Heritage Assets within Objective 7.		

cspo-435	Mr Andrew Thorley	Strategic Land Manager Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd		
Plan Ref	Chapter 3	A Vision for West Lancashire 2027 and the Spatial & Strategic Objectives		Object
Summary	The importance of Ormskirk/Aughton should be given greater emphasis in the Vision. Reference to the need for use of Green Belt should be identified in Objective 5. Object to aspirations for carbon neutral development under Objective 8. (S)			
Response	Comments noted. Ormskirk /Aughton is given adequate importance in the Vision and there are many areas of the Borough which must be considered. It is not considered necessary to add reference to the Green Belt within Objective 5 as the emphasis is on developing brownfield land first. The need for Green Belt land is addressed later in the document and is not a major objective of the Core Strategy. In relation to Objective 8, we proposed changing the wording to 'low carbon technology'.			
Recommendation	Objective 8 amended to read 'low carbon technology' instead of 'carbon neutral technology'.			
cspo-473	Mr Marcus Bleasdale	Bleasdale Investments Ltd		
Plan Ref	Chapter 3	A Vision for West Lancashire 2027 and the Spatial & Strategic Objectives		Support with conditions
Summary	Support intention to secure the long-term stability of Ormskirk/Aughton, but suggest that Aughton is treated as a single settlement in planning terms. Concern about traffic problems associated with Edge Hill. (S)			
Response	Comments noted. It is considered inappropriate to treat Aughton as a single settlement given its links and dependence upon the wider Ormskirk urban area. It is important to maintain this rather than allowing Aughton to expand into a larger settlement in its own right, which may have significant impact on the surrounding Green Belt. Comments on traffic issues also noted.			
Recommendation	No action.			
cspo-704	Ms Rose Freeman	Planning Assistant The Theatres Trust		
Plan Ref	Chapter 3	A Vision for West Lancashire 2027 and the Spatial & Strategic Objectives		Object
Summary	A Vision This is still too long with too much detail – it should prioritise the Objectives with the detail being in the policies’ text.			
Response	Comments Noted			
Recommendation	No Further Action. The Vision has been reduced to only include information considered necessary.			
cspo-738	Crompton property developments	David Crompton	A Vision for West Lancashire 2027 and the Spatial & Strategic Objectives	Observations
Summary	Various observations on the Vision and Objectives. (s)			
Response	Comments Noted			
Recommendation	No change.			
cspo-107	Mrs Jackie Liptrott			
Plan Ref	3.1	A Vision for West Lancashire 2027		Observations
Summary	Core Strategy needs to be revisited as it is unsound due to timescales (S)			
Response	It is agreed that the Core Strategy must be shown to be deliverable. Work is ongoing with those bodies who would deliver the Plan to ensure that its content is achievable (e.g. United Utilities, other infrastructure providers, developers, etc.). For a plan looking 15 years into the future, and being prepared in uncertain economic times, it is not possible to set out every timetable in detail. Instead, a pragmatic view needs to be taken. The Council considers the draft Core Strategy, along with its evidence base (including such documents as an Infrastructure Delivery Plan, currently under preparation) will provide the required information to demonstrate it is deliverable and meet the tests of soundness. Comments received from "delivery bodies" during this consultation are being given careful consideration, and where necessary, the draft Plan will be amended. There is a "Plan B" in the Core Strategy, which provides an alternative course of action should the Plan not be delivered in the anticipated way. This is being refined in the light of consultation comments and other evidence being received.			
Recommendation	No specific action in response to this objection, but obviously it is necessary to show the Core Strategy is deliverable, setting out what will be done by whom and be when.			
cspo-140	Mr Philip Carter	Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency		
Plan Ref	3.1	A Vision for West Lancashire 2027		Support
Summary	Support for the Council's approach to utilities provision (S).			
Response	Noted			
Recommendation	No action required			

cspo-168	Mr Martyn Coy	Planner British Waterways	
Plan Ref	3.1	A Vision for West Lancashire 2027	Support with conditions
Summary	Vision should make specific reference to the Leeds-Liverpool Canal. (S)		
Response	It is considered that the word "waterways" includes the Leeds-Liverpool Canal, and that to add the Canal specifically to paragraph 5 of the Vision is not necessary. As stated by the Objector, the Canal is mentioned specifically in paragraph 18 of the Vision.		
Recommendation	No change.		
cspo-218	Mr Shaun Taylor	Planning Associate Director G L Hearn Property Consultants	
Plan Ref	3.1	A Vision for West Lancashire 2027	Observations
Summary	Further consideration needs to be given to decisions surrounding growth including when and where this takes place. (s)		
Response	Comments noted however further work on developing the Core Strategy, in terms of delivery is still underway in order to ensure the Submission Core Strategy is a "sound" document.		
Recommendation	No action required		
cspo-220	Mr D Rimmer		
Plan Ref	3.1	A Vision for West Lancashire 2027	Support with conditions
Summary	Vision needs to be realistic and achievable. (s)		
Response	We are aware of the risks associated with deliverability of development in Skelmersdale based on consultation feedback and historic development completion rates. In response to this a review has been carried out to ensure the appropriate balance of development is spread across the Borough to ensure housing delivery is not jeopardised but that the focus remains on Skelmersdale to support regeneration.		
Recommendation	A review of housing targets and spread to ensure growth needs are met has been undertaken.		
cspo-396		Wirral to Wyre Team Natural England	
Plan Ref	3.1	A Vision for West Lancashire 2027	Observations
Summary	Natural England wants to see aspirational Visions that strongly promote the importance of the natural environment and its conservation and enhancement.		
Response	Comments noted.		
Recommendation	The word 'important' has been replaced before 'biodiversity' in the third paragraph on page 27.		
cspo-510	Mr Keith Keeley		
Plan Ref	3.1	A Vision for West Lancashire 2027	Object
Summary	Without reference to an IDP the deliverability of the proposals cannot be guaranteed (s)		
Response	The Vision is a statement of where the Council wish to see the Borough being in 2027, as it relates to spatial planning. Therefore, the quote referenced is stating an aim that the Council will seek to achieve through the Core Strategy. The Council are aware an IDP is necessary to inform this and the wider document, and this will be provided alongside the Publication Draft Version of the Core Strategy, as per PPS12. A draft IDP is not required during Regulation 25 public consultation, which the CSPO consultation is a part of. The Council acknowledges that it will not always be easy to find solutions for infrastructure constraints in many parts of the Borough, and this will ultimately inform any decision on where development will be targeted in the Borough.		
Recommendation	No Action Required		
cspo-530	Mr Alan Hubbard	Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust	
Plan Ref	3.1	A Vision for West Lancashire 2027	Support
Summary	The National Trust supports the proposed Vision and welcomes the new paragraph addressing climate change. (F)		
Response	Comment noted.		
Recommendation	No action.		

cspo-653	Mr Simon Artiss	Planning Manager Bellway Homes Ltd	
Plan Ref	3.1	A Vision for West Lancashire 2027	Observations
Summary	A vision for West Lancashire (Para 3.1) - given the options for growth set out later in the Core Strategy (CS), including the urban expansion of Ormskirk and Burscough, we question the appropriateness of the term 'long term stability' in reference to these settlements, whereas for Skelemdale the appropriate reference is for sustainable growth. To avoid potential misunderstanding, we consider the phrase 'sustainable growth' to apply to all 3 of these towns. The subsequent supporting text needs to reflect this.		
Response	Comments Noted.		
Recommendation	Wording amended as suggested.		
cspo-680	Jason and Marcus Bleasdale		
Plan Ref	3.1	A Vision for West Lancashire 2027	Support
Summary	Jason and Marcus Bleasdale also support the Council's intention to take major steps to secure the long-term stability of Ormskirk/Aughton as part of the Vision for West Lancashire of 2027 but as mentioned previously, consider that Aughton should be treated as a single settlement in planning terms.		
Response	Comments Noted		
Recommendation	No Further Action		
cspo-142	Mr Philip Carter	Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency	
Plan Ref	3.2	Spatial & Strategic Objectives	Support
Summary	Support for Strategic Objectives (S)		
Response	Comments noted		
Recommendation	No action required		
cspo-221	Mr Shaun Taylor	Planning Associate Director G L Hearn Property Consultants	
Plan Ref	3.2	Spatial & Strategic Objectives	Object
Summary	Objective 5 needs to be re-written, to be SMART, by taking account of delivery issues with PDL sites. (S)		
Response	It is accepted that some brownfield sites will be difficult to deliver, especially in the short term /current economic climate. Wording has been amended in recognition of this fact.		
Recommendation	Wording of Objective 5 amended. (See also Rep 534.)		
cspo-229	Mr D Rimmer		
Plan Ref	3.2	Spatial & Strategic Objectives	Support with conditions
Summary	Sites should be allowed to be developed providing it can be proved safe from flooding. (s)		
Response	PPS25 sets out the correct approach to planning for development at the strategic level and this must be reflected locally. However, where there are cases when flood mitigation measures can be used to help deliver a site for wider benefits then this may be evidenced through a planning application setting out specific parameters of the development.		
Recommendation	No action required.		
cspo-248	Mr Francis Williams	member Ormskirk Friends of the Earth	
Plan Ref	3.2	Spatial & Strategic Objectives	Object
Summary	The figure that is proposed of 300 new homes per annum we believe it is excessive. (S)		
Response	At the time of considering this objection, the Council is legally obliged to use the RSS figure, 300 dwellings per annum. Even if this were not the case, it is considered that 300 dwellings per annum is the most appropriate figure for West Lancashire, based on the evidence underpinning the RSS, and also taking into account the latest household projections, plus the 'RSS deficit', (the number of housing completions in West Lancashire from 2003-11 compared with the RSS requirement).		
Recommendation	No change.		
cspo-387	North West Skelmersdale Owners		
Plan Ref	3.2	Spatial & Strategic Objectives	Support
Summary	Many of the specific objectives are laudable, specifically objective 9 relating to Skelmersdale is supported.		
Response	Comments noted.		
Recommendation	No action.		

		Wirral to Wyre Team Natural England		
cspo-398				
Plan Ref	3.2	Spatial & Strategic Objectives		Observations
Summary	The strategic objectives form the link between the high level vision and the detailed strategy. They should expand the vision into the key specific issues for the area which need to be addressed, and how that will be achieved within the timescale of the core strategy. We are satisfied with the list of Objectives cited.			
Response	Comments noted.			
Recommendation	No action.			
cspo-475	Mr Marcus Bleasdale	Bleasdale Investments Ltd		
Plan Ref	3.2	Spatial & Strategic Objectives		Support with conditions
Summary	Objective 5 should be revised to acknowledge it will be necessary to release some Green Belt land within the Borough in order to meet the specified development targets. (S)			
Response	Releasing Green Belt is not a major objective of the Core Strategy and therefore it is unnecessary to include this within objective 5. Implications for the Green Belt are dealt with elsewhere in the document.			
Recommendation	No action.			
cspo-534	Hesketh Estate			
Plan Ref	3.2	Spatial & Strategic Objectives		Support with conditions
Summary	Too much emphasis on delivering housing on brownfield sites. This should be caveated with the need for it to be deliverable and viable. Other sites should then be considered in order to deliver housing targets. (S)			
Response	Preference for brownfield development is in line with national policy. It is agreed that viability is an important consideration, and this will be taken into account, e.g. when considering affordable housing contributions. Whilst the suggested wording is correct in principle, and is borne out elsewhere in the Core Strategy, it is not considered necessary to add to this objective. The objectives set out what is intended to be achieved, rather than what would be done if the first choice plan of action is not possible.			
Recommendation	Objective 5 amended in line with the Objector's wording: "The priority will be to deliver these on brownfield sites where the sites are available, deliverable and viable." (Noted that the response to the Objector states that it is not considered necessary)			
cspo-544	Mr Alan Hubbard	Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust		
Plan Ref	3.2	Spatial & Strategic Objectives		Support with conditions
Summary	Objective 7 would benefit from a specific reference to the wider settings within which heritage assets site. Suggested wording included. (S)			
Response	Comments Noted. Alternative wording added.			
Recommendation	Wording changed.			
cspo-642	Skelmersdale Limited Partnership			
Plan Ref	3.2	Spatial & Strategic Objectives		Support
Summary	SLP supports the recognition given, in Objective 6 of the Core Strategy, of the importance of ensuring the vitality and viability of the Borough's town centres. The explanatory text for this objective, and that for Objective 9, also underlines the importance of regenerating Skelmersdale town centre both for the benefit of the town itself and for the Borough as a whole. These statements are supported but SLP is concerned that the policy approach set out in the Core Strategy will not achieve these fundamental objectives. (s)			
Response	Comments Noted.			
Recommendation	No Further Action			
cspo-649	Ms Judith Nelson	English Heritage		
Plan Ref	3.2	Spatial & Strategic Objectives		Support with conditions
Summary	Recommendations for some change in wording (S)			
Response	Comments Noted and slight changes made to wording.			
Recommendation	Wording amended in light of this, and other comments received.			

cspo-655	Mr Simon Artiss	Planning Manager Bellway Homes Ltd	
Plan Ref	3.2	Spatial & Strategic Objectives	Observations
Summary	The 300 dwellings per year target must be the very minimum and a higher figure would greatly assist in the delivery of more affordable homes, identified as a considerable need and political priority. We would therefore support a higher minimum, especially in light of the emerging national planning agenda (S).		
Response	Comments noted. The backlog against RSS requirements from 2003 onwards is being taken into account in housing land supply calculations.		
Recommendation	Consideration given to comments regarding housing delivery backlog		
cspo-681	Jason and Marcus Bleasdale		
Plan Ref	3.2	Spatial & Strategic Objectives	Observations
Summary	It explains that these new homes will be concentrated on brownfield sites, where available, in the major urban areas where services and transport facilities are greatest. Jason and Marcus Bleasdale consider that this objective should be revised to acknowledge it will be necessary to release some Green Belt land within the Borough in order to meet the specified development targets.		
Response	Comments Noted		
Recommendation	Consideration given to acknowledge that it may be necessary to release some Green Belt within the Borough in order to meet the specified development targets. This is covered through the planning policies. No change to the objectives.		
cspo-705	Ms Rose Freeman	Planning Assistant The Theatres Trust	
Plan Ref	3.2	Spatial & Strategic Objectives	Support
Summary	We support Objective 3 which includes the provision of social and cultural facilities but suggest that the Glossary (should you decide to have one) or accompanying text for Policy CS13 could include a description of such facilities for clarity		
Response	Comments Noted		
Recommendation	No Further action. Policy CS13 does make reference to local social and community services and facilities.		
cspo-277	Mr Alexis De Pol		
Plan Ref	Chapter 4	An Overview of the Core Strategy Preferred Options	Object
Summary	Too much housing directed to the main settlements when some of the more rural settlements have many sustainable features and should take more development. (S)		
Response	Comments regarding the comparison of DS4 land with Green Belt land noted. In terms of infrastructure in the northern parishes, other than Rufford, all other villages are accessible only by bus so there is no opportunity for supporting the local rail network in order to secure enhanced services. Furthermore, the highway network into Tarleton and Hesketh Bank is largely dependant upon a one road in one road out arrangement which is already very busy at peak times. Improvement of this arrangement would not be easily achievable and therefore further significant development would be difficult to support from a highways point of view. Finally, in terms of utility infrastructure, due to the flat topography of the northern parishes, both waste and clean water must be pumped. The capacity of this pumping system is now limited and there are no plans for upgrading the system within United Utilities' spending plans. United Utilities have confirmed that they could not guarantee to provide a good standard of service to this area if significant development was to continue. Issues which may arise as a result of system failure include surface water flooding and low water pressure. The Council acknowledges that significant waste water issues also impact on Ormskirk, Burscough and some of the surrounding areas and is committed to working with United Utilities to support a bid for funds to create a solution to this issue. The reality of the situation is that funding for both issues is unlikely and therefore a solution to support the 2 main service centres within the Borough outside of Skelmersdale must be paramount.		
Recommendation	No Action Required		
cspo-368	Alan Syder		
Plan Ref	Chapter 4	An Overview of the Core Strategy Preferred Options	Observations
Summary	The level of development require is questionable and green belt land should only be released once all brownfield sites have been used. Further expansion of Edge Hill Univeristy should be carefully considered.		
Response	1) Housing targets are developed using population projections, past un-met need as a result of market conditions and household projections which takes account of the number of occupants in dwellings. 2) The Council agrees that the Green Belt should be used as a last resort after all land within the urban settlement areas has been used. 3) The Core Strategy sets out that the overwhelming need to meet housing and employment targets in order to support economic growth and meet housing needs is an exceptional circumstance. Furthermore, the requirement for Green Belt land equates to 0.26% of the significant amount of Green Belt land (over 91% of the Borough) that is designated within the Borough. 4) Sustainable development is central to the Core Strategy and Policy CS1. 5) The Core Strategy and in particular Policy CS7 prioritises Brownfield land over Green Belt. 6) Comments noted. 7) The purpose of managed expansion at Edge Hill is to assist in tackling many of the issues associated with the university including the delivery of on-site student accommodation in order to reduce the pressure on the housing stock of Ormskirk.		
Recommendation	No action required.		

cspo-41	Redrow Homes		
Plan Ref	Chapter 4	An Overview of the Core Strategy Preferred Options	Object
Summary	Green Belt land should not be released unless all non-Green Belt options have been considered first. 4.3.3: It is an oversimplification to say DS4 release is equivalent to Green Belt release. Some DS4 land may be suitable for development, and would not have insurmountable infrastructure constraints. The benefits of the Dispersal Option should be more clearly stated, given this involves 100 fewer dwellings on Green Belt land. More than 100 dwellings could be accommodated on non-Green Belt sites in Banks. (S)		
Response	Paragraph 4.2.4 makes clear that Green Belt has been considered only because of a lack of available and deliverable land within settlements. Green Belt development is only proposed for release as a "last resort", given the lack of suitable available and viable non-Green Belt sites ("suitable" encompassing such considerations as infrastructure, drainage, sustainability, deliverability, etc). It is considered that the sentence in paragraph 4.3.3 is justified as a generalisation, although it is accepted that there may be individual sites that are exceptions to this generalisation. The paragraph states that "large amounts of development" could not be considered there - not that "no development" could be considered. With regard to infrastructure: the general constraints in the Northern Parishes (drainage, traffic congestion, flood risk) apply to all sites, and whilst a particular site may be deliverable, its development would exacerbate overall infrastructure difficulties for the area. It is agreed that the Core Strategy could have listed a benefit of the Dispersal Option as being 100 fewer dwellings in the Green Belt. Should the Dispersal option ultimately be selected as the preferred one, this point can be clarified.		
Recommendation	No Action Required		
cspo-424	Ms Judith Nelson	English Heritage	
Plan Ref	Chapter 4	An Overview of the Core Strategy Preferred Options	Observations
Summary	Figure 4.2 "Area of Search Ormskirk The grade II* Bath Lodge, Dark Lane lies adjacent to the area of search, it is essential that the setting of this building is assessed and safeguarded if proposals are developed for this site. (f)		
Response	comments noted		
Recommendation	No Action Required		
cspo-447	Mr Roger Bell		
Plan Ref	Chapter 4	An Overview of the Core Strategy Preferred Options	Observations
Summary	The major development in Skelmersdale is essential to the success of that town. But the need for much improved rail service must be met. Of the additional options, the "Burscough Option"™ is clearly the preferred option. Although there are major issues that must be addressed, it is the only one that provides the opportunity to make a major improvement. Objects to dispersal and non-preferred options (s)		
Response	comments noted		
Recommendation	no action required		
cspo-476	Mr RA Barnish	Ormskirk & Dist Community Council	
Plan Ref	Chapter 4	An Overview of the Core Strategy Preferred Options	Support with conditions
Summary	Supports Burscough and Dispersal option, objects to non-preferred (Ormskirk) option and extension at Edge Hill University		
Response	Comments noted		
Recommendation	No Action required		
cspo-48			
Plan Ref	Chapter 4	An Overview of the Core Strategy Preferred Options	Object
Summary	The option of releasing large tracts of Green Belt land is questioned, when smaller less controversial areas could be released in appropriate locations across the Borough. It is considered that the Council should review their options and include an option that would allow the review of the Green Belt boundaries around the Key Service Centres. (S)		
Response	Agreed in principle, but the Council has already considered such an approach, and most sites / areas (primarily in the Northern Parishes) are subject to significant constraints, in particular in terms of infrastructure. If any suitable sites exist, they can indeed be allocated in a Site Allocations DPD, but SHLAA, etc. data indicates that Green Belt release will be necessary on top of such non-Green Belt allocations. Any Green Belt release would need to be identified either through a strategic site changing the Green Belt boundary or through the identification of broad areas of search within which the Site Allocations DPD would select sites and amend the Green Belt boundary.		
Recommendation	No Action Required		
cspo-498	Mrs D Payne		
Plan Ref	Chapter 4	An Overview of the Core Strategy Preferred Options	Support
Summary	Preferred option is option 2 dispersal: Lessen the impact of too much development in one place and allow more residents to stay local, and less Green Belt intrusion. (f)		
Response	Comments noted		
Recommendation	No Action		

cspo-508	Mrs Pauline Whelan		
Plan Ref	Chapter 4	An Overview of the Core Strategy Preferred Options	Object
Summary	Concerned with the loss of green belt and agricultural land, ruining the approach into Ormskirk and allowing Edge Hill University to expand.		
Response	comments noted		
Recommendation	no action		
<hr/>			
cspo-513	Mr Frank Whelan		
Plan Ref	Chapter 4	An Overview of the Core Strategy Preferred Options	Object
Summary	Concerned with traffic problems in Ormskirk as a result of any proposed development.		
Response	comments noted		
Recommendation	no action		
<hr/>			
cspo-551	Mrs Margaret Wiltshire	Planning Volunteer, Treasurer CPRE (West Lancs Group)	
Plan Ref	Chapter 4	An Overview of the Core Strategy Preferred Options	Observations
Summary	Concerned over the scale of development- will all the houses become occupied? Preferred option is Burscough but draining issues must be resolved. Edge Hill University must expand on the area it already has and then can expand into green belt providing it is kept as small as possible.		
Response	The target of 3000 homes is a target the Council felt was deliverable. However, having considered the response on this matter during public consultation, the figures will be reviewed. Comments regarding the Burscough Strategic site noted. Any development in Burscough would go hand in hand with the infrastructure delivery plan which would seek to address the waste water situation. Comments regarding Edge Hill noted		
Recommendation	Reduce housing target for Skelmersdale due to concerns over deliverability given the current and fore-seeable economic climate.		
<hr/>			
cspo-566	Mr Alan Hubbard	Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust	
Plan Ref	Chapter 4	An Overview of the Core Strategy Preferred Options	Observations
Summary	New development should bring with it new or enhanced provision of nature conservation resources. (S)		
Response	Protecting the natural environment is a theme running through the entire Core Strategy although it may not be specifically mentioned in every policy. In addition, the Core Strategy has a specific Policy (CS16) on Preserving and Enhancing Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity which does seek to protect biodiversity and habitat and ensure that, where new development does have an environmental impact, this is mitigated as far as is possible.		
Recommendation	No further action required		
<hr/>			
cspo-629	Robert J. & K. ADA Travis		
Plan Ref	Chapter 4	An Overview of the Core Strategy Preferred Options	Support
Summary	Ormskirk has a bigger capacity to cope with increased development, compared to Burscough and Banks.		
Response	Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development		
Recommendation	No action required		
<hr/>			
cspo-690	Michael J Horsfall		
Plan Ref	Chapter 4	An Overview of the Core Strategy Preferred Options	Object
Summary	Development would have severe negative impact upon already over-burdened volume of traffic generated by Edge Hill University. The land supports purpose of green belt to prevent urban sprawl between Aughton and Ormskirk. Additionally, I object to the inclusion of the 3 acre field on Ruff Lane [in this proposal] and any development upon it. It has been already ruled against at appeal and I agree with the Inspector's decision.		
Response	Comments noted		
Recommendation	No further action required		

cspo-691	Barbara Horsfall		
Plan Ref	Chapter 4	An Overview of the Core Strategy Preferred Options	Object
Summary	Development would have severe negative impact upon already over-burdened volume of traffic generated by Edge Hill University. The land supports purpose of green belt to prevent urban sprawl between Aughton and Ormskirk. Additionally, I object to the inclusion of the 3 acre field on Ruff Lane [in this proposal] and any development upon it. It has been already ruled against at appeal and I agree with the Inspector's decision.		
Response	Comments noted		
Recommendation	No further action required		
<hr/>			
cspo-692	Phil Southern		
Plan Ref	Chapter 4	An Overview of the Core Strategy Preferred Options	Object
Summary	I have lived in the Aughton and Ormskirk area all of my life and to keep encroaching into the countryside erodes both the agricultural land and destroys what makes the area a great place to live. I continue to live in the area because it offers a good balance of houses versus countryside. One only has to walk or cycle from aughton to ormskirk down scarth hill lane to recognise that the area would be adversely impacted by further development both in housing and further expansion of Edge Hill University.		
Response	Comments noted		
Recommendation	No further action required		
<hr/>			
cspo-736	Crompton property developments		
Plan Ref	David Crompton	An Overview of the Core Strategy Preferred Options	Support
Summary	Supports the need to review and release land from the Green Belt and the inclusion of the Burscough Strategic Development Site. (s)		
Response	Comments Noted		
Recommendation	No Action Required		
<hr/>			
cspo-754	Paul Cotterill		
Plan Ref	Chapter 4	An Overview of the Core Strategy Preferred Options	Object
Summary	Concern regarding the way the Options have been produced and presented to the public.		
Response	All strategic options for Green Belt release were considered equally prior to consultation and reasons were given by Council's Cabinet for the decision to not select the Ormskirk Strategic Development Site option as a preferred option, namely impact on traffic, impact on Green Belt serving an important Green Belt purpose and impact on views and high quality agricultural land. Ultimately, it was decided that this option should still be consulted upon, albeit with the clear status that it is not preferred by the Council, and so views both in support and objecting to the option were sought. Any representation by the landowners of the site involved in this option will be taken into account in deliberations on the Core Strategy as it is progressed, and all background work currently being undertaken on potential traffic impacts of different development sites has included all the options consulted upon. To this end, the Council believes it has followed a legitimate process.		
Recommendation	No Action Required		
<hr/>			
cspo-526	Mr Keith Keeley		
Plan Ref	4.1	Structure of the Core Strategy Preferred Options	Observations
Summary	This table is potentially misleading and should be linked to the sustainability appraisal. The objectives should also be linked to a delivery plan (s)		
Response	Table 4.1 is intended to illustrate "which objectives each policy is seeking to fulfil" (para 4.4.1) and so is not intended to show positive or negative effects, but simply to show that, taking all the policies together, each objective is addressed by at least one policy in the Core Strategy. The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) is a key supporting document that influences how the Core Strategy is shaped and is referred to in section 1.3 on p.10 of the CSPO document. The SA Report does not assess each policy individually, as this is not best practice in relation to SA. It is meant to be an assessment of the plan as a whole and it would be misleading to assess each policy individually without considering the wider context of the whole plan off-setting any potential negative impact an individual policy may have. A separate delivery plan is not required for the strategic objectives - the policies themselves in the Core Strategy are the mechanism for delivering the objectives, hence Table 4.1 is showing which objective(s) a policy helps to fulfil.		
Recommendation	No Action Required		

cspo-193	C/O Agent	WHITBREAD GROUP PLC	
Plan Ref	4.2	The Core Strategy Preferred Options - Key Messages	Support
Summary	Support the release of small parcels of land within the Green Belt for sustainable development eg Land adjacent (south) to the Morris Dancers, Scarisbrick		
Response	Comments noted with regard to the merits of releasing this piece of Green Belt land, although not every point is agreed. It is not the role of the Core Strategy to allocate small sites, nor to release small sites (such as the one suggested) from the Green Belt; if this were to be done, it would be through the DM Policies DPD (settlement boundaries) or the Site Allocations DPD.		
Recommendation	No further action.		
cspo-222	Mr Shaun Taylor	Planning Associate Director G L Hearn Property Consultants	
Plan Ref	4.2	The Core Strategy Preferred Options - Key Messages	Object
Summary	Too much focus on housing within Skelmersdale. Growth should consider more than local needs to deliver much needed infrastructure and affordable housing. (s)		
Response	We are aware of the risks associated with deliverability of development in Skelmersdale based on consultation feedback and historic development completion rates. In response to this a review is being carried out to ensure the appropriate distribution of development across the Borough so that housing delivery is not jeopardised and that the focus remains on Skelmersdale to support regeneration. The level of growth that would be required to fund Skelmersdale regeneration and the identified infrastructure would be so significant it would require extremely large The level of development required to support a growth strategy that would fund the Skelmersdale regeneration and major infrastructure delivery would be so significant that the amount of Green Belt land required would seriously compromise the environmental limits of the Boroughs settlements.		
Recommendation	Review of housing targets and distribution to ensure growth needs are met.		
cspo-231	Mr D Rimmer		
Plan Ref	4.2	The Core Strategy Preferred Options - Key Messages	Object
Summary	DS4 land should be considered for development prior to Green Belt such as BA.24 which is capable of providing 40 + dwellings whilst overcoming flooding and drainage issues. (s)		
Response	The Core Strategy, through policies CS1 and CS7 prioritises brownfield land over greenfield and Green Belt land. Furthermore, paragraph 4.3.3 sets out what Safeguarded land is but does not afford it the same degree of protection as Green Belt land.		
Recommendation	No action required		
cspo-326	Mr Roger Clayton		
Plan Ref	4.2	The Core Strategy Preferred Options - Key Messages	Object
Summary	It is undesirable and unrealistic to concentrate two-thirds of development into Skelmersdale. Affordable housing requirements in Skelmersdale belie the findings of the Fordham Research documents. No recognition has been given to existing empty housing. (S)		
Response	Skelmersdale is the highest settlement in the West Lancashire settlement hierarchy and thus it is appropriate to locate the largest proportion of development there. There is land and infrastructure to accommodate the proposed amount of development. Housing locations are influenced not just by need, but by availability of sites, infrastructure and services. It is agreed that house prices in Skelmersdale tend to be the most affordable in the Borough, but the Fordham Research document still recommends that a proportion of new housing in Skelmersdale should be affordable, and the Core Strategy has closely followed the findings of this research. The Core Strategy recognises the need for different types of accommodation to meet the changing demographic profile of West Lancashire (for example through Lifetime Homes and older persons accommodation requirements). The proportion of empty homes in West Lancashire is exceptionally low, and the scope for contribution towards housing land supply from this source is limited.		
Recommendation	No action required		
cspo-327	Mr Roger Clayton		
Plan Ref	4.2	The Core Strategy Preferred Options - Key Messages	Object
Summary	By releasing small sites in sufficient numbers to meet the local demand in the Parishes the council could avoid undesirable levels of development elsewhere – notably Skelmersdale. Such developments need not require major infrastructure provision (e.g. foul drainage) if modern alternatives were stipulated instead. (S)		
Response	Comments noted		
Recommendation	No action required		

cspo-351	Mr Robert W. Pickavance		
Plan Ref	4.2	The Core Strategy Preferred Options - Key Messages	Object
Summary	4.2.2 & 4.2.4: Release of green belt land must be carefully considered, however, the release of the New Road site would be within the village boundaries and within a natural boundary (sluice).		
Response	Acknowledged		
Recommendation	No action required		
cspo-481	Mr Marcus Bleasdale	Bleasdale Investments Ltd	
Plan Ref	4.2	The Core Strategy Preferred Options - Key Messages	Support
Summary	Support for recognition that Green Belt release is unavoidable to meet the Borough's demands in future. (S)		
Response	Comments noted		
Recommendation	No Action Required		
cspo-546	Mr Alan Hubbard	Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust	
Plan Ref	4.2	The Core Strategy Preferred Options - Key Messages	Support
Summary	The National Trust supports the preferred options approach based on focussing development on larger settlements. This is consistent with its previously expressed views and several of the identified key issues around addressing matters such as affordable housing, education, employment and poor image in the main settlements. (f)		
Response	Comments noted		
Recommendation	No further action required		
cspo-682	Jason and Marcus Bleasdale		
Plan Ref	4.2	The Core Strategy Preferred Options - Key Messages	Support
Summary	Support for recognition that Green Belt release is unavoidable to meet the Borough's demands in future. (S)		
Response	Comments noted		
Recommendation	No further action required		
cspo-106	Mr Kenneth Lamden		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	Building on Green Belt should not be an option. In particular, the rural setting of Ormskirk should be maintained. (S)		
Response	Comments noted		
Recommendation	No change		
cspo-122	Mr & Mrs B Hughes		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	Protest the redrafting of the Green Belt policy in connection with the land bounded by Ruff Lane, St Helens Road and Scarth Hill. Concern that Ormskirk being defined by the University, not by the rich heritage of peoples and farms. (S)		
Response	Comments noted. Any removal of land from the Green Belt must be justified by "every exceptional circumstances" and the Core Strategy Preferred Options Paper proposes that the need to begin to resolve any student accommodation, highways and car parking impacts caused by Edge Hill University constitutes those very exceptional circumstances.		
Recommendation	No further action		
cspo-123	Mr David P Gibson		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Observations
Summary	Concern about the potential loss for Green Belt adjacent to Ruff Woods. University expansion having a major impact on local residents. Concern about the restricted parking at Ruff Woods and argues that issue of parking around the University needs to be addressed. (S)		
Response	Comments noted. Any removal of land from the Green Belt must be justified by "every exceptional circumstances" and the Core Strategy Preferred Options Paper proposes that the need to begin to resolve any student accommodation, highways and car parking impacts caused by Edge Hill University constitutes those very exceptional circumstances.		
Recommendation	No further action.		

cspo-125	Mr Steven Hopkin		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	Green Belt should not be used at all, only sites within existing urban area. Increased traffic, pollution and demand on infrastructure is unacceptable. (S)		
Response	Comments noted. Ideally, Green Belt should not be developed, but given the housing requirements the Borough faces, the limited number of developable sites in urban areas, and taking into account infrastructure constraints, there exist exceptional circumstances that necessitate the release of a small amount of Green Belt land.		
Recommendation	No further action.		
cspo-126	Mr P Rothwell		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	A single large development site (option 1) is unlikely to be successful in view of the major infrastructure issues associated with such a large site. Whilst option 2 is regarded as more acceptable, a clearer definition of the areas where development will take place is necessary. The land to the north west of Parrs Lane should be identified as a single main area for residential development due to the way in which it satisfies all of the requirements for Green Belt land release. (S)		
Response	Comments noted. Site-specific comments in relation to Parrs Lane are noted here and being taken into account in the Green Belt Study. It is not agreed that having one large development site would lead to insurmountable infrastructure constraints. Conversely, having one site could make developer contributions simpler and enable infrastructure issues to be addressed in a more straightforward manner. Allocating specific sites is not appropriate for the Core Strategy, except for large Strategic Sites central to the delivery of the Core Strategy. Parrs Lane, even if supported, would not qualify as such a site. 'Areas of search' are appropriate for non-strategic sites, in line with guidance on preparing Core Strategies. These will not lead to uncertainty over the lifetime of the Plan - the precise sites would be chosen as part of the Site Allocations DPD work a couple of years into the Core Strategy period. Although Parrs Lane is not served by the New Lane treatment works, it still suffers sewerage infrastructure constraints. This site can be taken into account, along with others, when considering a Preferred Strategy, and / or a 'Plan B' portfolio of sites.		
Recommendation	Consider Parrs Lane site as part of the 'Plan B' portfolio of sites.		
cspo-127	Mr Clifford Holbert		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	The site east of Vale Lane would help address the shortfall in employment land as identified in the Core Strategy and would assist in reducing the amount of undefined Green Belt land which is to be taken to the south of the M58. (S)		
Response	Site-specific comments noted, and are also being taken into account in the Green Belt study. More evidence would be required regarding ground conditions before this site could be considered as a deliverable development site. Information the Council obtained from English Partnerships in 2005 showed that the site has been subject to shallow mine workings which could seriously constrain its development and make it unfeasible. If this is proved not to be the case, the site could be considered further in the future.		
Recommendation	No action required		
cspo-130	Estate of Mr J Travis Estate of John Travis		
Plan Ref	Options for Green Belt Release		Object
Summary	Orrell Lane site scores better when assessed against the 5 purposes of including land in the Green Belt set out in PPG2 than the identified strategic development site at Higgins Lane. Issues associated with Higgins Lane site in terms of infrastructure constraints means that it is unlikely to be developed as envisaged. A smaller site, such as that identified off Orrell Lane, would not generate the same infrastructure issues and would be more likely to be developed over the plan period. The site could be used as housing/community facilities with employment identified on the edge or located elsewhere in the Borough. (S)		
Response	Detailed site-specific comments are noted, and are also being taken into account in the Green Belt Study. It is not agreed that having one large development site would lead to insurmountable infrastructure constraints. Conversely, having one site could make developer contributions simpler and enable infrastructure issues to be addressed in a more straightforward manner. This site can be taken into account, along with others, when considering a Preferred Strategy, and / or a 'Plan B' portfolio of sites.		
Recommendation	Consider this site as part of the 'Plan B' portfolio of sites.		
cspo-131	Mr & Mrs E Ramsbottom		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Support with conditions
Summary	Wording of document should be amended to confirm rounding off of settlement boundaries will take place allowing release of small areas of Green Belt. (S)		
Response	Comments noted. However, it is also noted that the Green Belt boundary around the end of Chapel Lane was considered at the 2005 Local Plan Inquiry, and the Inspector ruled that it should not be altered. It is not the role of the Core Strategy to set detailed Green Belt boundaries, except for Strategic Sites. The Development Management Policies DPD will address settlement boundaries, possibly in conjunction with the Site Allocations DPD, and there should be opportunities for representations to be made when consulting on these documents.		
Recommendation	No further action.		

cspo-132	Mr Ian Ramsbottom		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	The area of land bounded by Wellfield Lane and Vicrage Lane, including Ruff Woods, should be incorporated into the settlement area of Ormskirk and be subject to Green Belt release in order to regularise the situation in this area. The removal of Ruff Woods from its Green Belt designation will not lead to any development as it should be subject to a supplementary planning document identifying the restriction on development in this area and explaining its biological heritage and nature conservation significance. (S)		
Response	Comments noted. Given the Vicarage Lane /Wellfield Lane area's physical separation from the built-up area of Ormskirk, it was considered more appropriate when setting Green Belt boundaries to 'wash over' this area as Green Belt, rather than include it as a 'finger' extension of the Ormskirk settlement boundary. It is not the role of the Core Strategy to set detailed Green Belt boundaries, except for Strategic Sites. The Development Management Policies DPD will address settlement boundaries, possibly in conjunction with the Site Allocations DPD, and there will be opportunities for representations to be made when consulting on these documents.		
Recommendation	No further action		
cspo-143	Mr Philip Carter	Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency	
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	If Option B is progressed a Level 2 SFRA will be required.		
Response	Comments Noted		
Recommendation	If Option B is selected a Level 2 SFRA will be carried out.		
cspo-145	Mr Philip Carter	Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency	
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Observations
Summary	Functional floodplain located within the Ormskirk Strategic site is also a constraint.		
Response	Noted		
Recommendation	Include this issue in appraisal of the Ormskirk Site and do further assessment through Level 2 SFRA if option is selected.		
cspo-159	Mr M Abrams		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	Objection to the expansion of Edge Hill into the Green Belt. Concern that increasing University size is having consequential affects on the market town, these affects include traffic congestion and more strain between the University and locals. (S)		
Response	Comments noted. The Council seeks to support any attempts to reduce any detrimental impact on local people caused by Edge Hill University. Even if student numbers stay broadly the same, land is required to improve student accommodation, access and car parking on campus to off-set negative impacts on the wider town. It is considered that the area of land identified within the draft Core Strategy will allow for managed and minimal levels of expansion into the Green Belt. The other alternative is that we do not provide such a policy in the Core Strategy and then expose ourselves to future applications from the University which we then cannot refuse, which could potentially have wider negative impacts on the surrounding Green Belt.		
Recommendation	No action required		
cspo-160	Ms Janet Chaddick		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	Objection to non preferred option: Ormskirk reasons include: "Highly negative impact on traffic and congestion in Ormskirk "Loss of Green Belt land "Loss of Grade 1 agricultural land and loss of open approach to the town. (S)		
Response	Comments noted.		
Recommendation	No action required.		
cspo-166	Mrs J Caunce		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	Option 2 would be more acceptable. More development near the A59 would bring more chaos to the main area of Burscough. (S)		
Response	Comments noted		
Recommendation	No action required.		

cspo-179		Roger Tym & Partners	
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	We believe that our client's site to the south of New Cut Lane (the northern portion of the site identified as SEFB13 in the draft Green Belt study) should be included in the Council's Preferred Options for the release of Green Belt land. (S)		
Response	Comments noted. Most of the detail relates to the Green Belt Study, and these comments have been noted and addressed in that Study.		
Recommendation	Consider site within potential portfolio of "Plan B" sites		
cspo-196	C/O Agent	WHITBREAD GROUP PLC	
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Observations
Summary	The Council should consider provide a third option which involves the release of small pockets of land elsewhere across the borough. For example, Land adjacent to the Morris Dancers, Scarisbrick (S)		
Response	Paragraph 4.2.4 does not support the release of "small parcels of Green Belt land for development", but is pointing out that the amount of Green Belt land proposed for release is relatively small in proportion to the overall amount of Green Belt land in the Borough as a whole. A piecemeal release of many small (<1ha) sites is not considered a viable option, because although their individual impact on the Green Belt might be modest, their combined impact would be likely to be significant. Also, the potential for "planning gain" in the form of affordable housing, infrastructure improvements, etc. from a series of small sites would be much less than from a small number of larger sites. Comments regarding the land adjacent to the Morris Dancers have been noted, but are more relevant for the DM Policies DPD (which would set settlement boundaries), or the Site Allocations DPD.		
Recommendation	No further action.		
cspo-213	Lt Coln RAR de Larrinaga		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Support with conditions
Summary	The rectangular site to the north of Edge Hill University should be regarded as appropriate for residential development in its own right rather than be associated with employment or educational facilities associated with Edge Hill University. (S)		
Response	Comments noted. This parcel has been submitted individually through other LDF evidence base documents (the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment) and will be considered on its own merits through the LDF process.		
Recommendation	No action required		
cspo-223	Mr Shaun Taylor	Planning Associate Director G L Hearn Property Consultants	
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	The Core Strategy must therefore reconsider the need for a greater level of Green Belt release and potential broad locations of such release. (S)		
Response	We are aware of the risks associated with deliverability of development in Skelmersdale based on consultation feedback and historic development completion rates. In response to this a review is being carried out to ensure the appropriate distribution of development across the Borough to ensure housing delivery is not jeopardised but that the focus remains on Skelmersdale to support regeneration. In terms of concerns regarding "lag time", plan B is currently being developed to ensure that in the the infrastructure upgrades do not take place or Skelmersdale fails to deliver revised growth targets, Plan B will come in to play.		
Recommendation	Review of housing targets and distribution to ensure growth needs are met.		
cspo-239	Mr D Rimmer		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	DS4 Land should be considered for development before Green Belt land. (s)		
Response	30 dwellings per hectare is a "ball park" figure, based on the former national minimum density requirement in PPS3. In some instances, open space (and roads, SUDS, etc.) can be incorporated within a development whilst achieving an overall [gross] density of 30dph, which if applied across the Borough would result in the need for 20ha of land release for housing. In other instances the inclusion of open space, etc. would result in an overall density of less than 30dph and a need for more than 20ha land release. Conversely, it may be possible to achieve an overall density in excess of 30dph, which would result in the need for less than 20ha land release. The approximation in paragraph 4.3.2 is for indicative purposes only. Individual site characteristics will be taken into account when preparing development briefs /planning applications and / or the Site Allocations DPD. DS4 land is not afforded the same level of protection as Green Belt land, paragraph 4.3.3 points out the similarities in characteristics and impacts of development on such land. Infrastructure providers have commented that significant development within the Tarleton and Hesketh Bank settlement area would not be appropriate given the road layout and lack of sustainable public transport links, Burscough has 2 rail stations and the main trunk road through the Borough passes through it. Furthermore, United Utilities have advised that hydraulic issues associated with the sewer system within the northern parishes are a limiting factor. Given both this issue and the issues surrounding Burscough and Ormskirk waste water treatment, do not have guaranteed funding, it would be more appropriate for funding to improve the drainage system in order to support the 2 of the 3 most sustainable settlements within the Borough rather than the key sustainable villages which, by their nature and size, have tighter environmental constraints. Comments regarding Banks are noted. However, site allocations are beyond the remit of the Core Strategy and would come at a later stage once we have an adopted Core Strategy.		
Recommendation	No action required.		

cspo-251	Mr Francis Williams	member Ormskirk Friends of the Earth	
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Observations
Summary	We would advocate retention for agricultural purposes of the Green Belt land which is of the most value to food production. (S)		
Response	Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk.		
Recommendation	No action required.		
cspo-268	Mr & Mrs A Southern		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	Edge Hill should not be allowed to swamp Ormskirk, character of the market town should be preserved. Student accommodation should be restricted. (S)		
Response	1) Comments noted. Policy CS6 seeks to manage development at Edge Hill and limit the impacts on Ormskirk. 2) Policy CS17 sets out how development must be of good quality design and Policy CS9 seeks to manage and limit where necessary, student accommodation. 3) Comments noted.		
Recommendation	No action required		
cspo-270	Mr David Berry	Ormskirk Green Belt Conservation Group	
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	Object to Ormskirk Option (3)		
Response	Comments noted		
Recommendation	No action required		
cspo-273	Mr & Mrs J & Geoff Kearsley		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	The council must consider very carefully the consequences before allowing either of the first two proposals for Green Belt release to go ahead. If all issues are considered logically then there can only be one set of decisions. (s)		
Response	Comments noted, it is for many of the reasons stated including impact on Green Belt, wildlife, traffic congestion and agricultural land, that the Council identified this option as "non-preferred. Managing development at Edge Hill university is central to Policy CS6. Without some controlled development, the Council would struggle to manage the existing impacts on Ormskirk such as Student accommodation and traffic. Comments relating to the Green Belt study are responded to within the Green Belt Study Consultation Response Report. Comments regarding student housing policy are noted.		
Recommendation	No further action required		
cspo-274	Samantha Disley		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	Object to green belt development in Ormskirk. (S)		
Response	The Ormskirk option presented itself as the settlement is the second largest settlement in the Borough with many sustainable features including an excellent rail system, town centre with many local facilities and a need for housing, in particular affordable housing to meet local need. Whilst some housing will still need to be located within Ormskirk on land within the settlement boundary, the Council reviewed and considered the impacts of the Ormskirk option for Green Belt release to meet the remainder of housing need and considered that overall the Burscough option for Green Belt release is a better option with less negatives. Housing targets are established through a combination of population projections figures, meeting unmet need that has not been delivered as a result of the slow in the housing market and household projections which set out the likely make up of housing in the future according to trends. All other comments noted but are largely in relation to a proposal which is not set out within this document and is being driven by an independent land owner.		
Recommendation	No action required		
cspo-278	Parish Clerk Keith Williams	Clerk Burscough Parish Council	
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	Do not support Option 1 (Burscough). Do not support Option 2 (Dispersal). Recommends the non-preferred option for review and adoption. (S)		
Response	Comments noted.		
Recommendation	No action required		

cspo-280	Mrs Jo Robison	Associate Smiths Gore	
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	Disagrees with the sites chosen as Green Belt study has not been consulted on.		
Response	The Council accepts that sites located around Ormskirk and Burscough are constrained by waste water treatment issues but considers that overcoming this issue is vital to the future of the Borough and the sustainability of its 2 main settlements outside of Skelmersdale. Although AUG.04 does not have the same waste water issue, its location means that access to the key A roads would be via existing B and unclassified roads which suffer pinch points and would be more problematic in terms of impact on the local highway network. All other Green Belt sites proposed have primary access onto the A59 which is one of the main arterial routes through the Borough.		
Recommendation	A Background Technical Paper will be produced setting out the detailed assessments undertaken in arriving at the preferred options for Green Belt release.		
cspo-283	Mr Alun Delaney		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	Object to proposed development of green belt in Ormskirk (S)		
Response	The Ormskirk option is the Council's non-preferred option for many of the reasons set out in this objection. The Council appreciates the value of the Green Belt in this location and considers that other Green Belt sites would be more suitable to come forward for development. Whilst we take note of previous comments from Inspectors, the Core Strategy will set out development requirements for the next 15 years, up to 2027. Over this time period we are facing an unprecedented situation whereby the population will continue to grow and the needs of the Borough will place great demand on the existing urban areas creating a need to expand into the Green Belt. Green Belt development is therefore inevitable if we are to meet the needs of a growing Borough, the issue we face is which part or parts of the Green Belt are most suitable for release for future development needs. As stated above, the Ormskirk Strategic Site is the Council's non-preferred option for this purpose.		
Recommendation	No action.		
cspo-285	Dave Usher		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Observations
Summary	Concerns on how the options have been developed. (S)		
Response	Although the Ormskirk Option has been identified as non-preferred, it has still been included within this consultation. It is clearly set out within all promotional material and the document itself in order to enable the public to express their views regarding the option and to allow them to comment.		
Recommendation	No action required		
cspo-288	Mrs Marilyn Bolton		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	Object to expansion of Edge Hill Uni using Green belt release (S)		
Response	The Ormskirk Strategic Site is the Council's non-preferred option for Green Belt release, which means that whilst it has been identified as a possibility, the Council considers that there are more suitable and sustainable sites which could be released for development first. The Green Belt was protected in 1987 for a period of 15 to 20 years to restrict urban sprawl. This designation was always intended to be reviewed depending on the implications of future population growth. 24 years after its designation, we are now having to review existing Green Belt boundaries in order to meet the needs of the Borough's growing population over the next 15 years. The Council is seeking to identify those areas which offer the lowest Green Belt value to the Borough rather than those which are more valuable and to prioritise those areas first. As stated above, the Ormskirk Strategic Site is considered least sustainable of all the options and therefore is the non-preferred option.		
Recommendation	No action.		
cspo-293	Mr Callum Hosie		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	I totally oppose any re-designation of (ORM.07) and release of green belt for development without strong justification and evidence (S)		
Response	The comments above relate mainly to the analysis of ORM.07 which has been addressed in the Green Belt Study Consultation Response Report (Representation GB 17)		
Recommendation	No action required within the Core Strategy. See officer recommendations to the Green Belt Study Consultation Report.		

cspo-296	L Wallbank		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	I am against the development on green belt 100%. (F)		
Response	The Borough does not have enough non Green Belt land to deliver the required growth targets needed to meet the housing and employment need of the existing and future population of the Borough. Therefore, release of less than 1% of the existing Green Belt land will be necessary.		
Recommendation	no action required		
<hr/>			
cspo-299	S Bold		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	Object to 600 houses under Burscough option (S)		
Response	Comments noted		
Recommendation	no action required		
<hr/>			
cspo-303	Mr James Kitchen		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	We at 296 Liverpool road South object to the above planned development in relation to the 600 homes on green belt land (F)		
Response	Comment noted		
Recommendation	No action required		
<hr/>			
cspo-305	Mr Stuart Colothan		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	I am writing to express my sincere concerns about the possibility of building 600 more homes in Ormskirk and losing the green belt by Altys Lane. I hope to hear from you soon regarding this matter as I am thoroughly opposed to it. (F)		
Response	Concern noted. This is the Councils "Non-Preferred" Option for development.		
Recommendation	No action required		
<hr/>			
cspo-306	Renee Bligh		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	Should not be allocating agricultural land for development. The pressure of development on infrastructure is a problem, particularly traffic and sewers which cause flooding. Also the additional anti social behaviour associated with new large estates cannot be managed as police are moving out of the area. Brownfield sites should be developed first. (S)		
Response	Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. The Core Strategy Preferred Options Document is informed by evidence which reviews all available land within the Borough and assesses its suitability for development. The Council is aware that most of our development requirements will fit within the existing urban settlements and will prioritise brown field in order to use up this land. However, there is a shortfall of land towards the end of the plan and the Green Belt will need to be considered to meet the remaining housing and employment needs.		
Recommendation	No action required.		
<hr/>			
cspo-318	Mr Ron Rowles		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	I write to state that I am totally opposed to any development of the land situated between St Helens Road and Altys Lane. I am also totally opposed to any further development of the land bounded by Ruff Lane, St Helens Road and Scarth Hill Lane. I am totally in favour of restricting the student occupancy of housing in the town to a maximum of 15%. (F)		
Response	The Council wishes to continue to support the Green Belt designation as much as possible due to the benefits associated with protecting the countryside and character of West Lancashire. However, the Core Strategy must manage development and development pressures up to 2027 and in this time it is expected that the University will need some additional land. All of the options presented in the Core Strategy allow for 10ha of expansion land at Edge Hill. It is considered that this will allow for managed and minimal levels of expansion into the Green Belt. The other alternative is that we do not provide such a policy in the Core Strategy and then expose ourselves to future applications from the University which we then cannot refuse, which could potentially have wider negative impacts on the surrounding Green Belt. Lastly, the University is a major contributor to the Borough's economy and the Council seeks to support its future plans, whilst attempting to reduce any detrimental impact on local people.		
Recommendation	No action required.		

cspo-320	Valerie Denniss		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	In relation to the Ruff Lane, St. Helen's Rd, and Scarth Hill areas, in 2005 it was stated that "This area performs and important Green Belt Function" why now, are proposals being made to do just the opposite? (s)		
Response	The Council wishes to continue to support the Green Belt designation as much as possible due to the benefits associated with protecting the countryside and character of West Lancashire. However, the Core Strategy must manage development and development pressures up to 2027 and in this time it is expected that the University will need some additional land. All of the options presented in the Core Stratgy allow for 10ha of expansion land at Edge Hill. It is considered that this will allow for managed and minimal levels of expansion into the Green Belt. The other alternative is that we do not provide such a policy in the Core Strategy and then expose ourselves to future applications from the University which we then cannot refuse, which could potentially have wider negative impacts on the surrounding Green Belt. Lastly, the University is a major contributor to the Borough's economy and the Council seeks to support its future plans, whilst attempting to reduce any detrimental impact on local people.		
Recommendation	No action required		
cspo-328	Mr Roger Clayton		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	A major weakness of the plan is the acceptance that infrastructure development would not take place until the latter half of the Core Strategy period. This creates an even greater reliance on development in Skelmersdale to meet targets over the first half of the period. Instead of bemoaning the restrictions on growth, the council should be playing to the strengths of our mainly rural borough. (S)		
Response	Comments noted. However, the Governments agenda for growth requires that all areas play there part and it is important to ensure homes are delivered and employment opportunities are provided. If this is not achieved then the population will continue to age within the Borough as young people are forced to leave the Borough to find suitable housing and the urban areas risk becoming dormitory settlements.		
Recommendation	No action required		
cspo-346	Miss Joan E Foster		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	Object to Ormskirk non-preferred option due to traffic volumes and loss of Green Belt. (S)		
Response	The Ormskirk Strategic site has been selected as the Council's non-preferred option in terms of Green Belt release. It has been identified as such due to the reasons stated in this objection. It is generally considered to be the least sustainable of the Green Belt options given the value of the Green Belt in this location and the already problematic traffic levels.		
Recommendation	No action.		
cspo-360	Susan Brookfield		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	Object to any development in Banks, mainly due to loss of village feel and flood risk. New homes are not for existing residents but for people moving into Banks. (S)		
Response	1) Comment noted. 2) The Council is aware of the flood risk associated with much of the land around Banks. However, area of search suggested in Option 2 identifies some land which is free from current flood risk. 3 - 5) comments noted		
Recommendation	no action required.		
cspo-364	Mr David Grimshaw		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Observations
Summary	Proposed release of Green Belt at Red Cat Lane, Burscough. My view with regard to the "Preferred Options Paper is that the original submission from Brian Mawdsley is still not only relevant but consistent with both Option 1 and Option 2. In my view the re-alignment of the Green Belt boundary as proposed is totally consistent with the stated vision for West Lancashire (S)		
Response	Comments noted, However this land has not been identified as an area of search for Green Belt release at this time.		
Recommendation	Consider site within potential portfolio of sites for "Plan B"		
cspo-365	Mr A Taylor		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	It is clear that Lord Derbys Estate sees this as an opportunity to turn greenbelt land into highly valuable development land to be sold to a developer. I doubt whether Lord Derbys Estates have any other consideration in this matter but to gain that valuable planning permission irrespective of any concerns local residents may have. (F)		
Response	The Ormskirk Strategic Site has been identified as the Council's non-preferred option for Green Belt release as it is considered to be the least sustainable site for development. We appreciate concerns regarding the confusion with the plans put forward by Lord Derby's Estate, however, these are not endorsed by the Council and do not feature in the proposed Core Strategy document.		
Recommendation	No action.		

cspo-376	Mr Martin Williams	
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release
Summary	Object	
Response	Object to Burscough option. (S)	
Response	<p>With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as "Considerate Constructors". 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the "Have Your Say" leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst "new jobs" is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, "new, high quality business space" (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. "Improved transport" refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough's traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list "improved transport" as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase "improved drainage" refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.</p>	
Recommendation	No action.	

cspo-377	Alan Murray		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	Object to Burscough option		
Response	<p>With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as "Considerate Constructors". 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the "Have Your Say" leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst "new jobs" is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, "new, high quality business space" (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. "Improved transport" refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough's traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list "improved transport" as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase "improved drainage" refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.</p>		
Recommendation	No action.		

cspo-378	A Swift		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	Object to Burscough option		
Response	<p>With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as "Considerate Constructors". 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the "Have Your Say" leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst "new jobs" is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, "new, high quality business space" (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. "Improved transport" refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough's traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list "improved transport" as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase "improved drainage" refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.</p>		
Recommendation	No action.		

cspo-379	Mr & Mrs McNiece	Object
Plan Ref	4.3 Options for Green Belt Release	
Summary	Object to Burscough option	
Response	<p>With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as "Considerate Constructors". 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the "Have Your Say" leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst "new jobs" is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, "new, high quality business space" (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. "Improved transport" refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough's traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list "improved transport" as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase "improved drainage" refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.</p>	
Recommendation	No action.	

cspo-380	Mr David Hope	
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release
Summary	Object	
Response	<p>Object to Burscough option</p> <p>With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as "Considerate Constructors". 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the "Have Your Say" leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst "new jobs" is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, "new, high quality business space" (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. "Improved transport" refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough's traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list "improved transport" as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase "improved drainage" refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.</p>	
Recommendation	No action.	

cspo-381	Bev Hope		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	Object to Burscough option (S)		
Response	<p>With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as ‘‘Considerate Constructors’’. 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the ‘‘Have Your Say’’ leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst ‘‘new jobs’’ is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, ‘‘new, high quality business space’’ (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. ‘‘Improved transport’’ refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough’s traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list ‘‘improved transport’’ as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase ‘‘improved drainage’’ refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.</p>		
Recommendation	No action.		

cspo-383	Mr L Abram		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	Object to Burscough option (S)		
Response	<p>With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as "Considerate Constructors". 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the "Have Your Say" leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst "new jobs" is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, "new, high quality business space" (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. "Improved transport" refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough's traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list "improved transport" as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase "improved drainage" refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.</p>		
Recommendation	No action.		
cspo-384	J Berry		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Support
Summary	My preferred option would be the Burscough one. (S)		
Response	Comments noted.		
Recommendation	No action.		
cspo-385	Mr John Butterworth		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	Object to release of green belt in Ormskirk particularly.		
Response	<p>Comments noted. The LDF Team held a range of events to consult with the public during May and June 2011. This included workshops, exhibitions and consultation with schools. The survey was intended as a simpler method of response for those not used to the formal representations often associated with planning. However, more general comment forms were also available, along with general representations submitted by email or by letter. It is unfortunate that the Lord Derby Estate scheme was promoted at the same time as the Council's consultation as the two are completely unrelated. The Council has identified the Ormskirk site as the 'non-preferred' option which means it is considered to be most unsustainable when compared with the other options.</p>		
Recommendation	No action.		

cspo-397	Mr Geoff Dermott		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	Object to the Ormskirk Strategic Site due to traffic congestion and the purpose of the Green Belt in this location. (S)		
Response	Comments noted. And for the reasons highlighted in the response above the Ormskirk Strategic Site has been identified as the non-preferred Option. This means that other identified options are considered more sustainable by the Council.		
Recommendation	No action.		
cspo-402	Mrs Julie Broadbent		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	Object to the Ormskirk Strategic Site as there is no change since the Public Enquiry in 2005. (S)		
Response	Comments noted. This is the Council's non-preferred option as it is considered to be the least sustainable of all of the options for Green Belt release.		
Recommendation	No action.		
cspo-410	Mrs P A McLaughlin		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	Support Option 1 - Burscough. Object to Ormskirk.		
Response	Comments noted. It is the Council's view that the Ormskirk option is the least sustainable of all of the Green Belt Options. Support for Burscough noted.		
Recommendation	No action.		
cspo-411	Mr PF McLoughlin		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	Object to Ormskirk. Support Burscough.		
Response	Comments noted. The Ormskirk Option is the Council's non-preferred option for many of the reasons highlighted above. The Council is aware of the confusion caused by the Ormskirk 2027 exhibition, unfortunately this was out of the Council's hands. Support for the Burscough option noted.		
Recommendation	No action.		
cspo-417	A Leaves		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	Object to Burscough option (S)		
Response	Comments on Burscough Option noted. All of the options pose potential problems in terms of infrastructure and traffic congestion. This will need to be managed working closely with developers to improve the existing situation as development goes ahead. The issue for West Lancs BC is that some land for new housing needs to be found and as assessment must be made as to which area would have the smallest negative impact if developed.		
Recommendation	No action.		
cspo-418	GE Jackson		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	Object to Ormskirk option and loss of green belt (S)		
Response	Comments noted. The Ormskirk Strategic site is the Council's non-preferred option as it is considered the least sustainable option in terms of future use of Green Belt land. This option has, however, still been consulted upon in order to gain the views of the public. In any case, we have allowed for 10ha of expansion land at Edge Hill University. The university campus is now reaching capacity and by allowing for managed expansion of 10ha within the plan, this will help us to avoid future over-development in the Green Belt. Extending the campus will also allow for functions such as a greater proportion of student accommodation on site, reducing pressure on existing housing in Ormskirk for students.		
Recommendation	No action.		
cspo-419	Margaret Whitfield		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	Object to Burscough (S)		
Response	Comments noted. The Council is aware that where ever development in the Green Belt goes ahead there will be some negative impacts such as loss of the function of the Green Belt, increased traffic congestion and pressure on existing infrastructure. We have to aim to manage these negative impacts by working with developers to lessen the impact. We also have to weigh the negative implications with much wider concerns that the future population of West Lancashire will not have access to housing.		
Recommendation	No action.		

cspo-421	Mr and Mrs R W Gilmour		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	Object to release of green belt land in Ormskirk		
Response	The Draft Green Belt Study which identifies land bounded by Ruff Lane and St Helens Road and adjacent to Edge Hill as ORM.07 is an evidence base document and not a policy document. What this means is that the study was carried out in order to inform planning policy which will be developed through the Local Development Framework process. The important difference is that what is identified within the evidence base may not in all circumstances be carried through as policy and ultimately, the Green Belt Study itself cannot remove land from the Green Belt. It is the Core Strategy which identifies areas of land to be removed from Green Belt and within the latest version, the Core Strategy Preferred Options Paper, the proposals do not propose to remove the whole of the parcel of land known as ORM.07 from the Green Belt. The proposal is for a much smaller area of land (10ha) within the parcel that is directly adjacent to the existing Green Belt boundary. Furthermore, any removal of land from the Green Belt must still be justified by 'every exceptional circumstances' and the Core Strategy Preferred Options Paper proposes that the need to begin to resolve any student accommodation, highways and car parking impacts caused by Edge Hill University constitutes those very exceptional circumstances.		
Recommendation	No action.		
cspo-434	Mr Andrew Thorley	Strategic Land Manager Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd	
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Observations
Summary	Specific policy is required addressing Green Belt release. (S)		
Response	It is the Council's view that, in the absence of a strategic review of the Merseyside Green Belt, it is primarily appropriate to release sufficient Green Belt as to meet development requirements over this Core Strategy period and enable sufficient flexibility through a "Plan B". In line with the requirements of a Core Strategy, the Council considers that the identification of 'strategic sites' and areas of search are sufficient at this stage. This will allow for precise sites to be identified at the site allocations stage.		
Recommendation	No action.		
cspo-439	Mr David Berry	Ormskirk Green Belt Conservation Group	
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	It quite obviously performs the purpose of the Green Belt which is a fact historically strongly supported by the council and ratified by independent government inspectors on at least two occasions.		
Response	Comments noted and responded too in detail within the Draft Green Belt Study Consultation Report. In terms of Green Belt release, Policy CS6 proposes that only a 10ha portion of the parcel adjacent to the existing university campus is to be released from the Green Belt. the remainder of the parcel would continue to be designated as Green Belt.		
Recommendation	No action required.		
cspo-440	Mr Roger Bell		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Support
Summary	Support Burscough, Object to other options		
Response	Comments noted.		
Recommendation	No action.		
cspo-442	Mr Roger Bell		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Observations
Summary	Support Burscough option (S)		
Response	Comments noted.		
Recommendation	No action.		
cspo-449	Mr Andrew Thorley	Strategic Land Manager Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd	
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Support with conditions
Summary	Support for distribution of dwellings in Ormskirk. High Lane should be identified as a Green Belt site for development, or failing that as safeguarded land for future residential development. (S)		
Response	Comments noted. The Council is re-considering all Green Belt options in light of such comments in order to ensure the most sustainable options are put forward within the final draft document. The potential for land at High Lane to deliver some of the housing targets is noted.		
Recommendation	Given the need for additional housing due to the revised housing target, it is recommended that a combination of Yew Tree Farm in Burscough and High Lane / Grove Farm in Ormskirk should be considered for release from the Green Belt for new housing.		

cspo-454	Mr Raymond McDonald		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	Burscough		
Response	Comments noted. The Council recognises that wherever new development is directed to within the Green Belt there will be some negative implications such as loss of open land, traffic impacts and infrastructure issues. Nevertheless, there are development targets which need to be met over the next 15 years and the Council must consider what is best for the entire Borough and that means selecting those sites which are considered to have fewest negative impacts when compared to others. All of the submitted comments on the options will be considered in some detail when writing up the amended draft document.		
Recommendation	No action.		
<hr/>			
cspo-456	Mr Donald C Hudson		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	Object to green belt release and note problems caused by university (S)		
Response	Comments noted.		
Recommendation	No action.		
<hr/>			
cspo-459	Mr Brian Marsh		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	Object to release of green belt in Ormskirk (S)		
Response	Comments noted. Population projections and the requirements of the Core Strategy (up to 2027) mean that the position has changed since 2005 and the Council must identify some Green Belt land if it is to meet projected housing needs to the end of the plan period.		
Recommendation	No action.		
<hr/>			
cspo-465	Mr Marcus Bleasdale	Bleasdale Investments Ltd	
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Observations
Summary	Little Moor Hall Farm should be considered for Green Belt release in order to deliver residential-led mixed use development. (S)		
Response	Site will be considered in terms of alternative Green Belt options.		
Recommendation	Site considered within assessment of potential "Plan B" sites, but found to not be most suitable for either preferred Green Belt release or for inclusion within the portfolio of "Plan B" sites.		
<hr/>			
cspo-466	Mr RA Barnish	Ormskirk & Dist Community Council	
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	Object to Ormskirk. Support Burscough. (S)		
Response	Comments noted. We understand the concerns raised in relation to the Ormskirk Strategic Site and the expansion of Edge Hill University. The position the Borough finds itself in has ultimately changed since 2005 and we must find land for additional houses in order to avoid a housing shortage over the next 15 year period. Unfortunately this means identifying some Green Belt land for development and in doing so the Council wishes to identify an area which will have the fewest negative impacts. It is for this reason that Ormskirk is the non-preferred option as it is considered that negative impacts associated with this site will be greater than the Burscough option and the dispersal option. A small area of expansion land at Edge Hill is identified within all the options and this includes a 10ha site on the edge of the existing campus. If the Council does not allow for this managed expansion, which is intended to provide some student accommodation to relieve pressure on the town, then it could be open to challenge and a much greater level of development in the Green Belt.		
Recommendation	No action.		
<hr/>			
cspo-467	Mr Allan D Cunningham		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	Object to Ormskirk option		
Response	Comments noted. The Council considers that the non-preferred option is the least sustainable option at the current time.		
Recommendation	No action.		

cspo-471	Mr William Davis		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	Object to Burscough (S)		
Response	Comments noted. The Council is aware that there are infrastructure and congestion problems associated with each of the options within the Core Strategy. It is intended that improvements will be made using developer contributions. Without development, such improvements cannot be facilitated.		
Recommendation	No action.		
cspo-477	Helen Griffin		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	Objects to Burscough option		
Response	<p>With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as "Considerate Constructors". 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the "Have Your Say" leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst "new jobs" is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, "new, high quality business space" (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. "Improved transport" refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough's traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list "improved transport" as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase "improved drainage" refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.</p>		
Recommendation	No action.		
cspo-478	Mr Marcus Bleasdale	Bleasdale Investments Ltd	
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Observations
Summary	A reduction of 0.26% of Green Belt land within the Borough represents a negligible change and on this basis, Jason and Marcus Bleasdale consider that the Council should give consideration to releasing additional Green Belt land for development, in particular the site at Little Moor Hall Farm given its 'suitability', 'achievability' and availability' for accommodating new housing, which has been established by the March 2010 West Lancashire SHLAA. (s)		
Response	Suggested site will be considered as an alternative Green Belt option.		
Recommendation	Site considered within assessment of potential "Plan B" sites, but found to not be most suitable for either preferred Green Belt release or for inclusion within the portfolio of "Plan B" sites.		

cspo-479	Mrs M Mellor	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Plan Ref				
Summary	Object to Burscough option			
Response	<p>With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as "Considerate Constructors". 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the "Have Your Say" leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst "new jobs" is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, "new, high quality business space" (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. "Improved transport" refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough's traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list "improved transport" as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase "improved drainage" refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.</p>			
Recommendation	No action.			

cspo-480	Mrs M Mellor	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Plan Ref				
Summary	Object to Burscough option			
Response	<p>With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as "Considerate Constructors". 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the "Have Your Say" leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst "new jobs" is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, "new, high quality business space" (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. "Improved transport" refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough's traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list "improved transport" as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase "improved drainage" refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.</p>			
Recommendation	No action.			

cspo-482	F A Collins	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Plan Ref				
Summary	Object to Burscough option (S)			
Response	<p>With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as "Considerate Constructors". 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the "Have Your Say" leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst "new jobs" is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, "new, high quality business space" (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. "Improved transport" refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough's traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list "improved transport" as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase "improved drainage" refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.</p>			
Recommendation	No action.			

cspo-483	S J McCloskey	Object
Plan Ref	4.3 Options for Green Belt Release	
Summary	Object to Burscough option (S)	
Response	<p>With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as "Considerate Constructors". 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the "Have Your Say" leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst "new jobs" is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, "new, high quality business space" (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. "Improved transport" refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough's traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list "improved transport" as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase "improved drainage" refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.</p>	
Recommendation	No action.	

cspo-485	Miss Karen Mellor	
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release Object
Summary	Object to Burscough option	
Response	<p>With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as "Considerate Constructors". 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the "Have Your Say" leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst "new jobs" is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, "new, high quality business space" (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. "Improved transport" refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough's traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list "improved transport" as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase "improved drainage" refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.</p>	
Recommendation	No action.	

cspo-487	Mr Derek Mellor	Object
Plan Ref	4.3 Options for Green Belt Release	
Summary	Object to Burscough option	
Response	<p>With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as "Considerate Constructors". 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the "Have Your Say" leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst "new jobs" is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, "new, high quality business space" (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. "Improved transport" refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough's traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list "improved transport" as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase "improved drainage" refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.</p>	
Recommendation	No action.	

cspo-489	Mrs J Molyneux	Object
Plan Ref	4.3 Options for Green Belt Release	
Summary	Object to Burscough option (S)	
Response	<p>With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as "Considerate Constructors". 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the "Have Your Say" leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst "new jobs" is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, "new, high quality business space" (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. "Improved transport" refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough's traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list "improved transport" as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase "improved drainage" refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.</p>	
Recommendation	No action.	

cspo-491	Mrs PM Woods		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	Object to Burscough option (S)		
Response	<p>With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as "Considerate Constructors". 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the "Have Your Say" leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst "new jobs" is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, "new, high quality business space" (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. "Improved transport" refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough's traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list "improved transport" as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase "improved drainage" refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.</p>		
Recommendation	No action.		
cspo-493	Craig and Cathy Walsh		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Support
Summary	Object to Burscough Option, support dispersal option as some housing (especially affordable) is needed in Burscough. (S)		
Response	Comments noted.		
Recommendation	No action.		

cspo-494	EM Lucas		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	Object to Burscough option (S)		
Response	<p>With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as "Considerate Constructors". 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the "Have Your Say" leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst "new jobs" is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, "new, high quality business space" (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. "Improved transport" refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough's traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list "improved transport" as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase "improved drainage" refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.</p>		
Recommendation	No action.		

cspo-496	Mr D J Matthews	
Plan Ref	4.3 Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	Object to Burscough option (S)	
Response	<p>With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as "Considerate Constructors". 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the "Have Your Say" leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst "new jobs" is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, "new, high quality business space" (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. "Improved transport" refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough's traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list "improved transport" as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase "improved drainage" refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.</p>	
Recommendation	No action.	

cspo-497	Mrs L Jones		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	Object to burscough option (S)		
Response	<p>With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as "Considerate Constructors". 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the "Have Your Say" leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst "new jobs" is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, "new, high quality business space" (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. "Improved transport" refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough's traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list "improved transport" as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase "improved drainage" refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.</p>		
Recommendation	No action.		

cspo-499	Mr & Mrs T Hayes-Sinclair		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	Object to Burscough option (S)		
Response	<p>With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as "Considerate Constructors". 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the "Have Your Say" leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst "new jobs" is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, "new, high quality business space" (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. "Improved transport" refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough's traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list "improved transport" as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase "improved drainage" refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.</p>		
Recommendation	No action.		
cspo-502	Jawahar Jain		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	I would like to register strong objection to WLDC Draft Green Belt Policy 2011. I live in Ruff lane area and the land opposite Ruff Woods is designated as Green Belt and it safeguards the countryside from Urban encroachment. The green belt area enhances the rural life of locality (F)		
Response	<p>The Draft Green Belt Study which identifies land bounded by Ruff Lane and St Helens Road and adjacent to Edge Hill as ORM.07 is an evidence base document and not a policy document. What this means is that the study was carried out in order to inform planning policy which will be developed through the Local Development Framework process. The important difference is that what is identified within the evidence base may not in all circumstances be carried through as policy and ultimately, the Green Belt Study itself cannot remove land from the Green Belt. It is the Core Strategy which identifies areas of land to be removed from Green Belt and within the latest version, the Core Strategy Preferred Options Paper, the proposals do not propose to remove the whole of the parcel of land known as ORM.07 from the Green Belt. The proposal is for a much smaller area of land (10ha) within the parcel that is directly adjacent to the existing Green Belt boundary. Furthermore, any removal of land from the Green Belt must still be justified by "every exceptional circumstances" and the Core Strategy Preferred Options Paper proposes that the need to begin to resolve any student accommodation, highways and car parking impacts caused by Edge Hill University constitutes those very exceptional circumstances.</p>		
Recommendation	No action.		

cspo-503	Mr & Mrs JC Burge	Object
Plan Ref	4.3 Options for Green Belt Release	
Summary	Object to Burscough option (S)	
Response	<p>With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as "Considerate Constructors". 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the "Have Your Say" leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst "new jobs" is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, "new, high quality business space" (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. "Improved transport" refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough's traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list "improved transport" as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase "improved drainage" refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.</p>	
Recommendation	No action.	

cspo-504	KM Bryant	Object
Plan Ref	4.3 Options for Green Belt Release	
Summary	Object to Burscough option (S)	
Response	<p>With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as "Considerate Constructors". 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the "Have Your Say" leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst "new jobs" is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, "new, high quality business space" (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. "Improved transport" refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough's traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list "improved transport" as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase "improved drainage" refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.</p>	
Recommendation	No action.	

cspo-505	Mrs N Davies	Object
Plan Ref	4.3 Options for Green Belt Release	
Summary	Object to burscough option (S)	
Response	<p>With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as "Considerate Constructors". 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the "Have Your Say" leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst "new jobs" is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, "new, high quality business space" (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. "Improved transport" refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough's traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list "improved transport" as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase "improved drainage" refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.</p>	
Recommendation	No action.	

cspo-506	Mr K Connell	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Plan Ref				
Summary	Object to Burscough option (S)			
Response	<p>With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as "Considerate Constructors". 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the "Have Your Say" leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst "new jobs" is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, "new, high quality business space" (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. "Improved transport" refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough's traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list "improved transport" as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase "improved drainage" refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.</p>			
Recommendation	No action.			

cspo-511	Anthony Marland	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Plan Ref				
Summary	Object to Burscough option (S)			
Response	<p>With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as "Considerate Constructors". 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the "Have Your Say" leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst "new jobs" is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, "new, high quality business space" (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. "Improved transport" refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough's traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list "improved transport" as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase "improved drainage" refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.</p>			
Recommendation	No action.			

cspo-512	Alex Rattray	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Plan Ref				
Summary	Object to burscough option (S)			
Response	<p>With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as "Considerate Constructors". 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the "Have Your Say" leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst "new jobs" is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, "new, high quality business space" (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. "Improved transport" refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough's traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list "improved transport" as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase "improved drainage" refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.</p>			
Recommendation	No action.			

cspo-514	William Rattray		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	Object to Burscough option (S)		
Response	<p>With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as "Considerate Constructors". 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the "Have Your Say" leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst "new jobs" is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, "new, high quality business space" (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. "Improved transport" refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough's traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list "improved transport" as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase "improved drainage" refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.</p>		
Recommendation	No action.		
cspo-515	Mr Keith Keeley		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	The Core strategy and this statement does not make it clear for members of the public what the evidence is for release of the greenbelt (s)		
Response	<p>The full range of evidence base documents that have influenced the preparation of the Core Strategy thus far are available on the Council's website, and have been before and throughout the CSPO consultation. The Core Strategy cannot, and should not, repeat all the evidence that has guided a particular policy or aspect of the plan, but the broad reasoning inferred from the evidence should be discussed and, where appropriate, an evidence base document be referenced. All relevant reasoning has been discussed in the justification for each policy as well as in other parts of the CSPO document, but all referencing of evidence base documents in the Publication Draft Core Strategy document will be reviewed before this document is made public.</p>		
Recommendation	Check referencing of Evidence Base documents throughout the Core Strategy document		

cspo-516	Mrs Judith Hornby	
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release
Summary	Object	
Response	Object to Burscough option (S)	
Response	<p>With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as "Considerate Constructors". 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the "Have Your Say" leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst "new jobs" is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, "new, high quality business space" (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. "Improved transport" refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough's traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list "improved transport" as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase "improved drainage" refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.</p>	
Recommendation	No action.	

cspo-518	Mr John Crawford	
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release Object
Summary	Object to Burscough option (S)	
Response	<p>With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as "Considerate Constructors". 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the "Have Your Say" leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst "new jobs" is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, "new, high quality business space" (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. "Improved transport" refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough's traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list "improved transport" as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase "improved drainage" refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.</p>	
Recommendation	No action.	

cspo-519	Mr & Mrs E Moore		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	Object to Burscough option (S)		
Response	<p>With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as "Considerate Constructors". 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the "Have Your Say" leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst "new jobs" is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, "new, high quality business space" (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. "Improved transport" refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough's traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list "improved transport" as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase "improved drainage" refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.</p>		
Recommendation	No action.		
cspo-52	Church Commissioners For England		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Support with conditions
Summary	The review of Green Belt boundaries is welcomed. The Core Strategy provides an opportunity to revise the over-restrictive Local Plan Green Belt policy to give some flexibility with regard to small scale conversions of underutilised farm buildings allowing for development of a range of residential and economic development including live/work units. (S)		
Response	Views noted. Current policy does allow for barn conversions, but only if the building is inherently unsuitable for any other use. However, in the light of the emerging NPPF, it may be appropriate to relax the West Lancashire Green Belt policy to allow for barn conversions to residential /employment use, including live/work units. The most appropriate policy to set out this change in policy is the rural employment policy.		
Recommendation	No change required to residential development policy, but amend rural employment policy to allow for conversion of underused / derelict rural buildings.		

cspo-520	Mr Keith Keeley	
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release Observations
Summary	It is not clear from the text how the Strategic Development Site or 'area of search' at Burscough have been identified (s)	
Response	<p>A Cabinet Report was put before Council's Cabinet in January 2010 setting out all the options across the Borough for Green Belt release considered by Council Officers and how the 3 options consulted upon in the CSPO document were arrived at. In preparing the Publication Draft Core Strategy document, a background paper will be prepared to accompany the Core Strategy setting out how the various options for Green Belt release were considered in preparation. In relation to Burscough specifically, the Yew Tree Farm site was identified in the draft Green Belt Study as the only site on the edge of Burscough (of a large enough size to accommodate a Strategic Development Site) that did not fulfil any of the 5 purposes of the Green Belt (cf PPG2). While the quality of the Green Belt is not the only consideration in deciding which areas of Green Belt should be considered for development, it is a key consideration and was supported by other considerations in comparison to other land on the edge of Burscough and Ormskirk / Aughton, such as agricultural land quality, potential accessibility to the major highway routes (the A59 and A5209 in Burscough), accessibility to public transport, proximity to schools and other services, especially the town centre, and accessibility to employment opportunities. While some other potential sites performed better than Yew Tree Farm against some of these criteria, none performed as well overall in relation to all the criteria as Yew Tree Farm. The draft Green Belt Study is only one aspect of the evidence base and it is primarily focused on whether land within the Green Belt fulfils the purposes of the Green Belt, not sustainability. Any land on the edge of Burscough would be faced with similar severe constraints in relation to infrastructure, the most crucial being around the provision of improved waste water treatment capacity for Burscough, surface water flooding in some parts of the town, and the impact of new development on the highway network through the town and beyond. Therefore, these constraints do not solely apply to the Yew Tree Farm Site but any other site in Burscough that may be put forward. The alternative infrastructure-led option is one which has been considered, in initial thinking on options for Green Belt release, but was considered inappropriate due to the scale of housing development that would be required to fund such costly improvements as the Ormskirk bypass and improved rail and road infrastructure in Burscough, with there still being more minor infrastructure needs to address and fund as well. Such a large scale of housing development in the Ormskirk and Burscough areas would not only completely alter the character of these towns, but could also prevent development coming forward in Skelmersdale, therefore stifling the regeneration of the Borough's largest and most deprived town, a key priority for not only the Core Strategy, but the Council as a whole.</p>	
Recommendation	No Action Required	

cspo-522	Karen Morris	Object
Plan Ref	4.3 Options for Green Belt Release	
Summary	Object to Burscough option (S)	
Response	<p>With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as ‘‘Considerate Constructors’’. 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the ‘‘Have Your Say’’ leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst ‘‘new jobs’’ is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, ‘‘new, high quality business space’’ (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. ‘‘Improved transport’’ refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough’s traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list ‘‘improved transport’’ as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase ‘‘improved drainage’’ refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.</p>	
Recommendation	No action.	

cspo-524	Lee Wallbank	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Plan Ref				
Summary	Object to Burscough option (S)			
Response	<p>With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as "Considerate Constructors". 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the "Have Your Say" leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst "new jobs" is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, "new, high quality business space" (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. "Improved transport" refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough's traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list "improved transport" as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase "improved drainage" refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.</p>			
Recommendation	No action.			

cspo-525	Mrs June Hilton		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	Object to Burscough option (S)		
Response	<p>With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as "Considerate Constructors". 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the "Have Your Say" leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst "new jobs" is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, "new, high quality business space" (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. "Improved transport" refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough's traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list "improved transport" as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase "improved drainage" refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.</p>		
Recommendation	No action.		
cspo-527	Hesketh Estate		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	More consideration should be given to land in Aughton known within the Green Belt Study as AUG.04. the Green Belt options should not have been produced using the draft evidence in the Green Belt Report which has not yet been tested.		
Response	Consider the alternative Green Belt site put forward at Parr's Lane, Aughton.		
Recommendation	Site to be included in recommended portfolio of potential "Plan B" sites		
cspo-535	Hesketh Estate		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	Aug.04 (Green Belt Study) is more deliverable than the sites identified for development within the proposed options A and B. Therefore at present, the Core Strategy would be wholly unsound in this respect.		
Response	Alternative Green Belt site suggested and will be investigated further.		
Recommendation	Site to be included in recommended portfolio of potential "Plan B" sites		

cspo-537	Sheila Oldfield	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Plan Ref				
Summary	Object to Burscough option (S)			
Response	<p>With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as "Considerate Constructors". 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the "Have Your Say" leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst "new jobs" is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, "new, high quality business space" (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. "Improved transport" refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough's traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list "improved transport" as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase "improved drainage" refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.</p>			
Recommendation	No action.			

cspo-538	Mr F Barker		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	Object to Burscough option (S)		
Response	<p>With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as ‘‘Considerate Constructors’’. 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the ‘‘Have Your Say’’ leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst ‘‘new jobs’’ is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, ‘‘new, high quality business space’’ (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. ‘‘Improved transport’’ refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough’s traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list ‘‘improved transport’’ as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase ‘‘improved drainage’’ refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.</p>		
Recommendation	No action.		

cspo-539	BW Bailey	Object
Plan Ref	4.3 Options for Green Belt Release	
Summary	Object to Burscough option (S)	
Response	<p>With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as "Considerate Constructors". 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the "Have Your Say" leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst "new jobs" is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, "new, high quality business space" (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. "Improved transport" refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough's traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list "improved transport" as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase "improved drainage" refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.</p>	
Recommendation	No action.	

cspo-540	Mr & Mrs Hesketh	Object
Plan Ref	4.3 Options for Green Belt Release	
Summary	Object to Burscough option (S)	
Response	<p>With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as "Considerate Constructors". 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the "Have Your Say" leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst "new jobs" is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, "new, high quality business space" (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. "Improved transport" refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough's traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list "improved transport" as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase "improved drainage" refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.</p>	
Recommendation	No action.	

cspo-541	Mrs L Grombleholme	Object
Plan Ref	4.3 Options for Green Belt Release	
Summary	Object to Burscough option (S)	
Response	<p>With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as "Considerate Constructors". 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the "Have Your Say" leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst "new jobs" is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, "new, high quality business space" (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. "Improved transport" refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough's traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list "improved transport" as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase "improved drainage" refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.</p>	
Recommendation	No further action required	

cspo-543	Mr L Jackson	Object
Plan Ref	4.3 Options for Green Belt Release	
Summary	Object to Burscough option (S)	
Response	<p>With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as "Considerate Constructors". 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the "Have Your Say" leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst "new jobs" is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, "new, high quality business space" (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. "Improved transport" refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough's traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list "improved transport" as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase "improved drainage" refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.</p>	
Recommendation	No further action required	

cspo-545	Mr & Mrs Difonzo	Object
Plan Ref	4.3 Options for Green Belt Release	
Summary	Object to burscough option (S)	
Response	<p>With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as "Considerate Constructors". 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the "Have Your Say" leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst "new jobs" is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, "new, high quality business space" (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. "Improved transport" refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough's traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list "improved transport" as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase "improved drainage" refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.</p>	
Recommendation	No further action required	

cspo-547	Janine Fleming	Object
Plan Ref	4.3 Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	Object to Burscough option (S)	
Response	<p>With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as "Considerate Constructors". 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the "Have Your Say" leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst "new jobs" is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, "new, high quality business space" (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. "Improved transport" refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough's traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list "improved transport" as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase "improved drainage" refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.</p>	
Recommendation	No further action required	

cspo-548	Dr Anne-marie Mullin	Object
Plan Ref	4.3 Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	Object to Burscough option (S)	
Response	<p>With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as "Considerate Constructors". 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the "Have Your Say" leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst "new jobs" is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, "new, high quality business space" (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. "Improved transport" refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough's traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list "improved transport" as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase "improved drainage" refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.</p>	
Recommendation	No further action required	

cspo-550	Carol Taylor		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	Object to Burscough options (S)		
Response	<p>With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as "Considerate Constructors". 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the "Have Your Say" leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst "new jobs" is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, "new, high quality business space" (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. "Improved transport" refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough's traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list "improved transport" as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase "improved drainage" refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.</p>		
Recommendation	No further action required		
cspo-552	Mr Alan Hubbard	Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust	
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Support
Summary	Support for resisting release of Green Belt land on the edge of villages, especially in the Northern Parishes. No preference in terms of Green Belt option. (S)		
Response	Comments noted		
Recommendation	No further action required		

cspo-553	Mr & Mrs DJ Murray	Object
Plan Ref	4.3 Options for Green Belt Release	
Summary	Object to Burscough option (S)	
Response	<p>With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as "Considerate Constructors". 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the "Have Your Say" leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst "new jobs" is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, "new, high quality business space" (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. "Improved transport" refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough's traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list "improved transport" as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase "improved drainage" refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.</p>	
Recommendation	No further action required	

cspo-554	M Richardson	
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release Object
Summary	Object to burscough option (S)	
Response	<p>With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as "Considerate Constructors". 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the "Have Your Say" leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst "new jobs" is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, "new, high quality business space" (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. "Improved transport" refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough's traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list "improved transport" as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase "improved drainage" refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.</p>	
Recommendation	No further action required	

cspo-556	Mr Andrew Smith	
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release Object
Summary	Object to Burscough option (S)	
Response	<p>With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as "Considerate Constructors". 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the "Have Your Say" leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst "new jobs" is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, "new, high quality business space" (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. "Improved transport" refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough's traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list "improved transport" as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase "improved drainage" refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.</p>	
Recommendation	No further action required	

cspo-557	Marjorie Smith	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Plan Ref				
Summary	Object to Burscough option (S)			
Response	<p>With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as "Considerate Constructors". 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the "Have Your Say" leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst "new jobs" is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, "new, high quality business space" (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. "Improved transport" refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough's traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list "improved transport" as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase "improved drainage" refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.</p>			
Recommendation	No further action required			

cspo-559	Moirá Jones	Object
Plan Ref	4.3 Options for Green Belt Release	
Summary	Object to Burscough option (S)	
Response	<p>With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as ‘‘Considerate Constructors’’. 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the ‘‘Have Your Say’’ leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst ‘‘new jobs’’ is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, ‘‘new, high quality business space’’ (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. ‘‘Improved transport’’ refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough’s traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list ‘‘improved transport’’ as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase ‘‘improved drainage’’ refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.</p>	
Recommendation	No further action required	

csपो-560	Mr & Mrs J Basterra		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	Object to Burscough option (S)		
Response	<p>With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as "Considerate Constructors". 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the "Have Your Say" leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst "new jobs" is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, "new, high quality business space" (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. "Improved transport" refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough's traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list "improved transport" as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase "improved drainage" refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.</p>		
Recommendation	No further action required		
csपो-561	RS Newland		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	Green belt needs protecting for agricultural needs (S)		
Response	<p>The Council acknowledges that Green Belt needs protecting and is important for agriculture, however West Lancashire does not have sufficient brownfield or greenfield sites to meet our required housing targets and therefore a small amount of Green Belt land is required. The Council has conducted a Green Belt Study to ensure that the quality of Green Belt sites is taken into consideration.</p>		
Recommendation	No further action required		
csपो-562	Unknown		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	Object to Burscough and Dispersal option, supports non-preferred (Ormskirk) option (S)		
Response	<p>It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. As part of any large scale application environmental assessment will be conducted.</p>		
Recommendation	No further action required		

cspo-568	Susan Dunn	Secretary West Lancashire Civic Trust	
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Support
Summary	Support Burscough option (S)		
Response	Comments noted		
Recommendation	No further action required		
<hr/>			
cspo-571	Mr & Mrs B Wallington		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	Object to release of green belt land in ormskirk.(S)		
Response	Comments noted Although the expansion of Edge Hill has caused issues for residents in Ormskirk this proposed expansion is seen as a realistic opportunity to resolve some of the issue causing nuisance for Ormskirk residents eg car parking. Edge Hill also contributes significantly to the economy of West Lancashire. This is considered a small expansion into the Green Belt which can be controlled through policy.		
Recommendation	No further action required.		
<hr/>			
cspo-572	Mr I Makin		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	Object to the Burscough option due to traffic congestion which would be made worse, there is no need for an additional school as places in the existing schools, the pressure on health services in Burscough and Skelmersdale would be unacceptable, the sewer system cannot cope and the loss of green Belt and agricultural land is equally as important in Burscough as in Ormskirk. (S)		
Response	Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. The Council has been informed by the local education authority that primary schools in Burscough are near capacity and that with any high level of housing growth these schools will be over capacity. Any large scale development would therefore require a new school. As part of the Council's infrastructure delivery plan we have liaised in detail with the local health providers to ensure that any developments planned can be accommodated. It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. As part of the Council's work on the infrastructure delivery plan sewerage issues are being investigated. Until waste water issues can be addressed development will not take place		
Recommendation	No further action required		
<hr/>			
cspo-574	Ms Michelle Blair		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	In summary i object to all three options, and in particular to options 1 and 2. (s)		
Response	comments noted		
Recommendation	no action required		
<hr/>			
cspo-575	Mr Peter Vernon	Director Vernon & Co	
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Observations
Summary	The overarching approach to deliver development on brownfield sites and reduce the need for Green Belt release is supported. The second preferred option would release less Green Belt and the land at Banks could deliver a greater amount of the identified need.(S)		
Response	Comments noted		
Recommendation	No further action required		
<hr/>			
cspo-584	Carol Judge		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	Objection to an additional 600 homes in Ormskirk due to the congestion this would create and the additional studentpopulation which would like fill the new homes.		
Response	Comments noted		
Recommendation	No further action required		

cspo-600	Hollins Strategic Land LLP		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Observations
Summary	Option 2 is the clear preference for West Lancashire's Core Strategy. However, more sites need to be included to avoid over reliance on individual land owners. An over reliance on Skelmersdale to deliver housing is a risk as the market is very poor and unlikely to deliver the Council's housing targets. Enough Green Belt should be released for beyond the plan period in order to conform with PPG2. Bath Farm and Grove Farm north of Ormskirk are both sustainable in terms of location and appropriate in terms of Green Belt release. (s)		
Response	Comments Noted.		
Recommendation	Housing target for Skelmersdale to be reduced following consultation feedback and review of evidence on deliverability.		
cspo-609	Gavin Rattray		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	In summary i strongly oppose Options 1 and 2.		
Response	Comments noted. It is accepted that all options will create positives and negatives and that some increase in traffic will be observed. However, the Council is conducting initial traffic modelling to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified the Council will seek to, if possible provide appropriate mitigation.		
Recommendation	No action required		
cspo-620		Centre Model Developments	
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Support with conditions
Summary	Option 2 is the clear preference for West Lancashire's core strategy. However, more sites need to be included to avoid over reliance on individual land owners. There is an over reliance on Skelmersdale to deliver housing, which is a risk as the market is very poor and unlikely to deliver the Council's housing targets. Enough Green Belt should be released for beyond the plan period in order to conform with PPG2. Banks is appropriate for development as it makes use of land other than Green Belt land. Land running west from Hoole Lane, including the former school site and adjoining land in the area between development fronting Station Road and Church Road, is one such site (s).		
Response	comments noted Site proposed on Hoole Lane involves land currently protected from development and in an area at high risk of flooding and with concerns over the capacity of water infrastructure. Therefore, it is not an ideal location for development, especially given that PPS25 guides Local Authorities to locate development away from areas at risk of flooding if at all possible and the fact that there are alternative sites outside of areas at risk of flooding.		
Recommendation	No action required		
cspo-622	LLoyd and Slack		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	Objections to the nonpreferred option at Ormskirk. It would result in a loss of views across stunning countryside and impact on the character of Ormskirk, loss of agricultural land, increase traffic congestion. Edge Hill should consider a second campus to meet its needs, it should not be allowed to exapnd into Green Belt for student accomodation.		
Response	Comments noted regarding the non preferred option. Regarding Edge Hill, the Council believe that the proposed expansion represents an opportunity to mitigate against many of the existing issues associated with Edge Hill. Edge Hill also has major economic benefits for West Lancashire.		
Recommendation	No action required		
cspo-624	Mrs Joanna Eley		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Support
Summary	Support the Burscough Option. Object to dispersal option and any development in Banks generally. (S)		
Response	Comments noted regarding Ormskirk and dispersal option. As part of the Council's work on the infrastructure delivery plan the electricity and sewage network will be assessed.		
Recommendation	No action required		
cspo-627	Mr Ralph Rawsthorne		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	Object to Burscough Option. Preference stated for non-preferred Ormskirk Option. (S)		
Response	Comments noted. However it is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development.		
Recommendation	No action		

cspo-630	Mr Peter Link		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	Object to Burscough Option. Other areas, for example Bickerstaffe, should be considered. (S)		
Response	Comments noted Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. Unfortunately, wherever development is proposed there will be an increase in traffic and subsequent effect on residents, however, infrastructure improvements will be required to reduce this impact. All areas of the Borough were considered before settling on two preferred options. Other areas were ruled out for a variety of reasons including size of settlements, infrastructure provision, rural character and quality of Green Belt		
Recommendation	No action required		
cspo-631	Mrs JM Graham		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	Object to Burscough option. Support Ormskirk.		
Response	Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. From speaking to the education authority we are aware that schools in Burscough are near capacity and that with new developments this capacity is likely to be exceeded. Therefore, if Burscough is chosen as the strategic site preferred option, a new school will be required. The Council have liaised with the local hospital trusts and NHS representatives to ensure that development is planned and that local hospitals/GPs have sufficient capacity. This work is part of the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The Council is aware of the current problems of the waste water network and are working with United Utilities to ensure that solutions are found. No major development will take place until these infrastructure issues have been resolved. The Council did not prefer the Ormskirk option because it was considered that the Ormskirk option had more negative impacts than the Burscough option, mainly the traffic impacts, impact on the landscape and the Burscough site being lesser quality Green Belt and agricultural land than the site for the Ormskirk option.		
Recommendation	No action required		
cspo-632	Mr Daniel Robinson		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	Object to Burscough Option. Preference for Ormskirk (non-preferred) Option). (S)		
Response	Comments noted regarding opposition to Yew Tree Farm, Burscough in particular and the second preferred option. As part of the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan we have liaised with health care providers and the local education authority to ensure that facilities are in place to accommodate development. In particular a new school is planned as part of the Burscough Strategic Site development. Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions		
Recommendation	No further action		
cspo-633	Mr Andrew Taylor		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	Object to Ormskirk Non-Preferred Option. (S)		
Response	comments noted		
Recommendation	no action required		

cspo-637	Mrs N Makin		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	Object to Burscough option (S)		
Response	<p>Regarding traffic impacts, initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. Regarding education provision, from speaking to the Local Education Authority the Council have been informed that school capacity in Burscough is limited and that new developments may go above the existing capacity. For this reason the Burscough strategic site development includes a new school. In relation to health, through the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan the Council have been liaising with the health authority to ensure that sufficient facilities are in place/ or will be in place to cope with any new development. The Council are aware that there are issues with the the waste water treatment capacity and that any new development in areas such as Burscough will require upgrading the facilities. The Council has been investigating this issue as part of its Infrastructure Delivery Plan and significant development will not take place until the issue has been resolved. In relation to Green Belt, the Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk.</p>		
Recommendation	No action required		
cspo-638	Mrs Cynthia Dereli		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	Object to both the dispersal option and the Burscough option. (S)		
Response	<p>Comments relate to each point set out within the representation; 1. The Draft Green Belt Study forms only part of the evidence base for the LDF and is not a strategy. The study was carried out by Council Officers, not consultants, and was prepared in conjunction with Sefton and Knowsley Councils and validated by Lancashire County Council. Given its influence on the options for Green Belt release, it was considered appropriate to consult on the draft Green Belt Study alongside the Core Strategy Preferred Options. In terms of the inaccuracies pointed out, it would appear that the data sheet for BUR.04 has been misinterpreted. The assessment of the boundary strength is of the existing Green Belt boundary in comparison to the new boundary should the parcel be developed. Whilst the new boundary to the south of the parcel would be a strong road boundary (Pippin Street), the boundary to the west of the parcel and the direction in which development would be extending, is weaker than the existing boundary as it is a narrow track rather than a strong build line. This also applies to the comment relating to BUR14. The Draft Green Belt Study and the methodology does not include land owner discussions regarding future aspirations for the parcels. This information may well be required when considering the deliverability of land through the LDF process. Parcelling up was done using logical existing boundaries and the methodology tests the purposes of including land within the Green Belt as set out in PPG2. Therefore, the use of land as a buffer zone between residential and industrial uses cannot be considered within this study but may form part of the wider LDF process in allocating land for development. 2 The CSPO sets out broadly and strategically where it is realistic to deliver development in the Borough over the next plan period. According to the Council's evidence base, there is enough available land within the settlement area of Burscough to deliver around 200 dwellings. However, it is apparent that there is a shortfall of land within the existing settlement boundaries of the Borough's towns and villages and that without considering other land such as Green Belt, development targets will not be achieved. The document sets out 2 options for meeting targets and delivering the additional housing required. Both options include Burscough, one seeks to deliver a large strategic site and around 600 dwellings the other looks to disperse Green Belt development a little more across the Borough and proposes to deliver 300 dwellings on Green Belt land in Burscough. Both options would still require the initial delivery of 200 dwellings in the existing settlement area and development would be prioritised here over Green Belt release. 3. The Core Strategy is a strategic document and must be flexible over the 15 year plan period. Therefore, the document identifies broad areas of search for development rather than pinpointing exactly where development would go. Site identification may be carried out at a later stage and as an additional Site Allocations document to the Core Strategy. The only exception to this is where development in one area is so significant it could be viewed as strategic to the delivery of the entire document. Examples of this are Skelmersdale Town Centre and in the event Preferred option 1 is selected. 4. Comments noted. However, more than two-thirds of development will be located in Skelmersdale.</p>		
Recommendation	No action required		

cspo-639	Mr Michael J Parker		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	Object to Burscough option (S)		
Response	<p>Regarding traffic impacts, initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. Regarding education provision, from speaking to the Local Education Authority the Council have been informed that school capacity in Burscough is limited and that new developments may go above the existing capacity. For this reason the Burscough strategic site development includes a new school. In relation to health, through the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan the Council have been liaising with the health authority to ensure that sufficient facilities are in place/ or will be in place to cope with any new development. The Council are aware that there are issues with the the waste water treatment capacity and that any new development in areas such as Burscough will require upgrading the facilities. The Council has been investigating this issue as part of its Infrastructure Delivery Plan and significant development will not take place until the issue has been resolved. In relation to Green Belt, the Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. Consultation comments noted.</p>		
Recommendation	No action required		
cspo-641	Mr Brian Sillett		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	Object to Burscough Option. State preference for the non-preferred Ormskirk Option. (S)		
Response	<p>Regarding traffic impacts, initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. Regarding education provision, from speaking to the Local Education Authority the Council have been informed that school capacity in Burscough is limited and that new developments may go above the existing capacity. For this reason the Burscough strategic site development includes a new school. In relation to health, through the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan the Council have been liaising with the health authority to ensure that sufficient facilities are in place/ or will be in place to cope with any new development. The Council are aware that there are issues with the the waste water treatment capacity and that any new development in areas such as Burscough will require upgrading the facilities. The Council has been investigating this issue as part of its Infrastructure Delivery Plan and significant development will not take place until the issue has been resolved. In relation to Green Belt, the Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk.</p>		
Recommendation	No action required		
cspo-644	Mrs Pauline Parker		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	Object to Burscough option (S)		
Response	<p>Regarding traffic impacts, initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. Regarding education provision, from speaking to the Local Education Authority the Council have been informed that school capacity in Burscough is limited and that new developments may go above the existing capacity. For this reason the Burscough strategic site development includes a new school. In relation to health, through the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan the Council have been liaising with the health authority to ensure that sufficient facilities are in place/ or will be in place to cope with any new development. The Council are aware that there are issues with the the waste water treatment capacity and that any new development in areas such as Burscough will require upgrading the facilities. The Council has been investigating this issue as part of its Infrastructure Delivery Plan and significant development will not take place until the issue has been resolved. In relation to Green Belt, the Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk.</p>		
Recommendation	No action required		

cspo-645	Jess E Parker		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	Object to Burscough option (S)		
Response	<p>Regarding traffic impacts, initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. Regarding education provision, from speaking to the Local Education Authority the Council have been informed that school capacity in Burscough is limited and that new developments may go above the existing capacity. For this reason the Burscough strategic site development includes a new school. In relation to health, through the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan the Council have been liaising with the health authority to ensure that sufficient facilities are in place/ or will be in place to cope with any new development. The Council are aware that there are issues with the the waste water treatment capacity and that any new development in areas such as Burscough will require upgrading the facilities. The Council has been investigating this issue as part of its Infrastructure Delivery Plan and significant development will not take place until the issue has been resolved. In relation to Green Belt, the Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk.</p>		
Recommendation	No action required		
cspo-647	Mr John McCloskey		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	Object to Burscough option (S)		
Response	<p>Regarding traffic impacts, initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. Regarding education provision, from speaking to the Local Education Authority the Council have been informed that school capacity in Burscough is limited and that new developments may go above the existing capacity. For this reason the Burscough strategic site development includes a new school. In relation to health, through the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan the Council have been liaising with the health authority to ensure that sufficient facilities are in place/ or will be in place to cope with any new development. The Council are aware that there are issues with the the waste water treatment capacity and that any new development in areas such as Burscough will require upgrading the facilities. The Council has been investigating this issue as part of its Infrastructure Delivery Plan and significant development will not take place until the issue has been resolved. In relation to Green Belt, the Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk.</p>		
Recommendation	No action required		
cspo-648	Mrs Joyce McCloskey		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	Object to Burscough option (S)		
Response	<p>Regarding traffic impacts, initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. Regarding education provision, from speaking to the Local Education Authority the Council have been informed that school capacity in Burscough is limited and that new developments may go above the existing capacity. For this reason the Burscough strategic site development includes a new school. In relation to health, through the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan the Council have been liaising with the health authority to ensure that sufficient facilities are in place/ or will be in place to cope with any new development. The Council are aware that there are issues with the the waste water treatment capacity and that any new development in areas such as Burscough will require upgrading the facilities. The Council has been investigating this issue as part of its Infrastructure Delivery Plan and significant development will not take place until the issue has been resolved. In relation to Green Belt, the Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk.</p>		
Recommendation	no action required		

cspo-651	Ms Judith Nelson	English Heritage	
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Observations
Summary	The grade II Bath Lodge, Dark Lane lies adjacent to the area of search, it is essential that the setting of this building is assessed and safeguarded if proposals are developed for this site (F)		
Response	Comments Noted. If this site is taken forward the setting of the listed building will be assessed.		
Recommendation	No action required		
cspo-657	Mr Simon Artiss	Planning Manager Bellway Homes Ltd	
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Observations
Summary	Welcome that if the green belt boundaries were restricted, it would act as a constraint to deliver the CS objectives.		
Response	The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk.		
Recommendation	No action required		
cspo-676	Jason and Marcus Bleasdale		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Support
Summary	The land at Little Moor Hall Farm does not achieve any of the purposes for including land in the Green Belt. With this in mind, the site should be taken into the next phase of the assessment of the Green Belt Study (Stage 3- site constraints and opportunities) as part of the future updates that are made to the Study. (s)		
Response	Comments referring to the Green Belt Study have been addressed within the Green Belt Study Consultation. The Core Strategy identifies Green Belt land for potential development based on evidence outlining sustainability, infrastructure and the Green Belt Study which reviews how well parcels of Green Belt land meet the purposes of the Green Belt as set out in PPG2. Through this process, the parcel that is subject to this representation was not considered to fulfil much of this criteria and has therefore, not been identified for further consideration		
Recommendation	No action required		
cspo-683	Jason and Marcus Bleasdale		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Observations
Summary	A reduction of 0.26% of Green Belt land within the Borough represents a negligible change and on this basis, Jason and Marcus Bleasdale consider that the Council should give consideration to releasing additional Green Belt land for development, in particular the site at Little Moor Hall Farm given its 'suitability', 'achievability' and availability' for accommodating new housing, which has been established by the March 2010 West Lancashire SHLAA. (s)		
Response	Suggested site will be considered as an alternative Green Belt option.		
Recommendation	Site considered within assessment of potential "Plan B" sites, but found to not be most suitable for either preferred Green Belt release or for inclusion within the portfolio of "Plan B" sites.		
cspo-689	John Evans		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	In my view, this land performs an important function in providing a block to building development to the east of Ormskirk. It seems to me to be good agricultural land as well. I feel strongly that Green Belt land should be held as long as possible because, once gone, history has shown that is invariably gone forever. There will be many short term, financially driven forces brought to bear to alter the land's status, now and in the future. I look to the Council to take a balanced and long term view and to arrive at a decision which protects this land for future generations.		
Response	Comments noted		
Recommendation	No action required		
cspo-694	Helen Snellgrove		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	Whilst I do not want option 3 to be the area to be developed, I do request the Council cabinet to extend the consultation with all three options on an equal footing, enabling the public to have a chance to comment.		
Response	Comments noted. The Council has included the non preferred option as part of this consultation so that members of the public have the opportunity to comment on all schemes.		
Recommendation	No action required		

cspo-696	Mr L McFarlane		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	Agricultural Green Belt land should be protected. Issues raised over over Edge Hill expansion (S)		
Response	Comments noted regarding Green Belt and Edge Hill university.		
Recommendation	No action required		
<hr/>			
cspo-698	Mr John Leadbetter		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	I strongly oppose the non-preferred option that is being considered. I support Option C with dispersed development representing the greatest gain to the borough with the least disruption		
Response	Comments noted		
Recommendation	No action required		
<hr/>			
cspo-70	Mr P Waite		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	We are concerned about Option 2 and exactly where the houses will be sited in relation to the railway line. There are potential traffic safety issues; current volume and speed of traffic are already too high for this road. (S)		
Response	Comments noted. The Core Strategy does not allocate specific sites (except for very large developments), so an "area of search" was included for Option 2, which included land to the west and the east of the railway. The Council is aware that there are traffic and access problems associated with land to the east of the railway, and this will be taken into account when choosing a development site, should Option 2 be chosen.		
Recommendation	No action required.		
<hr/>			
cspo-700	Mr D Atkinson		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	It is clear as day that the South Ormskirk option, is absolutely NOT an option.		
Response	Comments noted		
Recommendation	No further action required		
<hr/>			
cspo-702	Ms Gillian Bjork		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	Improve the infrastructure first, preserve our greenbelt land and utilise brown field sites, and then the people of Burscough may be more open to discussion about development		
Response	Comments noted		
Recommendation	No further action required		
<hr/>			
cspo-703	Mrs JA Leadbetter		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	Object to Ormskirk non-preferred option. Greenbelt land should only be considered for development after all other options have been considered ie: the regeneration of derelict or brown belt land.		
Response	Comments noted		
Recommendation	No further action required		
<hr/>			
cspo-713	Ms Margaret Gregory		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	Object to Ormskirk option. Objects to loss of Green Belt and prime agricultural land. Would like to see more consideration of implications of an ageing population and off-campus student accommodation. Do not think existing traffic problems in Ormskirk can be addressed.		
Response	comments noted. Implications of an ageing population have been considered in preparing the Core Strategy. Off-campus student accommodation has also been considered.		
Recommendation	no action required		

cspo-730	Hesketh Estate		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Observations
Summary	The parcel at Parrs Lane (AUG.04 in Green Belt Study) is actually classified as mainly Grade 2 with some graded 3a and 3b. However there is no agricultural land classed as grade 1 as is stated in the Green Belt study. There is no real difference between this parcel and some of those put forward for inclusion within the Core Strategy Preferred Options and this additional information makes it more favourable than some of the sites which are Grade 1 classification. Therefore the site should be carried forward and considered as part of the DPD (s)		
Response	Alternative location for Green Belt release noted.		
Recommendation	Parr's Lane site to be considered within the portfolio of potential "Plan B" sites.		
cspo-735	Bickerstaffe Trust		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	Supports a variation upon the non-preferred option for an Ormskirk Strategic Development Site and objects to Option 1 for a Burscough Strategic Development Site. (s)		
Response	The Core Strategy is in line with the Government's Growth Agenda, although it is recognised that the deliverability of 3,000 homes in Skelmersdale will need to be revisited, and is not overly prescriptive or inflexible. In addition, the Core Strategy is also consistent with the "presumption in favour of sustainable development" that is expected to be included within the National Planning Policy Framework. The Council has no concerns about the deliverability, suitability or sustainability of the Yew Tree Farm site in Burscough (which the Bickerstaffe Trust refer to in para 4.10 of their representation), other than the need to improve the waste water treatment infrastructure serving the site (which is a constraint that applies equally to all greenfield sites in Ormskirk, Burscough, Rufford and Scarisbrick), and the Bickerstaffe Trust has provided no convincing evidence to say that development of this site is not deliverable, suitable or sustainable. It should also be pointed out that the Sustainability Appraisal carried out on the 3 shortlisted options for Green Belt release identified that all could be said to be sustainable. It should also be noted that the Bickerstaffe Trust representation incorrectly states that the Council's Sustainable Settlement Study (2010) confirms that Burscough has limited facilities and services and is not as accessible as other larger settlements in the Borough (para 4.7). The study actually makes similar comments about the services and facilities in Burscough as it does about those in Ormskirk. It is fair to point out that the disaggregation of development targets within the CSPO paper does not entirely conform to the Borough's settlement hierarchy, although only in that Burscough receives more development than the Ormskirk / Aughton urban area. However, ultimately, even with this new development, the Ormskirk / Aughton urban area (indeed Ormskirk alone) will still be larger than Burscough and so the settlement hierarchy will be retained. While it would be usual for settlements to be targeted for new development in line with their place in the settlement hierarchy, it is not always possible to do so, nor is it necessary to do so, as long as the infrastructure is in place to allow more development in a settlement lower down the hierarchy. Therefore, it is the Council's view that sufficient evidence to justify the spatial options preferred in the CSPO paper has been demonstrated. The Council has considered the evidence that the Bickerstaffe Trust have presented in their representation in support of their new proposals at Alty's Lane and, overall, remain to be convinced that it offers a better or more reasonable proposal than either of the preferred options consulted upon in the Core Strategy, or the non-preferred option. This is predominantly due to the fact that the new proposals offer less benefits compared to the non-preferred option (because of the removal of employment development and student accommodation) while still having the same impact on Green Belt and views and, potentially, still having a negative effect on traffic congestion on St Helens Road, local country roads and Ormskirk town centre.		
Recommendation	No Action Required		
cspo-755	Paul Cotterill		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	Object to the areas of search for housing and employment land.		
Response	Opportunities for locating development adjacent to authority boundaries which contain built up areas are limited, particularly in the South West. Any development in this part of the Borough would be adjacent to equally open and rural areas in Sefton. However, there are one or two opportunities to the west and perhaps to the east, where largely open land within West Lancashire adjoins built-up areas in Sefton and possibly Wigan. These are currently being explored but it is unlikely that they will deliver the significant amounts of development we are currently directing to the existing largest towns and key service settlements within the Borough.		
Recommendation	Continue to review all possible land which may meet development needs.		

cspo-8	Mr Howard Courtley	Courtley Consultants Ltd	
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	The Council has failed to consider land at Fine Janes Farm, Moss Road, Birkdale as an appropriate site for Green Belt release. (S)		
Response	The Core Strategy is not able to consider specific sites unless they are of "strategic" importance, for example Skelmersdale Town Centre (Policy CS2) or the Burscough Strategic Development Site (Policy CS3). Therefore, it cannot make specific reference to the Fine Jane's Farm site. However, in arriving at the two preferred options for development on Green Belt, the Council did consider a wide range of locations for Green Belt release, including areas on the Southport / Birkdale boundary. However, in considering this general area, it was considered that the openness of the area would be unduly harmed by locating significant development within it and that the presence of areas of flood risk, deep peat and grade 1 agricultural land made this location less appropriate for development. The Council has assessed considered the Green Belt on the Borough's rural boundaries in the draft Green Belt Study available for consultation alongside the Core Strategy Preferred Options and it has found only one site (not Fine Jane's Farm) that does not meet any of the purposes of the Green Belt (as established within PPG2) of those assessed on the Sefton boundary. Given that Fine Jane's Farm is not large enough to be considered a "strategic" site, even if it were considered to be a "major" development site in the Green Belt (based on PPG2's definition in Annex C), it could not be specifically addressed in the Core Strategy. Any policy guidance that is needed for such a "major" site would be provided in a subsequent Development Plan Document under the Local Development Framework. However, as the Core Strategy is reviewed prior to preparing the next version of the document or as the remainder of the LDF is prepared, Fine Jane's Farm should be considered as any site-specific matters are dealt with.		
Recommendation	Consider Fine Jane's Farnr for inclusion within the "Plan B", as this aspect of the Core Strategy is refined.		
cspo-80	Mr Robert Kewley		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Observations
Summary	Suggestion of a new location for development - site immediately adjacent to 'The Pads'. (S)		
Response	Comments noted. The Core Strategy does not allocate specific sites for development unless they are strategic in nature. The Site Allocations DPD will allocate specific sites in due course. However, "The Pads" are currently designated as a Local Nature Conservation Site.		
Recommendation	No Action Required		
cspo-93	Mr Brian Culshaw		
Plan Ref	4.3	Options for Green Belt Release	Object
Summary	Objects to non-preferred (Ormskirk) option. (S)		
Response	Comments noted. It is agreed that there are negative impacts associated with the non-preferred option. These were taken into account by Members when considering whether or not to support this option.		
Recommendation	No change required.		
cspo-224	Mr Shaun Taylor	Planning Associate Director G L Hearn Property Consultants	
Plan Ref	4.4	Meeting the Objectives	Object
Summary	It is clear (for the reasons set out elsewhere in these representations), that the objectives will not be met by this Core Strategy as currently written. (f)		
Response	Comments noted		
Recommendation	No action required.		
cspo-103	Mr Martin Backhouse		
Plan Ref	Chapter 5	Core Strategy Preferred Options: Over-arching Spatial Strategy and the Strategic Sites	Object
Summary	I am strongly against the idea to release Green Belt land for development by Edge Hill University. (S)		
Response	Comments noted. At the time of the 2005 Local Plan Inquiry, the Council considered Edge Hill had not made a robust case for the need for expansion onto Green Belt land. Since then, the Council has accepted that the University does have a robust case for needing to expand, hence the change. The University has undergone a period of redeveloping its existing campus to ensure best use of space and is now reaching a point where it will shortly need further land to accommodate not only its increasing number of faculties but also to accommodate student accommodation, taking the pressure off existing houses in Ormskirk. The Core Strategy allocates 10ha of land for managed expansion over a 15 year period up until 2027. Without this allocation, the Council could expose itself to challenge and more significant development in the Green Belt over the plan period.		
Recommendation	No further action.		

cspo-104	Mrs D Backhouse		
Plan Ref	Chapter 5	Core Strategy Preferred Options: Over-arching Spatial Strategy and the Strategic Sites	Object
Summary	I am strongly against the idea to release Green Belt land for development by Edge Hill University. (S)		
Response	Comments noted. The University has undergone a period of redeveloping its existing campus to ensure best use of space and is now reaching a point where it will shortly need further land to accommodate not only its increasing number of faculties but also to accommodate student accommodation, taking the pressure of existing houses in Ormskirk. The Core Strategy allocates 10ha of land for managed expansion over a 15 year period up until 2027. Without this allocation, the Council could expose itself to challenge and more significant development in the Green Belt over the plan period.		
Recommendation	No action required.		
cspo-105	Carol O'Brien		
Plan Ref	Chapter 5	Core Strategy Preferred Options: Over-arching Spatial Strategy and the Strategic Sites	Object
Summary	Re land bounded by Ruff Lane, St Helens Road and Scarth Hill Lane:- I am very concerned that the Council appears to have done a U turn regarding this Green Belt area and are now proposing re-designation of the land. The countryside should be protected from encroachment. (s)		
Response	At the time of the 2005 Local Plan Inquiry, the Council considered Edge Hill had not made a robust case for the need for expansion onto Green Belt land. Since then, the Council has accepted that the University does have a robust case for needing to expand, hence the change in approach towards the University. The University has undergone a period of redeveloping its existing campus to ensure best use of space and is now reaching a point where it will shortly need further land to accommodate not only its increasing number of faculties but also to accommodate student accommodation, taking the pressure off existing houses in Ormskirk. The Core Strategy allocates 10ha of land for managed expansion over a 15 year period up until 2027. Without this allocation, the Council could expose itself to challenge and more significant development in the Green Belt over the plan period.		
Recommendation	No further action		
cspo-124	Dr Carol Stott		
Plan Ref	Chapter 5	Core Strategy Preferred Options: Over-arching Spatial Strategy and the Strategic Sites	Support
Summary	I object to both options open to discussion and feel that the non preferred option should not have been removed from the list of options for the very weak reasons given in Cabinet.		
Response	Comments regarding Green Belt options noted. In assessing the Burscough option, the Council has consulted the Primary Care Trust and education provider (Lancashire County Council). Advice received is that a new primary school would be necessary for the Burscough site, and that extra money for the existing health centre would be sufficient to cope with the increase in population. Appropriate buffers will be in place between housing and employment uses, which will be business, rather than manufacturing /heavy industry, and therefore health risks should be minimal. The ageing population of West Lancashire is recognised at several points in the Core Strategy, and is addressed in terms of housing in policies CS7 and CS8. See also response to Rep. 129		
Recommendation	No change required.		
cspo-14	Mr JA Lewis		
Plan Ref	Chapter 5	Core Strategy Preferred Options: Over-arching Spatial Strategy and the Strategic Sites	Object
Summary	Object to Option 2 (Ormskirk) due to increase in traffic problems. Edge Hill should not be allowed to expand. (S)		
Response	Area of Search to the north of Ormskirk - potential traffic impacts of development on the eastern half of this area of search will be a key factor in considering which part of the area of search is allocated for development if the dispersal option is taken forward in the Core Strategy. Any impact of development within the town will also be factored into any traffic assessments. Edge Hill University and Student Accommodation - comments noted - any expansion of the University will need to provide student accommodation to cope with the growth in the University.		
Recommendation	No Action Required		
cspo-16	Susan O'Halloran		
Plan Ref	Chapter 5	Core Strategy Preferred Options: Over-arching Spatial Strategy and the Strategic Sites	Object
Summary	The non-preferred option could not be supported by roads and would be a poor use of agricultural land. (S)		
Response	Noted		
Recommendation	No Action Required		

cspo-18	Mr David Rothwell		
Plan Ref	Chapter 5	Core Strategy Preferred Options: Over-arching Spatial Strategy and the Strategic Sites	Object
Summary	We are against the dispersal option due to issues with traffic and vehicular access. We support for the non-preferred option, to allow Edge Hill Uni to provide more student accommodation out of town. (S)		
Response	Comments and Views Noted		
Recommendation	No Action Required		
cspo-19	Dr Paul Morris		
Plan Ref	Chapter 5	Core Strategy Preferred Options: Over-arching Spatial Strategy and the Strategic Sites	Support
Summary	If there is no other option then i think the non-preferred option should be reconsidered. This would have positive benefits in freeing up affordable accommodation for people in the town. Parking is also likely to improve (S)		
Response	Comments and Views Noted		
Recommendation	No Action Required		
cspo-21	Carol Smith		
Plan Ref	Chapter 5	Core Strategy Preferred Options: Over-arching Spatial Strategy and the Strategic Sites	Object
Summary	I would like to express my concerns regarding the non-preferred option. The site is home to wildlife, and possibly orchids. An Environmental Impact Assessment should be carried out. Elm Place is narrow and it would be dangerous to use this road as an access point to such development. Major traffic congestion would also be an issue. (S)		
Response	Comments noted - should the non-preferred option be taken forward in the future, detailed proposals to address access, highways impacts and environmental impacts will be considered.		
Recommendation	No Action Required		
cspo-25	Charlotte Riley		
Plan Ref	Chapter 5	Core Strategy Preferred Options: Over-arching Spatial Strategy and the Strategic Sites	Support
Summary	I support the Ormskirk option (S)		
Response	Comments Noted		
Recommendation	No Action Required		
cspo-26	Mrs Mary Blackhall		
Plan Ref	Chapter 5	Core Strategy Preferred Options: Over-arching Spatial Strategy and the Strategic Sites	Object
Summary	I vote no to both plans (S)		
Response	Comments Noted. The Council is aware of the need to protect our countryside and agricultural industry as far as is possible and is only considering development on Green Belt because all suitable land within the built-up areas has already been taken into account. Therefore, the Council is attempting to strike the delicate balance between providing much needed new housing and preserving our local environment.		
Recommendation	No Action Required		
cspo-28	Mr Ed Dickinson		
Plan Ref	Chapter 5	Core Strategy Preferred Options: Over-arching Spatial Strategy and the Strategic Sites	Support with conditions
Summary	I would submit that a revised Option A (ORMSKIRK) could also help limit or relieve the problem of both short term construction traffic and town traffic until such time as long awaited A580 Bypass can be built, with planned improvements to suit the added requirements of Edge Hill access etc. Ormskirk cannot afford to lose this opportunity of enlargement and development to allow it to sustain a large University (S)		
Response	In arriving at the Core Strategy Preferred Options Paper, the Council has taken into account the potential traffic impacts of all development options, including those of the Yew Tree Farm option, but is currently undertaking further traffic modelling work to better understand these impacts. While the Council are aware of Sefton Council's initial strategic options for their Core Strategy, it is not yet at a stage where a true assessment of increased traffic along the A570 from Southport can be carried out, especially in light of the approved Thornton to Switch Island link road in Sefton which it is anticipated will alleviate some pressure on the A570. The Ormskirk bypass has not been vetoed by the Council, but is in fact supported by the Core Strategy (cf CS12). However, the Council recognises that it may be difficult to deliver the bypass in the Core Strategy period due to funding constraints. The Council welcomes Mr Dickinson's revised proposal for the non-preferred option, and any consideration of phasing of development will be considered within detailed proposals for the site, should that option be taken forward in the future.		
Recommendation	Council officers are continuing to monitor Sefton Council's proposals for development and how they might affect highways in West Lancashire, especially cumulatively with West Lancashire development proposals.		

cspo-29	Mr Paul Moy		
Plan Ref	Chapter 5	Core Strategy Preferred Options: Over-arching Spatial Strategy and the Strategic Sites	Object
Summary	I object to Option 2 of 200 houses in Ormskirk on Green Belt land (S).		
Response	Comments Noted		
Recommendation	No Action Required		
cspo-331	Mr Roger Clayton		
Plan Ref	Chapter 5	Core Strategy Preferred Options: Over-arching Spatial Strategy and the Strategic Sites	Object
Summary	We object to the description of Skelmersdale as a "Regional Town". (S)		
Response	Acknowledged.		
Recommendation	No change.		
cspo-332	Mr Roger Clayton		
Plan Ref	Chapter 5	Core Strategy Preferred Options: Over-arching Spatial Strategy and the Strategic Sites	Object
Summary	We believe that many more dwellings could (and should) be delivered on small sites of mainly affordable or retirement housing, according to local needs, within the Eastern and Western parishes. The Skelmersdale target should be reduced to a level which is a) deliverable, b) meets only the needs of the Skelmersdale population without trying to attract migration from other areas or other countries. (F)		
Response	The deliverability of Skelmersdale housing targets is currently under review as a result of consultation feedback and historic completions evidence.		
Recommendation	Review housing targets and distribution		
cspo-35	Dr Anthony Evans		
Plan Ref	Chapter 5	Core Strategy Preferred Options: Over-arching Spatial Strategy and the Strategic Sites	Object
Summary	Object to option 2. And 3000 new homes in Skelmersdale. (S)		
Response	Comments noted. The Council has a housing target it is currently legally required to meet. This housing needs to be directed to the most sustainable locations. The proposed locations have been chosen taking account of a range of issues including infrastructure provision, impact on the environment, land availability, etc.		
Recommendation	No change.		
cspo-37	Mrs Julie Broadbent		
Plan Ref	Chapter 5	Core Strategy Preferred Options: Over-arching Spatial Strategy and the Strategic Sites	Object
Summary	We object to the non-preferred option (S)		
Response	Comments noted		
Recommendation	No change required.		
cspo-40	Mr Robin Agnew		
Plan Ref	Chapter 5	Core Strategy Preferred Options: Over-arching Spatial Strategy and the Strategic Sites	Object
Summary	With regard to the 200 houses at Ormskirk (Dispersal Option), they should go to the west of the railway, not the east. (S)		
Response	Comments noted. It is agreed that access to the site to the west of the railway is less problematic than to the site to the east of the railway.		
Recommendation	No action required		
cspo-484	Mr B Howard	Clerk of the Council Newburgh Parish Council	
Plan Ref	Chapter 5	Core Strategy Preferred Options: Over-arching Spatial Strategy and the Strategic Sites	Observations
Summary	We would be concerned about any future major increase in traffic, from employment or residential areas, without the development of new and appropriate infrastructure to avoid further impact on rural villages.		
Response	Comments noted. Adequate infrastructure provision and the impact of traffic are both important factors when considering suitable locations for new development and these are topic areas that continue to be considered in some detail as the LDF progresses. The impact on rural villages is a further important consideration and therefore development directed to these areas is to be minimal in the interests of sustainability.		
Recommendation	No action.		

cspo-49	Mr Retwiss		
Plan Ref	Chapter 5	Core Strategy Preferred Options: Over-arching Spatial Strategy and the Strategic Sites	Object
Summary	The Council should resist development on the Green Belt. The proposed housing is not needed. (S)		
Response	Comments noted. The Council's evidence base shows housing is required, even taking into account the downturn in the housing market. Green Belt development is proposed because there is insufficient land within settlement areas to accommodate all the required housing. This is a different approach from Development Control, in which unplanned development on non-allocated Green Belt is usually resisted.		
Recommendation	No action required.		
cspo-59	Mr Norman Smith		
Plan Ref	Chapter 5	Core Strategy Preferred Options: Over-arching Spatial Strategy and the Strategic Sites	Object
Summary	Option 2 (Dispersal) is the most balanced and sustainable of the three presented, although I'd prefer none. Edge Hill University should not be allowed to keep expanding to the detriment of the town. Concern expressed about the effect of the University expansion on residential accommodation within Ormskirk, and the conversion of town centre shops to bars. (S).		
Response	Views on the Dispersal Option, traffic issues, and Edge Hill University expansion noted. With regard to the final two points: 1. Policy CS9 seeks to minimise the impact of the University on residential accommodation within Ormskirk by constraining the percentage of HMOs in individual streets, although the Council's powers are limited in this respect. Please also see the Council's response to Representation 60 for more comments about Edge Hill University. 2. Policy CS11 seeks to maintain town centre viability by requiring a certain percentage of units within town centres to be Class A1 retail (as opposed to uses such as A4 drinking establishments). The Council would support initiatives to improve Ormskirk Town Centre.		
Recommendation	No action required.		
cspo-62	Mrs J Jupp		
Plan Ref	Chapter 5	Core Strategy Preferred Options: Over-arching Spatial Strategy and the Strategic Sites	Object
Summary	I object to the non-preferred option on the grounds of Green Belt, the impact of Edge Hill University and no proven need for a sports village. (S)		
Response	Comments noted.		
Recommendation	No change.		
cspo-63	Mrs J White		
Plan Ref	Chapter 5	Core Strategy Preferred Options: Over-arching Spatial Strategy and the Strategic Sites	Object
Summary	I object to the non-preferred option on the grounds of Green Belt, impact of Edge Hill University and no need for a sports village (S)		
Response	Comments noted.		
Recommendation	No change.		
cspo-636	Mr Chris Seddon		
Plan Ref	Chapter 5	Core Strategy Preferred Options: Over-arching Spatial Strategy and the Strategic Sites	Observations
Summary	Support development in Appley Bridge		
Response	Comments noted		
Recommendation	No action required		
cspo-64	Dennis Sutton		
Plan Ref	Chapter 5	Core Strategy Preferred Options: Over-arching Spatial Strategy and the Strategic Sites	Support
Summary	My preferred option is Ormskirk, followed by dispersal. (S)		
Response	Comments noted		
Recommendation	No change		

cspo-66	Mrs Ros Wess		
Plan Ref	Chapter 5	Core Strategy Preferred Options: Over-arching Spatial Strategy and the Strategic Sites	Support
Summary	I vote for Preferred Option 2: Dispersal. I object most strongly to any further building in Parbold because of the sewer/drainage problems we have (especially surface water) I object most strongly to Green Belt land being used for building. I think WLBC were wrong to throw out the Ormskirk option. (F) (F)		
Response	Comments noted. It is considered that there is scope for a small amount of infill development in Parbold (but no major development or Green Belt release).		
Recommendation	No action required.		
<hr/>			
cspo-672		Mainsprint Limited	
Plan Ref	Chapter 5	Core Strategy Preferred Options: Over-arching Spatial Strategy and the Strategic Sites	Observations
Summary	This site is classed as a Development opportunity in the adopted Local Plan and it is respectively suggested that the site is given 'broad location for mixed-use development' status in the core strategy for the sake of continuity. It is appreciated that it is not the role of the core strategy to allocate specific development sites but it is considered that the site does need to be afforded some form of development status in the adopted document so that the regeneration of the site is not jeopardised by Appley Bridges' relatively poor status in the settlement hierarchy. (S)		
Response	Comments noted		
Recommendation	No further action required		
<hr/>			
cspo-675	Mr Harry Tonge		
Plan Ref	Chapter 5	Core Strategy Preferred Options: Over-arching Spatial Strategy and the Strategic Sites	Observations
Summary	On behalf of my client, i wish to object to the strategic development options identified in the core strategy paper on the basis that the identified options unnecessarily constrain the possible larger scale employment development of the south Skelmersdale area of search. Furthermore, it has not been adequately demonstrated that the strategy of dispersing the additional areas of employment land throughout the identified areas in the borough is correct (S)		
Response	Comments noted. The majority of all new employment development 87ha is being located in Skelmersdale with 8ha proposed for land to the South (mentioned) and also 52ha from existing allocation and the remodelling of existing employment estates. Although Skelmersdale does have the best connections to the motorway network it is felt that 60ha is a realistic and deliverable figure. It is also important to allow economic growth in other parts of the Borough.		
Recommendation	No action required		
<hr/>			
cspo-84	Mr Ian Yates		
Plan Ref	Chapter 5	Core Strategy Preferred Options: Over-arching Spatial Strategy and the Strategic Sites	Support
Summary	I support Option 2 (in principle). However, I do not support the aspect allowing the expansion of Edge Hill into the Green Belt, (eastwards) nor indeed the erosion of any of the green belt, nor the housing target of 4,500 new homes. The housing requirement of 300 dwellings a year needs to be scrutinised. (S)		
Response	Comments noted regarding the options and Edge Hill University expansion. Edge Hill University has undergone a period of rapid growth and has been working to make space utilisation on site more efficient. It has now reached a point whereby all space on the existing campus will soon be fully utilised. The Core Strategy must provide for development over the next 15 year period and by allowing small-scale expansion (of 10ha) the Council considers that this will avoid larger scale development which may occur if we do not allow for this managed growth over the plan period. Re. housing requirements: Following a Court of Appeal ruling in May 2011, the intention to abolish the Regional Spatial Strategy ("RSS", which set our housing requirement of 300 dwellings per annum) cannot be taken into account when Councils are considering the adoption of new Development Plan Documents such as Core Strategies, until such time as a Strategic Environmental Assessment of RSS abolition has been concluded. Thus the Council is obliged to use the 300 dwellings per annum housing requirement in the Core Strategy. Housing requirements for West Lancashire will be looked at once RSS abolition is beyond doubt, although it is the Council's view at present that the 300pa requirement is the most appropriate for West Lancashire.		
Recommendation	Check the Core Strategy is sufficiently flexible to allow for a change in housing requirements in future (e.g. Policies CS1, CS7, Chapter 10).		
<hr/>			
cspo-89	Mrs Sybil Sheperd		
Plan Ref	Chapter 5	Core Strategy Preferred Options: Over-arching Spatial Strategy and the Strategic Sites	Support
Summary	The further development of Skelmersdale has a key growth area is to be welcomed. Preferred Option 2: Dispersal would be the most advantageous as it would strengthen communities and minimise impact on Green Belt. The non-preferred option is not supported. The provision of land for commercial and industrial development is crucial. (S)		
Response	Comments noted		
Recommendation	No action required.		

cspo-90	G Davies			
Plan Ref	Chapter 5	Core Strategy Preferred Options: Over-arching Spatial Strategy and the Strategic Sites		Object
Summary	We support the rejection of the Ormskirk option (S)			
Response	Comments noted.			
Recommendation	No action required.			
cspo-95	Mr Steve Mawdsley			
Plan Ref	Chapter 5	Core Strategy Preferred Options: Over-arching Spatial Strategy and the Strategic Sites		Object
Summary	We wish to object to all 3 options proposed by WLBC to develop 800+ new houses in Burscough and Ormskirk. Burscough in particular suffers from transport and infrastructure problems. (S)			
Response	Comments noted.			
Recommendation	No change required.			
cspo-96	Mr D Birchall			
Plan Ref	Chapter 5	Core Strategy Preferred Options: Over-arching Spatial Strategy and the Strategic Sites		Object
Summary	We object to Option 2, in particular development north of Ormskirk due to impact on agricultural land, highways, landscape and nature conservation. (S) We support Option 1. (S)			
Response	Comments noted. (If the Nursery Avenue site ended up being chosen for development, housing would not be likely to extend as far as Bath Farm and its access avenue.)			
Recommendation	No further action.			
cspo-97	F Johnson			
Plan Ref	Chapter 5	Core Strategy Preferred Options: Over-arching Spatial Strategy and the Strategic Sites		Object
Summary	Object to Option 1; Ormskirk site is ideal as close to the motorway. (S)			
Response	Comments noted.			
Recommendation	No further action			
cspo-98	Mr & Mrs Holcroft			
Plan Ref	Chapter 5	Core Strategy Preferred Options: Over-arching Spatial Strategy and the Strategic Sites		Object
Summary	Object to non-preferred option. Support to dispersal option 2. (S)			
Response	Comments noted			
Recommendation	No further action			
cspo-112	Mrs Jackie Liptrott			
Plan Ref	Policy CS1	A Sustainable Spatial Development Framework for West Lancashire		Observations
Summary	Object to the methodology of categorising green belt boundaries.			
Response	This comment relates to the Green Belt Study. However, the methodology used an established boundary hierarchy which assessed the features of the boundary and how prominent they were. The approach has been validated by Lancashire County Council and the measure of features as strong or weak was shared by the neighbouring authorities and other authorities nationwide. Therefore, it is considered appropriate to consider a ditch, track or line of trees weak in comparison to say a river, main road or woodland.			
Recommendation	No change required to either Core Strategy or Green Belt Methodology.			
cspo-146	Mr Philip Carter	Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency		
Plan Ref	Policy CS1	A Sustainable Spatial Development Framework for West Lancashire		Object
Summary	Inclusion of protection of water quality is required. (S)			
Response	Comments Noted			
Recommendation	Changes will be made to the policy to reflect any recommendations set out within the SA.			

cspo-147	Mr Philip Carter	Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency	
Plan Ref	Policy CS1	A Sustainable Spatial Development Framework for West Lancashire	Support
Summary	Support for Policy CS1 subject to the inclusion of protection of water quality (S).		
Response	Comments noted		
Recommendation	No further action		
<hr/>			
cspo-205		Escalibur Ltd	
Plan Ref	Policy CS1	A Sustainable Spatial Development Framework for West Lancashire	Object
Summary	Appley Bridge should be identified as a Key Sustainable Village. The current distribution of housing is unrealistic and should take into account the sustainable development benefits of expanding settlements such as Appley Bridge which has a railway station and other facilities. (S)		
Response	The Councils current evidence base work suggests that whilst Appley Bridge benefits from reasonable proximity to Wigan, service infrastructure in general is not the most sustainable. Furthermore, the draft Green Belt study did not identify any parcels of land which do not fulfil at least one purpose of the Green Belt as set out in PPG2.		
Recommendation	Comments noted and further infrastructure work will be carried out along with refining work to the Green Belt Study in order to inform the next stage of the Core Strategy.		
<hr/>			
cspo-254	Mr Francis Williams	member Ormskirk Friends of the Earth	
Plan Ref	Policy CS1	A Sustainable Spatial Development Framework for West Lancashire	Observations
Summary	We would not wish Skelmersdale to lose its "green" image through development. The River Tawd is a neglected asset. Unused land should be returned to agriculture. (S)		
Response	The Core Strategy Preferred Options document prioritises brownfield land over green field land. However, where there is a shortfall in brownfield land and a surplus of underused poor quality green field land, the Council would wish to see that land be put to better use and any financial contributions generated from doing so used to improve the remaining open spaces that require improvements. Evidence in the Open Space Study 2009 relating to Skelmersdale supports this approach. The inclusion of a large part of the River Tawd valley within the Skelmersdale Town Centre Strategic Site in Policy CS2 is in part, to assist with the much needed management, public access and environmental improvements.		
Recommendation	No action required.		
<hr/>			
cspo-302	Mrs Jo Robison	Associate Smiths Gore	
Plan Ref	Policy CS1	A Sustainable Spatial Development Framework for West Lancashire	Object
Summary	Strongly objects to Green Belt areas of search and that development should be prioritised to brownfield land (s)		
Response	The parcels of Green Belt land identified have been informed by evidence identifying infrastructure, environmental limits and sustainability along with a review of Green Belt land. The Council prioritises brownfield land for development and Policy CS7 allows for non brownfield sites to be brought forward where there are no suitable available brownfield sites and this can be evidenced.		
Recommendation	No action required.		
<hr/>			
cspo-558	Mr Keith Keeley		
Plan Ref	Policy CS1	A Sustainable Spatial Development Framework for West Lancashire	Observations
Summary	How are utility constraints to be overcome. Issues with the highway network should also be noted. (s)		
Response	The Core Strategy is not the place to set out the detail of how infrastructure constraints should be overcome - it is sufficient for this strategic policy to only reference the fact that they should be overcome before new development is completed. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan will set out the details of how such constraints will be overcome. Other policies in the Core Strategy address highway constraints (e.g. Policy CS12 - promotes other forms of travel than the private car). However, if background highway modelling work currently being undertaken for the Council identifies any major highway constraints to new development, consideration should be given to including reference to highway constraints in Policy CS1.		
Recommendation	No action.		

cspo-563	Mr Keith Keeley		
Plan Ref	Policy CS1 A Sustainable Spatial Development Framework for West Lancashire		Object
Summary	The justification offers no proper detailed rationale for the proposed distribution of housing and employment land in particular between Ormskirk and Burscough. Nor does it present any data on the implications on settlement growth for each settlement as compared to 2010 baseline. (s)		
Response	The Settlement Hierarchy in Policy CS1 does recognise a distinction between Ormskirk/Aughton (Borough Town) and Burscough (Market Town) although it does classify both as Key Service Centres. As the paragraph previous to the settlement hierarchy in Policy CS1 (discussed in CSPO-531) states, new development should be promoted in accordance with this hierarchy. The Council acknowledges that Ormskirk is a more sustainable settlement than Burscough but consideration must be given to other factors as well, especially when weighing up the loss of Green Belt and agricultural land. In addition, Burscough has sufficient level of service provision to be considered sustainable enough to accommodate a significant level of new development and any infrastructure issues that new development would create would be expected to be resolved prior to completion of the new development, as best as possible. It should also be noted that Ormskirk and Burscough suffer from very similar infrastructure constraints and that many observers would actually say that Ormskirk suffers more greatly than Burscough in relation to highways congestion in particular (although the Council awaits the completion of modelling work on our highways capacity to confirm or contradict this perception) and that this constraint is perhaps the most difficult to resolve in this particular case (due to the funding and delivery of new highways and public transport infrastructure and the difficulty of changing people's travel habits). Therefore, in making a final decision on where Green Belt land should be released for development in the Core Strategy, the Council will weigh all these factors, including the existing scale of the towns, into consideration. While Skelmersdale and Burscough will take the vast majority of new employment development (Use Class B) under the existing proposals in the CSPO document, some employment development will take place in other rural locations and at Simonswood. Burscough was selected as a secondary focus due to the benefits of having a critical mass together with the existing provision of employment land and due to the need to expand the existing provision to meet existing and anticipated demand in Burscough. Ormskirk was not highlighted as a location for new employment development in the CSPO document due to the lack of suitable land for Use Class B development within the urban area and in the locations considered for Green Belt release on the edge of the urban area, although a small amount of high quality employment is included in the non-preferred option. While Ormskirk is a more accessible town than Burscough, it does not have an existing significant market for providing Use Class B accommodation, unlike Burscough. It should be noted than in discussing employment land, this does not incorporate other Use Classes whose users employ people, for example Edge Hill University and retail provision, and these particular types of development are covered by Policies CS6 and CS11 respectively.		
Recommendation	No Action Required		
cspo-565	Mr Keith Keeley		
Plan Ref	Policy CS1 A Sustainable Spatial Development Framework for West Lancashire		Observations
Summary	In view of the abolition of the RSS and its Housing targets what previous consultation has been held locally on these locally agreed targets (ie following abolition of RSS)? (f)		
Response	No previous consultation on these targets has taken place until this public consultation. Indeed none was possible given the recent changes surrounding the RSS and the Localism Bill. It should also be noted that the RSS has not yet been abolished. The CSPO consultation provided the first, and most appropriate, opportunity to consult on these proposed targets, which must be based on robust and reasonable evidence of housing need.		
Recommendation	No Action Required		
cspo-567	Mr Keith Keeley		
Plan Ref	Policy CS1 A Sustainable Spatial Development Framework for West Lancashire		Observations
Summary	Without reference to a robust Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) it cannot be justified and explained that the proposals to develop a strategic site at Burscough under Option 1 will not lead to a deterioration in local infrastructure and the general sustainability of the local community. (f)		
Response	The CSPO consultation falls under Regulation 25 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2008, which reflects the fact that the Council are still consulting on options for the Core Strategy, including the location(s) for Green Belt release. Therefore, once a final location(s) is selected for Green Belt release, the decision will be informed by a sound analysis of all types of infrastructure, which will be evidenced in the IDP. The IDP will also directly inform other policies in the Core Strategy and the Council's approach to developer contributions.		
Recommendation	No Action Required		

cspo-570	Mr Keith Keeley		
Plan Ref	Policy CS1	A Sustainable Spatial Development Framework for West Lancashire	Observations
Summary	There are no locally supported documents listed. The Strategic Development Site at Burscough is not shown on this Key Diagram. There is no discussion about the important relationship between existing and proposed infrastructure and development. (S)		
Response	The Core Strategy will effectively be setting the new local planning policy for the Borough and so will replace any existing local planning policy that addresses the over-arching spatial strategy for the Borough. The Area of Search under the Dispersal option covers the same area as the Burscough Strategic Site - it would just involve less housing, and therefore less land within the area of search. A Proposals Map will be produced alongside a Publication / Submission version of the Core Strategy - one cannot be prepared until the Council have made their final decision on options. Draft Policies CSPO11 to CSPO14 cover all infrastructure and services and highlights the need to link new development in with infrastructure.		
Recommendation	No Action Required		
cspo-711	Crompton property developments		
Plan Ref	David Crompton	A Sustainable Spatial Development Framework for West Lancashire	Support
Summary	Full Submission of Crompton Property Developments - see also CSPO712, 719-728 and 736-738. (s)		
Response	See individual comments on response CSPO712, 719-728 and 736-738.		
Recommendation	See Recommendations for CSPO712, 719-728 and 736-738.		
cspo-715	Ms Deborah McLaughlin	Executive Director North West Homes and Communities Agency	
Plan Ref	Policy CS1	A Sustainable Spatial Development Framework for West Lancashire	Support
Summary	The HCA welcomes the categorisation of Skelmersdale as a Key Service Centre and a priority location for new development.		
Response	Comments noted		
Recommendation	No action required.		
cspo-728	Crompton property developments		
Plan Ref	David Crompton	A Sustainable Spatial Development Framework for West Lancashire	Support with conditions
Summary	Policy CS1 is supported, but the approach to Green Belt and the release of land could be more clearly set out. The distribution of development with the strategic employment site at Burscough is supported. It is likely to be essential for a strategic site to be released in advance of all brownfield sites so that it can be properly planned for. It is considered that Burscough has better sustainable transport connections given its rail links (S).		
Response	The Core Strategy Publication Version will clearly identify where revisions to the Green Belt boundary will take place as part of any strategic site or will identify areas of search within which Green Belt boundaries will be revised through a Site Allocations DPD. Any sites or locations included in the final "Plan B" for the Core Strategy will be consulted upon through the Publication version of the Core Strategy, but it is recognised that, where Green Belt boundaries will be affected by these locations, formal revision of the boundaries will need to take place in either the Core Strategy or another DPD should "Plan B" be enacted. Development on any greenfield site in Ormskirk, Burscough, Rufford and Scarisbrick will be constrained by the waste water treatment infrastructure, and so any development of Green Belt in these areas will not be able to take place until this issue is resolved. Therefore, while it may be appropriate in certain circumstances that development of a strategic site on Green Belt could come forward before all land in the urban area has been developed, it will still be constrained and limited by the waste water treatment infrastructure issue. It is recognised that both Ormskirk and Burscough have good access to sustainable public transport connections, and this is a key contributing factor to both settlements being considered Key Service Centres. This is reflected in paragraph 5.1.17 of the CSPO paper. It is considered that Ormskirk's sustainable public transport connections are a little better than Burscough's simply due to the frequency of services and the variety of locations across the Borough in particular that there are direct connections to from Ormskirk.		
Recommendation	No action required.		
cspo-9	Mr Howard Courtley	Courtley Consultants Ltd	
Plan Ref	Policy CS1	A Sustainable Spatial Development Framework for West Lancashire	Object
Summary	Policy CS1 fails to consider sustainable patterns of development available adjoining other settlements outside its District (S)		
Response	The Council has considered the option of providing for development on its boundaries adjoining other settlements outside the Borough but in the case of the Borough's boundaries with Sefton, have found that the impact of urban sprawl from Sefton into West Lancashire would be unacceptable. The Core Strategy Preferred Options has set a relatively low target for housing in the Western Parishes to ensure that the rural character of this area is not diminished. Specific sites, other than those that are considered "strategic", cannot be considered specifically within the Core Strategy - that is for a later Development Plan Document such as a Site Allocations DPD.		
Recommendation	No Action Required		

cspo-148	Mr Philip Carter	Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency	
Plan Ref	5.1	Policy Area CS1: A Sustainable Spatial Development Framework for West Lancashire	Observations
Summary	Level 2 SFRA required to justify areas of search in flood zones (S).		
Response	Comments noted. Level 2 SFRA will be carried out if development is allocated in areas at risk of flooding.		
Recommendation	Carry out Level 2 SFRA if development is allocated in areas at risk of flooding (see also reps 139. 143)		
cspo-227	Mr Shaun Taylor	Planning Associate Director G L Hearn Property Consultants	
Plan Ref	5.1	Policy Area CS1: A Sustainable Spatial Development Framework for West Lancashire	Object
Summary	Too much emphasis placed on housing delivery within Skelmersdale at the early phase of the Core Strategy. Smaller scale Green Belt releases should be considered around Ormskirk and Burscough. (S)		
Response	As previously noted, we are aware of the risks associated with deliverability of development in Skelmersdale and in response to this will review housing targets and location to ensure an appropriate balance is struck which will ensure housing delivery is not jeopardised but that the focus remains on Skelmersdale to support regeneration. The SHLAA has evidenced that there is a supply of land within the urban areas of the Borough which will meet a large proportion of the required housing and employment land targets. Therefore, it would be inappropriate to support Green Belt release ahead of Brownfield land.		
Recommendation	Review housing targets and spread to ensure growth needs are met.		
cspo-240	Mr Andrew Taylor	Planning Director David Wilson Homes	
Plan Ref	5.1	Policy Area CS1: A Sustainable Spatial Development Framework for West Lancashire	Object
Summary	Undeliverable housing over provision in Skelmersdale. (s)		
Response	We are aware of the risks associated with deliverability of development in Skelmersdale based on consultation feedback and historic development completion rates. In response to this a review is being carried out to ensure the appropriate distribution of development across the Borough to ensure housing delivery is not jeopardised but that the focus remains on Skelmersdale to support regeneration.		
Recommendation	Review of housing targets and distribution to ensure growth needs are met.		
cspo-246	Mr D Rimmer		
Plan Ref	5.1	Policy Area CS1: A Sustainable Spatial Development Framework for West Lancashire	Support with conditions
Summary	General Support (s)		
Response	CS1) We are aware of the risks associated with deliverability of development in Skelmersdale based on consultation feedback and historic development completion rates. In response to this a review is being carried out to ensure the appropriate distribution of development across the Borough to ensure housing delivery is not jeopardised but that the focus remains on Skelmersdale to support regeneration 5.1.11) Comments regarding Banks are noted. However, site allocations are beyond the remit of the Core Strategy and would come at a later stage once we have an adopted overarching development strategy (Core Strategy). 5.1.21) The main reason for phasing of targets is to address and manage the constraint issue relating to Ormskirk and Burscough. However, this will be reviewed along with the housing targets.		
Recommendation	Review of housing targets, distribution and phasing to ensure growth needs are met.		
cspo-282	Mr Alexis De Pol		
Plan Ref	5.1	Policy Area CS1: A Sustainable Spatial Development Framework for West Lancashire	Object
Summary	There is a disproportionate amount of development is being directed towards Skelmersdale & Up Holland, Ormskirk & Aughton and Burscough, with insufficient housing and development being directed to the Northern Parishes. Safeguarded land and open land on the urban fringe should be considered ahead of Green Belt release.(S)		
Response	Over-reliance on Skelmersdale and eliverability of the housing and employment targets is under review. However, reasons for not concentrating significant amounts of development within the Northern Parishes have been set out in response to Rep 280.		
Recommendation	Review of housing targets and distribution to ensure growth needs are met.		

cspo-290	Mrs Jo Robison	Associate Smiths Gore	
Plan Ref	5.1	Policy Area CS1: A Sustainable Spatial Development Framework for West Lancashire	Support with conditions
Summary	Housing targets are welcomed, however, viability should play a key role in identifying housing sites. Recommends changing wording of policy.		
Response	Simply stating "other" sites does not give enough certainty to developers or the Council in terms of what constitutes acceptable "other" sites. The Core Strategy's existing approach notes that applicants may propose residential development on Greenfield sites but they must evidence that there are no suitable Brownfield and / or allocated sites available to provide a similar number of units, either individually or collectively.		
Recommendation	No action required		
cspo-298	Mrs Jo Robison	Associate Smiths Gore	
Plan Ref	5.1	Policy Area CS1: A Sustainable Spatial Development Framework for West Lancashire	Support with conditions
Summary	we would suggest that it is not suitable to specifically set out two preferred options if these options - and all reasonable alternatives "have not been properly considered as part of a robust assessment. (s)		
Response	Comments noted		
Recommendation	no action required		
cspo-312	IKO Plc		
Plan Ref	5.1	Policy Area CS1: A Sustainable Spatial Development Framework for West Lancashire	Object
Summary	Object to settlement hierarchy. Appley Bridge is a higher order settlement. Also object to proposed housing distribution, with a focus on Skelmersdale. Suggested amendments included. (S)		
Response	It is acknowledged that Appley Bridge is integrated with Shevington Vale. However, within the Wigan Borough Council Core Strategy, Shevington Vale is only identified as a local or neighbourhood centre having limited facilities to support local convenience. The Sustainable Settlement Study 2010, which informed the settlement hierarchy, identified Appley Bridge as a "small local service centre". The Settlement Study does make reference to the association with Shevington but the overall findings determine the role of Appley Bridge as providing limited local services. Concerns regarding the deliverability of so much development within Skelmersdale are being addressed through a revision of housing targets and distribution. However, it is unlikely that a significant amount more would be allocated to the rural villages as this is contrary to PPS1 and the principles of locating development in the most sustainable settlements first.		
Recommendation	No action required.		
cspo-319	Wainhomes Developments		
Plan Ref	5.1	Policy Area CS1: A Sustainable Spatial Development Framework for West Lancashire	Object
Summary	Firstly, policy CS1 should include a revised housing requirement from 2010. The shortfall from 2003 should also be included as that is the start date for the RSS. Secondly, all references to Skelmersdale in policies CS1 and CS7 (and throughout the Core Strategy) should be referred to as Skelmersdale (Up Holland). What this means is that Up Holland is part of the Key Service Centre and is not a Key Sustainable Village. (S)		
Response	With regard to the status of Up Holland, the Council generally agrees with the comments made by the Objector, and the Core Strategy should be amended to clarify that Up Holland is considered alongside Skelmersdale as part of the Key Service Centre, and any housing in Up Holland counts towards the Skelmersdale target. Secondly, with regard to the start date of the Plan, and the deficit in housing completions compared with RSS requirements from 2003, this deficit is being taken into account in Core Strategy housing calculations, along with development requirements and housing completions from 2010-2012. Assuming the RSS will have been abolished at the time of the Core Strategy examination, the Council also considers it appropriate to take account of the most recent evidence available, i.e. the 2008-based household projections. Overall, this will result in a higher housing requirement, although not as high as the figure stated by the Objector.		
Recommendation	Amend Core Strategy to clarify that Up Holland and Skelmersdale are treated as one settlement. Amend housing requirement to take account of RSS deficit and development between 2010 and 2012. (See also response to Rep. 729.)		
cspo-352	Mr Robert W. Pickavance		
Plan Ref	5.1	Policy Area CS1: A Sustainable Spatial Development Framework for West Lancashire	Observations
Summary	This states that Rufford is a rural, sustainable village, therefore development could be permitted		
Response	Acknowledged		
Recommendation	No action required		

cspo-353	Mr Robert W. Pickavance		
Plan Ref	5.1	Policy Area CS1: A Sustainable Spatial Development Framework for West Lancashire	Observations
Summary	5.1.18: The New Road site is ideal as it is within the village, it also has excellent transport links and it is not liable to flood risk as it is on a slight incline, with free draining to the Sluice at the bottom of the site. 5.1.19: New Road site is within the settlement boundary and in the "call for sites" it was identified as a site which should have already been developed. (F)		
Response	Acknowledged		
Recommendation	No action required.		
cspo-354	Mr Robert W. Pickavance		
Plan Ref	5.1	Policy Area CS1: A Sustainable Spatial Development Framework for West Lancashire	Support
Summary	5.1.34: I support the overall feeling that development should be across the Borough		
Response	Acknowledged		
Recommendation	No action required		
cspo-372	Ms Kathleen M Prince		
Plan Ref	5.1	Policy Area CS1: A Sustainable Spatial Development Framework for West Lancashire	Observations
Summary	So far Banks has managed to retain its village character but cannot continue to do so if housing development is allowed to expand further. (s)		
Response	Comments noted. The limitations of Banks as a location for further large scale development is recognised.		
Recommendation	No action.		
cspo-382	North West Skelmersdale Owners		
Plan Ref	5.1	Policy Area CS1: A Sustainable Spatial Development Framework for West Lancashire	Object
Summary	The Council's selection of its Area of Search repeats the error of the earlier Local Plan. At that time the Local Plan Inspector was not convinced of the Council's approach. The draft Core Strategy repeats these errors. My clients are prepared to work with the Council to find an acceptable solution at North West Skelmersdale. (s)		
Response	Development of the land to the North West of Skelmersdale would constitute a very large extension of Skelmersdale into the Green Belt and the objector has raised this as an alternative both to a Burscough Strategic Development Site and an area of search for employment to the south of Skelmersdale. It is the Council's view that this would be an inappropriate extension into the Green Belt compared to the options put forward in the CSPO paper, extending Skelmersdale significantly out into the Lathom countryside. While there are infrastructure constraints in Burscough, the Council are confident that these can be adequately resolved to enable development in that area.		
Recommendation	No Action Required		
cspo-388	North West Skelmersdale Owners		
Plan Ref	5.1	Policy Area CS1: A Sustainable Spatial Development Framework for West Lancashire	Object
Summary	The allocation of land at Burscough for both housing and employment is flawed without a demonstration of how essential infrastructure can be achieved and is viable.		
Response	Comments noted. The Council is aware of infrastructure issues in this area, and indeed in many other parts of the Borough. Only with development can significant amounts of investment be gained in order to deal with these issues. Any development in this location will be required to address such issues as part of development proposals.		
Recommendation	No action.		
cspo-400	Wirral to Wyre Team	Natural England	
Plan Ref	5.1	Policy Area CS1: A Sustainable Spatial Development Framework for West Lancashire	Observations
Summary	We are pleased to see a broad overarching strategic policy that facilitates appropriate development while the valuable biodiversity, landscape, heritage and green infrastructure assets of the Borough will be protected and, where appropriate, enhanced. However, we question the use of the term "valuable". PPS9 promotes the conservation and enhancement of all biodiversity, as does the European landscape Convention (ELC) promote the conservation and enhancement of all landscapes. We therefore respectfully ask that "valuable" be removed in order to tie the policy in with National Policy and the ELC. (F)		
Response	Comments noted. It is considered that 'valuable' has been interpreted wrongly by this reader. The wording suggests that all biodiversity is valuable rather than that only 'valuable biodiversity' will be protected.		
Recommendation	No action.		

cspo-42	Redrow Homes (Lancs)		
Plan Ref	5.1	Policy Area CS1: A Sustainable Spatial Development Framework for West Lancashire	Object
Summary	Support the designation of Banks as a Key Sustainable Village, and the sequential approach to land release with Green Belt being considered last. Objections: 1. The plan needs to be in conformity with the RSS. The deficit in completions against targets between 2003 and 2010 needs to be added to the overall requirement. 2. The plan's base date should be 2010, with development between 2010 and 2012 needing to be taken into account. 3. The plan should specify that the housing target can be exceeded. 4. 3,000 dwellings are not deliverable in Skelmersdale. 2,250 is a more realistic target. 5. More development should be permitted in the Northern Parishes. 6. Paragraph 5.1.21 - it is not appropriate to restrict development (200dwp target in early years) whilst need exists. (S)		
Response	1. It is agreed that the deficit in completions against RSS targets from 2003 needs to be taken into account - the Core Strategy does in fact do so. This will be made more clear in the next version of the CS. 2. Whilst the CS base date is 2012, development targets and performance between 2010 and 2012 will be taken into account. 3. It is agreed that the housing target can be exceeded (where appropriate) - this will be specified in the next version of the CS. 4. The Skelmersdale target will be reviewed in the light of representations received on this matter. The target for the town (and Borough) needs to be deliverable. 5. Comment noted. The Northern Parishes has constraints in terms of flood risk, water and drainage infrastructure, and road capacity (Tarleton /Hesketh Bank) and thus the scope for significant amounts of further development there is considered limited, especially taking into account recent grants of permission and pending planning applications. 6. The low targets for early years are in recognition of difficulties associated with delivering the required number of housing completions in early years of the Core Strategy, given infrastructure constraints and the current economic situation. This lower target will not be a "maximum" and can be exceeded. Thus it is not "restraint" as such, but an attempt to set a deliverable target.		
Recommendation	Reduce Skelmersdale's housing target from 3,000 to 2,400 to take account of deliverability concerns expressed through CSPO consultation. Deficit in completions against RSS targets will now be taken into account in recalculating housing target. Housing tar		
cspo-425	Ms Judith Nelson	English Heritage	
Plan Ref	5.1	Policy Area CS1: A Sustainable Spatial Development Framework for West Lancashire	Observations
Summary	It is suggested that in addition to impacts on the character of the surrounding area policy on wind energy should also specifically mention impacts on the setting of heritage assets. Care must be taken that restricting development to existing built up areas within existing settlement boundaries does not result in village cramming. (s)		
Response	Comments noted. The paragraphs referred to set out the general approach to development within settlements of different sizes. It is not considered appropriate to single out the impact on heritage within this part of the document as many other impacts would then also have to be addressed here.		
Recommendation	No action.		
cspo-438	Mr Andrew Thorley	Strategic Land Manager Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd	
Plan Ref	5.1	Policy Area CS1: A Sustainable Spatial Development Framework for West Lancashire	Support with conditions
Summary	Support for housing targets and general distribution of housing across the Borough. However, should allow some flexibility in when Green Belt sites can come forward to ensure delivery of necessary housing. Reference should also be made to the need for safeguarding land beyond the LDF period. (S)		
Response	Comments noted. We appreciate concerns regarding the amount of development directed towards Skelmersdale to what is a relatively weak housing market compared to other parts of the Borough. Promotion of the High Lane site also noted. Safeguarded land for use beyond the plan period is currently being considered.		
Recommendation	Reduce Skelmersdale's housing target from 3,000 to 2,400 to take account of deliverability concerns expressed through CSPO consultation.		
cspo-441	Mr Andrew Thorley	Strategic Land Manager Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd	
Plan Ref	5.1	Policy Area CS1: A Sustainable Spatial Development Framework for West Lancashire	Object
Summary	Object to the proposed distribution of housing between Burscough and Ormskirk. Ormskirk is a larger settlement so is a more sustainable location. (S)		
Response	Comments noted. Although Ormskirk is a larger settlement there is much more to consider in terms of sustainable residential development. Congestion associated with the University means that parts of Ormskirk already suffer from very high levels of traffic. Whilst development of housing, particularly in the Green Belt, will have some negative impacts where ever it is developed, it is considered that Burscough has a role to play in terms of future housing provision given the nature of Green Belt land available in the area and also in terms of supporting Burscough's important employment function.		
Recommendation	Amend split of housing between Ormskirk and Burscough.		

cspo-53		Church Commissioners For England	
Plan Ref	5.1	Policy Area CS1: A Sustainable Spatial Development Framework for West Lancashire	Object
Summary	We support the identification of Halsall and Haskayne as rural sustainable villages but there is concern regarding the restricted development potential in such settlements. 80 dwellings seems extremely low and there is no proposed new development for new employment sites in the Western Parishes. We question this underdevelopment. (S)		
Response	Comments noted. It is not considered appropriate to allow Green Belt development on the edge of small rural villages, or settlement extensions, but development on appropriate sites within appropriate sustainable settlements will be supported. The overall housing figure for the Western Parishes will be reconsidered, taking into account land supply. In any case, this figure may not be a maximum.		
Recommendation	Reconsider development figure for Western Parishes area. Should it be specified that this is not a maximum?		
<hr/>			
cspo-531		Mr Keith Keeley	
Plan Ref	5.1	Policy Area CS1: A Sustainable Spatial Development Framework for West Lancashire	Observations
Summary	It is not clear from this policy what the justification is for the level of proposed development at Burscough. (s)		
Response	See Comments on Response CSPO-472 - even the highest level of development proposed at Burscough is not out of scale in comparison to historic delivery of housing in Burscough, but if a Burscough option is ultimately selected for Green Belt release, a more in-depth justification and explanation will be provided. This was not required at this time, as the Council are only consulting on options. Wording quoted from CS1 will be reviewed to make meaning clearer.		
Recommendation	Amend wording in 2nd sentence of Policy CS1 as follows: "New development will be promoted in accordance with the following Settlement Hierarchy, with those settlements higher up the hierarchy, in general, taking more development than those lower down and n		
<hr/>			
cspo-536		Hesketh Estate	
Plan Ref	5.1	Policy Area CS1: A Sustainable Spatial Development Framework for West Lancashire	Object
Summary	Support the majority of development going to the Key service centres of the Borough. However, object to the proposed Green Belt locations as other parcels (AUG.04) are more appropriate and deliverable.		
Response	Comments noted. The Council is aware that deliverability of development on brownfield sites may be an issue and therefore, through the process of the SHLAA, only those sites which are likely to come forward for development have been counted towards the brownfield land target. On this basis, the Council is confident that a realistic assessment has been made.		
Recommendation	No action.		
<hr/>			
cspo-555		Mr Keith Keeley	
Plan Ref	5.1	Policy Area CS1: A Sustainable Spatial Development Framework for West Lancashire	Observations
Summary	This should at least include a statement subject to available infrastructure.(f)		
Response	Comment Noted		
Recommendation	Amend 6th para of Policy CS1 to include reference to the provision of appropriate infrastructure required for specific development proposals.		
<hr/>			
cspo-569		Mr Alan Hubbard Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust	
Plan Ref	5.1	Policy Area CS1: A Sustainable Spatial Development Framework for West Lancashire	Support with conditions
Summary	Support the general hierarchy of settlements, however it would be useful if the policy or supporting text offered an explanation of the different roles between, and general levels of development within, the Key Sustainable Village, Rural Sustainable Village and Small Rural Village tiers. (S)		
Response	Comments noted		
Recommendation	No further action required		
<hr/>			
cspo-578		Mrs Margaret Wiltshire Planning Volunteer, Treasurer CPRE (West Lancs Group)	
Plan Ref	5.1	Policy Area CS1: A Sustainable Spatial Development Framework for West Lancashire	Observations
Summary	concerns that Brown Edge/Pool Hey has been inaccurately labeled a rural sustainable village. Also concerned about caveats within policy which may undermine the honourable intent of the policy. Supports Skelmersdale masterplan. (s)		
Response	Comments noted. The boundary for Skelmersdale Town Centre has changed to include part of the Tawd Valley Park. This has been done to encourage greater links and recreational opportunities.		
Recommendation	No further action required		

cspo-61				
Plan Ref	5.1	Policy Area CS1: A Sustainable Spatial Development Framework for West Lancashire		Object
Summary	The Non Preferred Option should not be supported as it would waste good agricultural land and worsen congestion issues around St Helens Road and parking in Ormskirk town centre/			
Response	Comments noted.			
Recommendation	No action required.			
<hr/>				
cspo-643				
Plan Ref	5.1	Policy Area CS1: A Sustainable Spatial Development Framework for West Lancashire		Observations
Summary	SLP considers that it is both important and appropriate that the Core Strategy should recognise the role that Skelmersdale plays, both at a regional level and within the Borough, through the overarching development framework, thus providing a strategic context for other policies and future development. As such this policy is supported by SLP. (s)			
Response	Comments noted			
Recommendation	No action required			
<hr/>				
cspo-652	Ms Judith Nelson	English Heritage		
Plan Ref	5.1	Policy Area CS1: A Sustainable Spatial Development Framework for West Lancashire		Observations
Summary	CS1 should mention setting of heritage assets. Care must be taken not to village cram and preserve character and appearance, particularly in conservation areas (S)			
Response	Comments noted. Policy CS1 sets out the general strategic aims of the plan but is not intended to provide detail on every aspect - this is dealt with separately later on within individual policies on each topic area. The policy refers to the importance of protecting the Borough's heritage assets and this is considered sufficient for this policy.			
Recommendation	No action required.			
<hr/>				
cspo-659	Mr Simon Artiss	Planning Manager Bellway Homes Ltd		
Plan Ref	5.1	Policy Area CS1: A Sustainable Spatial Development Framework for West Lancashire		Observations
Summary	Support locating the majority of homes in the 3 key service centres as they are sustainable. Recognise the need to release green belt in order to accommodate development and housing needs.			
Response	Comments noted			
Recommendation	No action required			
<hr/>				
cspo-670	Mr C Smith			
Plan Ref	5.1	Policy Area CS1: A Sustainable Spatial Development Framework for West Lancashire		Object
Summary	We object to policy CS1 and in particular its proposed distribution of housing between the settlements. Specifically we object to the provision of two-thirds of residential development in Skelmersdale. We consider there should be development of more dwellings in Burscough (and Ormskirk/Aughton) and less in Skelmersdale. We have doubts about the deliverability of the proposed numbers of dwellings in Skelmersdale during the plan period and therefore the soundness of any Core Strategy dependant upon this. We support the option for a Strategic Development Site that allows the delivery of no fewer than 800 dwellings in Burscough. We object to the alternative dispersal of Green Belt housing development that delivers only 500 dwellings in the town. (f)			
Response	Comments noted regarding housing numbers in Skelmersdale, however in order to assist with the regeneration of the town Skelmersdale must be the focus of housing delivery.			
Recommendation	Amendments to be made to the distribution of housing in Skelmersdale, Ormskirk and Burscough in light of the comments provided.			
<hr/>				
cspo-731	Bickerstaffe Trust			
Plan Ref	5.1	Policy Area CS1: A Sustainable Spatial Development Framework for West Lancashire		Object
Summary	Amendments proposed to policy wording and table. (S)			
Response	It is agreed that the housing target should be a "minimum" figure and the wording of CS1 should be amended to show this. Whichever option the Council ultimately select for Green Belt release, the table within Policy CS1 will be amended accordingly. The Council sees no reason to delete the wording in the last paragraph on p.45 regarding the constraints of waste water treatment infrastructure for Ormskirk, Burscough, Rufford and Scarisbrick. This is a key issue for the Core Strategy and one which must be resolved before greenfield development takes place in these areas. Therefore, limiting development on greenfield sites in these areas in the first part of the Core Strategy period is essential.			
Recommendation	Amend wording of Policy CS1 to refer to the housing target as a "minimum" figure.			

cspo-74	The Coal Authority		
Plan Ref	5.1	Policy Area CS1: A Sustainable Spatial Development Framework for West Lancashire	Observations
Summary	The Core Strategy should acknowledge that surface coal resources are present within the Plan area, in particular in relation to the greenfield sites around Skelmersdale, and as part of taking forward development / redevelopment proposals within these resource areas, it will be necessary for any sterilisation effects on the coal resource to be considered, as well as whether the prior extraction of the coal would be appropriate. (S)		
Response	Comments noted. It is agreed that coal (and other mineral) -related issues (sterilisation and mining-related legacy) need to be taken into account in the Core Strategy, and that the Core Strategy wording should be added to acknowledge this fact. Consider the insertion of an appropriate sentence at this point of the Plan to acknowledge these issues.		
Recommendation	Insert appropriate wording into the Core Strategy to acknowledge that surface coal resources are present within parts of the Plan area. See also the Coal Authority's recommended wording in Rep. 75.		
cspo-75	The Coal Authority		
Plan Ref	5.1	Policy Area CS1: A Sustainable Spatial Development Framework for West Lancashire	Object
Summary	The issue of mining legacy needs to be acknowledge in the Core Strategy. The Coal Authority would suggest that the 10th paragraph of this policy be amended to read as suggested in full response. (S)		
Response	Comments noted. It is agreed that it would be appropriate to add text to the Plan to acknowledge the issue of mining legacy, although the wording suggested by the Coal Authotiry in this instance may be over-long, especially if the matter is to be mentioned elsewhere in the Policy (see rep. 74).		
Recommendation	The Coal Authority suggests that the 10th paragraph of this policy be amended to read as follows: "While new development that is in accordance with this Core Strategy will be promoted in the appropriate locations, the valuable biodiversity, landscape		
cspo-76	The Coal Authority		
Plan Ref	5.1	Policy Area CS1: A Sustainable Spatial Development Framework for West Lancashire	Support
Summary	The Coal Authority supports the text in paragraph 5.1.32 which sets out the context for issues relating to the issues of ground conditions including unstable land in support of Policy CS1. (S)		
Response	Comments noted.		
Recommendation	No change required.		
cspo-170	Mr Martyn Coy	Planner British Waterways	
Plan Ref	5.2	Core Strategy Key Diagram	Object
Summary	The Core Strategy Key Diagram should recognise the existence of the Millennium Ribble Link. (S)		
Response	The Key Diagram does not show rivers, and as the Ribble Link uses the River Douglas, it is therefore not shown on the map. This level of detail is something that can be picked up on the Proposals Map but is considered too detailed for the key diagram.		
Recommendation	No action required.		
cspo-225	Mr Shaun Taylor	Planning Associate Director G L Hearn Property Consultants	
Plan Ref	5.2	Core Strategy Key Diagram	Object
Summary	The Key Diagram should also show the eastern edge of Ormskirk as "Potential Areas of Search for Green Belt Release for Housing and / or Employment Development". (f)		
Response	The Key Diagram already includes this area as an area of search.		
Recommendation	No action required		
cspo-39	Ms Sharon Duff		
Plan Ref	5.2	Core Strategy Key Diagram	Object
Summary	I object to the dispersal option (2) on the grounds of traffic and loss of green space / playing area (S).		
Response	Views noted.		
Recommendation	No change required.		
cspo-149	Mr Philip Carter	Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency	
Plan Ref	Policy CS2	Skelmersdale Town Centre - A Strategic Development Site	Object
Summary	Policy CS2 should make reference to improvements of the River Tawd along with the Tawd Valley (S).		
Response	Comments noted. The wording of the policy will be amended as recommended.		
Recommendation	Amendment to be made to refer to the 'Tawd Valley and River Tawd Corridor' rather than just the Tawd Valley in isolation.		

cspo-192	Mrs EA Broad	Parish Clerk Lathom South Parish Council	
Plan Ref	Policy CS2	Skelmersdale Town Centre - A Strategic Development Site	Object
Summary	Skelmersdale's image problem is associated primarily with its most deprived wards. These need to be tackled first of all. The plan is failing to provide a comprehensive cohesive development plan for Skelmersdale. (S)		
Response	The overall aim of the Core Strategy is to improve and regenerate Skelmersdale as a whole, including both the more deprived and less deprived wards. This will be through targeted physical regeneration and improvements to the existing built environment but also improving access to services and facilities for the local population to improve their overall well being, economic activity and educational attainment. The intended regeneration will therefore address all aspects of deprivation in the town. The Core Strategy sets out the broad aspirations of this work; however the detail will be worked up in subsequent LDF documents.		
Recommendation	No action.		
cspo-2	Mrs Shirley O'Hara		
Plan Ref	Policy CS2	Skelmersdale Town Centre - A Strategic Development Site	Object
Summary	Plans for Skelmersdale town centre and facilities have been offered so often in the past and are usually the first to be dropped in favour of providing improvements to the more opulent areas like Burscough and Ormskirk. Who do the council think this paper is fooling.		
Response	3,000 new homes are targeted for Skelmersdale for several reasons, including the need to generate investment in the town to support regeneration proposals for the town and the fact that as the Borough's largest town it has most key services and these will be improved. The proposals for the town centre (Policy CS2). In addition, there is land available in Skelmersdale for new development, whereas much of the rest of the Borough has limited land available within towns and villages and so even more development would need to be provided in the Green Belt than is currently proposed in the Core Strategy if development was diverted from Skelmersdale to areas such as Ormskirk and Burscough. Based on discussions with the PCT, they have no plans to change current hospital service provision in the Borough in light of the Core Strategy's proposals. The Core Strategy supports the provision of a range of new facilities and infrastructure in Skelmersdale and the town centre proposals (Policy CS2) set out these improvements, including a new bus station, new retail and leisure facilities and improvements to the Tawd Valley for recreation. The Core Strategy also supports a new rail link for Skelmersdale (Policy CS12) but this is not something the Council can deliver and there may be difficulties gaining funding for such a proposal. Policy CS8 on affordable housing sets out that 20% of housing in developments of 15 or more dwellings in Skelmersdale will be affordable (including social housing), with this figure reduced to 10% within the town centre area. The affordable housing which is to be social housing will be managed by Registered Social Landlords. The Core Strategy is a key document in helping to deliver the Vision for West Lancashire as set out in the Sustainable Community Strategy, and is setting a coherent spatial strategy for development across the Borough. It will replace the Local Plan adopted in 2006 under the old planning system. In relation to Skelmersdale specifically, the proposals within the Core Strategy build upon the plans already put forward in the masterplan for the town centre. While the delivery of this masterplan has been delayed due to the current economic climate, the Council is confident it can still be delivered, with the proposed slight modifications in Policy CS2, within the Core Strategy period.		
Recommendation	No Action Required		
cspo-228	Mr Shaun Taylor	Planning Associate Director G L Hearn Property Consultants	
Plan Ref	Policy CS2	Skelmersdale Town Centre - A Strategic Development Site	Object
Summary	A better balance of development between Skelmersdale and elsewhere in the borough needs to be achieved. (s)		
Response	Comments regarding directing housing to other parts of the Borough and not just Skelmersdale are noted. We appreciate that the Core Strategy needs to be deliverable and realistic and will look at this in more detail before progressing to the Publication Draft document.		
Recommendation	Reconsider housing numbers in Skelmersdale.		
cspo-716	Ms Deborah McLaughlin	Executive Director North West Homes and Communities Agency	
Plan Ref	Policy CS2	Skelmersdale Town Centre - A Strategic Development Site	Support
Summary	The HCA notes and welcomes the priority given to the Town Centre in the Core Strategy and in addition to proposed amendments to the SPD / Masterplan, particularly the emphasis on the need for high quality design and the increased flexibility in the location of any new food store in the Town Centre. (F)		
Response	Comments noted		
Recommendation	No action required.		

cspo-100	Mr David W Cheetham		
Plan Ref	5.3	Policy Area CS2: Skelmersdale Town Centre	Support with conditions
Summary	Detailed comments regarding Skelmersdale Town Centre. Can be summarised as: Maintain Skelmersdale as a green and pleasant well-landscaped town with good roads and footpaths. Extend development policies to the whole of the former New Town area. (S)		
Response	Comments and support noted. Responses as below: 1. Noted. 2. Noted. 3. The Core Strategy identifies Skelmersdale as a strategic development site. Not all of the land identified within the boundary will be developed for housing, and indeed a major thrust of the policy seeks to improve the existing park and access to pleasant green space. 4. Comments noted. The broad uses proposed will be considered in greater detail as part of a masterplan for the site. 5. Comments noted. 6. Residential uses in the town centre are considered important to the sustainability of a modern town centre. However, we note the comments made and we realise that aspirations must be realistic. We also appreciate that housing development in the wider Skelmersdale area should have a positive impact on users of the town centre. 7. In order to meet broader housing targets there will need to be some new housing development in Skelmersdale, that is in addition to improving existing housing stock. Therefore, the housing market has a role to play. 8. 'High Street' is a descriptive term for the link we want to encourage between the concourse and ASDA, the name will no doubt be formalised as the project continues. Skelmersdale currently lacks an important primary route/pedestrian area that most towns have as a focus for retail/leisure functions. 9. Comments noted. A linear pedestrian area is one of the aspirations for the town. The Concourse will remain in place as an important retail function. 10. Comments noted. Despite its strengths the policy must identify what needs to change, building on existing services and positive aspects. 11. Comments noted. The night time economy is considered crucial to the viability of the town centre and this is severely lacking at the current time. 12. The regeneration of existing housing estates in Skelmersdale is addressed through Policy CS1.		
Recommendation	No action.		
cspo-183	Mrs Elizabeth Anne Broad	Dalton Parish Council	
Plan Ref	5.3	Policy Area CS2: Skelmersdale Town Centre	Observations
Summary	Impact of development in Skelmersdale on Dalton needs to be considered (S)		
Response	Comments noted. The aim of the Core Strategy is to regenerate Skelmersdale over a 15 year period in order to address many of the issues raised above. It is intended that this regeneration will have positive benefits for all aspects of the town whether this be employment opportunities or educational facilities and achievement. The Core Strategy is a broad level document and the details will be addressed in further LDF documents. In terms of the Dalton site, this is currently protected from development (Policy DS4), and the intention is to keep it undeveloped due to its landscape importance. If the Whalleys North sites are developed, some sort of landscape buffer (including tree planting) will be necessary to screen it from Dalton. The issue of traffic travelling northwards from residential development in the Whalleys /Cobbs Clough area of Skelmersdale is recognised now, but it is considered most appropriate to address the details when allocating specific sites /dealing with development briefs or planning applications.		
Recommendation	No action.		
cspo-201	Mrs Anne-Sophie Bonton	Planning Officer	
Plan Ref	5.3	Policy Area CS2: Skelmersdale Town Centre	Support with conditions
Summary	Policy CS2 is a key policy. This policy is supported in principle for the regeneration of Skelmersdale town centre. The extension of the town centre boundary will be supported if this makes the proposal viable and deliverable. (F)		
Response	Comments noted.		
Recommendation	No action.		
cspo-401		Wirral to Wyre Team Natural England	
Plan Ref	5.3	Policy Area CS2: Skelmersdale Town Centre	Observations
Summary	We acknowledge and support the role of greenspace to sustainable communities. The policy refers to development of a park. We would welcome a broader reference to the role of such a park and any other green space to the broader plan for GI in the borough. Whilst the green spaces are shown on the diagram, it would appear that links and green corridors are also needed to prevent fragmentation and provide an overall strategy. We would also welcome inclusion of biodiversity within this policy, Conserving and enhancing biodiversity should be an integral part of developing a sustainable community, and here where there are opportunities for green infrastructure a key item to include alongside recreation and access to such spaces. (f)		
Response	Comments noted.		
Recommendation	Reference to more general Green Infrastructure to be added to policy CS2. Wording to read, 'In addition, general improvements will be made to green infrastructure in the town along with conserving and enhancing biodiversity'.		

cspo-43	Mr Tony McAteer	McAteer Associates Ltd	
Plan Ref	5.3	Policy Area CS2: Skelmersdale Town Centre	Object
Summary	Policy CS2 is unrealistic and undeliverable. There is an over-reliance on Skelmersdale throughout the Core Strategy. (S)		
Response	Delivery in Skelmersdale over the past three years has been affected by the recession, and as the economy picks up, general housing rates are expected to increase. The Council anticipates in the order of 800 new dwellings in the town centre (not 1,000 as stated by the Objector), and it is considered that whilst it may be challenging to deliver this many units in a difficult market area, it should be possible over a 15 year period, especially if this is in tandem with major investment in the town centre regeneration programme. Overall figures for Skelmersdale will be carefully considered in the light of representations made. The Council does not consider that incorporating scope for a "Plan B" into the Core Strategy demonstrates an admission that the plan is likely to fail, but provides flexibility as the plan is prepared in uncertain economic times.		
Recommendation	Reduce Skelmersdale's housing target from 3,000 to 2,400 to take account of deliverability concerns expressed through CSPO consultation.		
cspo-646	Skelmersdale Limited Partnership		
Plan Ref	5.3	Policy Area CS2: Skelmersdale Town Centre	Object
Summary	The adopted town centre masterplan and SPD is supported by SLP and is considered to provide an appropriate and suitably robust policy framework to ensure that future development proposed as part of the regeneration of the town centre achieves an integrated and cohesive centre which remains viable and vital in the long-term. The emerging policies contained within the Core Strategy now seek to materially alter this approach such that the vitality and viability of the town centre is threatened. The policy approach is not considered to be consistent with the Council's stated Key Principle of making Skelmersdale a leisure, recreation and retail centre of excellence within the North West. (s)		
Response	Points noted. The Council has commissioned an up to date Retail Study due this autumn and the retail floorspace figure for the town centre will be amended in accordance with the latest evidence in the Retail Study. The issue of the Nye Bevan pool is that removing the building is not deliverable in financial terms, therefore the Core Strategy would be unsound to promote such an aspiration knowing it is highly unlikely to be demolished.		
Recommendation	The following wording will be added at the start of the bullet point which refers to an improved western entrance to the Concourse Centre: 'To ensure maximum practical integration....'.		
cspo-663	Mr Simon Artiss	Planning Manager Bellway Homes Ltd	
Plan Ref	5.3	Policy Area CS2: Skelmersdale Town Centre	Observations
Summary	1,000 new homes in Skelmersdale town centre is too much and not considered deliverable. (S)		
Response	Point noted.		
Recommendation	Housing numbers to be considered as final draft document prepared.		
cspo-91	Mr Barry Eckersley Hope		
Plan Ref	5.3	Policy Area CS2: Skelmersdale Town Centre	Object
Summary	I am concerned about the development of housing in the Whalleys / Cobbs Clough area of Skelmersdale, and in particular the impact of traffic travelling northwards from this area along Lower Beacon Lane, Higher Lane Dalton and the A5209. (S)		
Response	It is agreed that site-specific traffic impacts need to be addressed for housing sites. This will take place primarily when the allocation of individual sites is carried out, and when planning applications are submitted for the development of such sites. Impacts of new housing on existing infrastructure - for example nearby rural lanes - needs to be minimised to an acceptable level wherever possible. New homes are targeted for Skelmersdale for several reasons, including the need to generate investment in the town to support regeneration proposals for the town and the fact that as the Borough's largest town it has most key services and these will be improved by the proposals for the town centre. Skelmersdale also has significantly more capacity in terms of existing road infrastructure than all other parts of the Borough. In addition, there is land available in Skelmersdale for new development, whereas much of the rest of the Borough has limited land available within towns and villages and so even more development would need to be provided in the Green Belt than is currently proposed in the Core Strategy if development was diverted from Skelmersdale to areas such as Ormskirk and Burscough. The Core Strategy supports the provision of a range of new facilities and infrastructure in Skelmersdale and the town centre proposals (Policy CS2) set out these improvements, including a new bus station, new retail and leisure facilities and improvements to the Tawd Valley for recreation. The Core Strategy also supports a new rail link for Skelmersdale (Policy CS12) but this is not something the Council can deliver and there may be difficulties gaining funding for such a proposal.		
Recommendation	No action required at present. Consider traffic impacts when assessing proposals for residential development at Whalleys /Cobbs Clough.		
cspo-150	Mr Philip Carter	Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency	
Plan Ref	Policy CS3	Burscough Strategic Development Site	Object
Summary	In relation to the measures to address the surface water drainage issues in Burscough, we request that this is changed to measures to address the foul and surface water drainage issues in Burscough (F).		
Response	Comments noted. The wording of Policy CS3 will be amended as recommended.		
Recommendation	Change CS3 from measures to address the surface water drainage issues in Burscough, to measures to address the foul and surface water drainage issues in Burscough.		

cspo-187	Irene Melling		
Plan Ref	Policy CS3	Burscough Strategic Development Site	Object
Summary	Object to loss of greenbelt land, lack of capacity infrastructure, and loss of green infrastructure. Traffic Impact on local roads (S)		
Response	Comments noted. It is recognised that there are disadvantages associated with the Burscough Preferred Option, and that issues such as infrastructure would need to be addressed in order for development to go ahead.		
Recommendation	No further action.		
cspo-230	Mr Shaun Taylor	Planning Associate Director G L Hearn Property Consultants	
Plan Ref	Policy CS3	Burscough Strategic Development Site	Object
Summary	Given infrastructure issues, the Burscough site should not be put forward as a Strategic Development site. Other sites capable of early delivery are needed if the Core Strategy is to be found sound. (S)		
Response	PPS12 paragraph 4.7 states "It may be beneficial to delivery of its objectives for details of key sites to be included in it, where these sites are central to the achievement of the strategy and where investment requires a long lead-in". This suggests that the complexity of the investment required to support the Burscough option warrants its status as a Strategic Site. Paragraph 4.7 goes on to say "It may be preferable for the site area to be delineated in outline rather than detailed terms, with site specific criteria set out to allow more precise definition through masterplanning using an area action plan (if required) or through a supplementary planning document (SPD)". This suggests that provided the site is allocated at this stage, the detail may be added at a later stage. Therefore, identifying this site as a strategic site is the most appropriate option to ensure land is secured for the delivery of housing and employment needs towards the end of the plan. Housing targets distribution will be reviewed.		
Recommendation	Review housing targets and distribution to ensure that growth needs are met.		
cspo-27	Mr Arthur Stout		
Plan Ref	Policy CS3	Burscough Strategic Development Site	Support with conditions
Summary	I believe that the development of the Yew Tree Farm site (which has been derelict for many years) has many benefits for the area there are issues which must be addressed. (S)		
Response	Comments noted - any measures to alleviate traffic impacts and other impacts of development will be provided within detailed design proposals for the site, should option 1 be taken forward within the Core Strategy.		
Recommendation	No Action Required		
cspo-314	Mr Luke Garrett		
Plan Ref	Policy CS3	Burscough Strategic Development Site	Object
Summary	Objection to Burscough Strategic Development Site (s)		
Response	The Core Strategy Preferred Options proposes to distribute development needs across the Borough in accordance with land availability, to support strategic objectives such as regeneration of Skelmersdale and meeting local housing need, whilst having an awareness of the environmental limits and infrastructure capacity of the area. It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. Furthermore, the Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered.		
Recommendation	No action required		
cspo-386	North West Skelmersdale Owners		
Plan Ref	Policy CS3	Burscough Strategic Development Site	Observations
Summary	With regard to the Council's vision for new infrastructure to serve Burscough, the CS offers little evidence to show how this can be achieved.		
Response	The Council is currently working on an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). The IDP sets out the existing levels of infrastructure provision, where capacity and constraint exists and what might be required in order to support new development. The IDP will be available at the next stage of consultation and will support the Submission Core Strategy.		
Recommendation	No action required		
cspo-389	North West Skelmersdale Owners		
Plan Ref	Policy CS3	Burscough Strategic Development Site	Object
Summary	The CS, if it is to be approved, must demonstrate the viability and accesibility of development. If that fails, the council must refer to where infrastructure already exists. That very clearly is Skelmersdale. (s)		
Response	Comments noted.		
Recommendation	No action.		

cspo-409	Miss Laura Chadburn	
Plan Ref	Policy CS3 Burscough Strategic Development Site	Object
Summary	Object to the Burscough option due to: traffic congestion, lack of infrastructure, pollution, financial incentives reportedly offered to the council, detrimental impact on the value of homes, increased social housing, loss of farmland and wildlife habitat and the early dismissal of the Ormskirk Option. (S)	
Response	<p>With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as "Considerate Constructors". 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the "Have Your Say" leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst "new jobs" is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, "new, high quality business space" (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. "Improved transport" refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough's traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list "improved transport" as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase "improved drainage" refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.</p>	
Recommen- dation	No action.	

cspo-472	Mr Keith Keeley		
Plan Ref	Policy CS3 Burscough Strategic Development Site		Observations
Summary	Concerned that necessary infrastructure improvements are considered and planned in a comprehensive manner and in accordance with Government advice. (s)		
Response	See comments on CSPO Responses 510, 515, 520, 526, 531, 555, 558, 563, 565, 567, 570, 573, 577, 583, 586, 589, 591, 595, 599, 605, 606, 608, 614, 615, 616 and 618 - the attached schedule of comments has been broken down and individual comments attached to the relevant part of the CSPO document. In response to the general concern stated that infrastructure improvements are considered and planned in preparing the Core Strategy in accordance with Government advice, the Council have been undertaking a wide range of work relating to infrastructure planning over recent years, and continue to do so. The combined understanding created by this work has fed into the proposals put forward in the CSPO document, particularly in relation to what can be accommodated within the existing built-up areas of the Borough and the decision to focus the vast majority of new development in Skelmersdale. However, in relation to the options for development on Green Belt, all the options consulted upon, including the non-preferred option, are affected by similar infrastructure constraints - most notably waste water treatment infrastructure and potential highways constraints. Therefore, whichever option is ultimately selected, it will be necessary to improve infrastructure serving Ormskirk and / or Burscough, where possible. Until the Council have settled on the most appropriate Green Belt option, it is difficult to define the precise infrastructure improvements that will be required, and therefore it is difficult to complete a robust IDP to reflect the final proposals. However, where the Council is aware of infrastructure issues affecting the options for Green Belt sites, these have been discussed in either Chapter 4 or Chapter 5 of the CSPO document when discussing the different options / strategic sites and the over-arching spatial strategy. In relation to the need to make explicit the reasoning behind focusing development on Burscough as opposed to Ormskirk, this would only be necessary if the strategic development site at Yew Tree Farm is ultimately pursued in the Core Strategy. At the moment the Council has not made this decision and the whole reason for consulting on 3 options was to gain public input on those 3 options before any final decision is reached. Both Ormskirk and Burscough are similarly constrained and both are Key Service Centres, and both towns would require Green Belt release if they were to be a secondary focus for development after Skelmersdale. In either case the level of development proposed will not be significantly higher than in previous years. The maximum level of development proposed overall in Ormskirk and Burscough under any option is 900 units and 800 units respectively. This can be compared with historic delivery of new housing between 1992-2007 (i.e. an equivalent 15 year period before the housing market downturn) of 702 units and 747 units respectively. In relation to helping local residents to understand complex planning documents such as the Core Strategy, the Council has done all that it can to make the document as accessible as possible and have undertaken a very extensive consultation programme during the 6 week period that has gone well beyond the minimum requirements set out in our SCI and national guidance. Should any local residents and local community groups ever require support and clarification in understanding the CSPO document, or any other planning document, the Council's Officers will always make themselves available to support within the resources available.		
Recommendation	No Action Required relating to the general observation - any action relating to comments in attached schedule will be addressed separately in above CSPO Responses		
cspo-573	Mr Keith Keeley		
Plan Ref	Policy CS3 Burscough Strategic Development Site		Observations
Summary	My concerns largely relate to the potential impacts on infrastructure, and ensuring that any proposed major housing and employment development result in a sustainable and improved Burscough in terms of its infrastructure provision, and in particular transportation, waste water, and community facilities.		
Response	Given that the Council is still effectively consulting on options for the Core Strategy as part of the CSPO document, it was not possible to include all the information referred to in CSPO-573, but this information will be available alongside a Publication / Submission version of the Core Strategy for any strategic sites. At this stage, the Council were seeking the public's views on the concept of the different options for Green Belt release.		
Recommendation	Known infrastructure requirements for strategic sites included in policy.		
cspo-577	Mr Keith Keeley		
Plan Ref	Policy CS3 Burscough Strategic Development Site		Object
Summary	Policy CS3 is unsound as there is no guarantee infrastructure improvements will take place. (s)		
Response	See comments on CSPO Responses 510, 515, 520, 526, 531, 555, 558, 563, 565, 567, 570, 573, 577, 583, 586, 589, 591, 595, 599, 605, 606, 608, 614, 615, 616 and 618 - the attached schedule of comments has been broken down and individual comments attached to the relevant part of the CSPO document.		
Recommendation	No Action Required relating to the general observation - any action relating to comments in attached schedule will be addressed separately in above CSPO Responses		
cspo-583	Mr Keith Keeley		
Plan Ref	Policy CS3 Burscough Strategic Development Site		Object
Summary	Publication of the Preferred Options document have been delayed until the full potential impacts of the development were known and mitigation measures presented in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (s)		
Response	Should any location in Burscough (or elsewhere) be selected for development of a strategic scale and included in the Council's Publication version of the Core Strategy, all such infrastructure details will be provided within that document or the accompanying IDP. The Strategic Development Site at Yew Tree Farm, Burscough would not have been put forward by the Council if all evidence collated to date indicated that infrastructure restraints could not be overcome.		
Recommendation	No Action Required.		

cspo-586	Mr Keith Keeley		
Plan Ref	Policy CS3	Burscough Strategic Development Site	Observations
Summary	The requirement for an SPD should be more explicit. Alternatively, the Policy should require a comprehensive planning application for the whole site which should be accompanied by a detailed masterplan. This would ensure that piecemeal development does not take place.		
Response	Comments Noted. The policy refers to the need for a masterplan and this is considered sufficient for the purposes of the policy in order to ensure a flexible approach depending on the market and timescales for delivery.		
Recommendation	No action.		
<hr/>			
cspo-589	Mr Keith Keeley		
Plan Ref	Policy CS3	Burscough Strategic Development Site	Observations
Summary	The alternatives Option does not include an appraisal of locating development (or part) to the north and west of Burscough Bridge railway station. Why has no consideration been given to possible alternative options which would benefit from and directly contribute towards the provision of the Ormskirk by-pass? No IDP has been published for the strategic site and there is therefore no way that the community can determine that no negative impacts or depletion to the quality of existing infrastructure will result.		
Response	Within the "alternatives" section for each policy, only those alternatives that were seemed realistic were included. Various locations for Green Belt release were considered before narrowing down to the 3 options consulted upon, but most were ruled out as undeliverable for various reasons. Areas to the north and west of Burscough were considered but ruled out on the grounds of impact on the Green Belt (urban sprawl) and highways accessibility / impact on the highway network because these locations had an unsuitable highways access and / or would have added traffic to the A59 to the north of the town centre or directly into the town centre and so would have had a greater impact on congestion in the town centre. A full technical paper will be provided alongside the Publication Draft Core Strategy setting out how the final Green Belt locations for development have been identified, including an explanation of those locations ruled out early on in the process. A larger infrastructure-led option has already been discounted - see response to representation CSPO-520. Policy CS3 is in conformity with Policy CS13, because Policy CS13 goes on to state that "[proposals for development should] contribute towards improvements to existing infrastructure and provision of new infrastructure, as required to support the needs of the development", i.e. if the existing infrastructure is not sufficient to accommodate the proposed development, the new development will be required to provide improvements to infrastructure to ensure that the needs of the development are catered for.		
Recommendation	A Technical Paper has been prepared on selecting the most appropriate location for Green Belt release.		

cspo-634 F. D. Bligh
Plan Ref Policy CS3 Burscough Strategic Development Site

Object

Summary Object to Burscough option (S)

Response I support the attached letter (11 items) in its entirety. Having attended the meeting at Burscough Wharf, organised by the parish council on Monday 20th June I will add my view. With regard to the mounting congestion on our roads, I believe everyone at the meeting was additionally concerned to learn that measurements of air pollution have already exceeded those pronounced acceptable to Brussels and this for three months in the last 12. We understand there has not yet been a proper feasibility study in relation to road capacity. Any sizeable increase in residential and industrial activity will surely exacerbate our existing traffic flow problems. This at a time when Lancashire Constabulary have announced that manpower cuts are coming and that our local part time police station is likely to be sold! I wonder if Mrs Cooper realises how the future security situation looks to us. To me it would seem that all three over stretched emergency services may well find prompt response a mounting concern. Is she totally aware of serious infrastructure problems - eg drainage that obtain at this time! A dire consequence of poor evaluation for additional construction in this area is the loss of agricultural land. This is the nation that came close to being starved to death in the 2nd world war because of Hitler's highly effective U-boat strategy. At that time with a population of 40 million we were nearly 50% self sufficient in food production. I well remember how public parks and playing fields were requisitioned for growing vital food. The Ministry of Food exhorted us to use every inch of available space, even window boxes for this purpose! Can it really be that people, at my level of insignificance, should deem it necessary to remind those paid by us to have responsibility for our welfare that we may be in a very dangerous situation. I refer to the highly volatile state of relations in Europe, Africa, the middle east, Asia etc. The economic climate is jittery to say the least. We are now so reliant on imported food stuffs that concerns about fuel for road transport are probably only secondary! We have all witnessed what happened when the filling stations run short. Do the men and women in Westminster really 'grasp the nettle' about the situation if the supermarkets experience the same sort of problems for a long time! Finally, many of us would like to know who the individuals are who stand to profit from this, who, for example, is Mr Crompton? I am reliably informed that he has purchased a fairly large area of land within the proposed site. There is puzzlement as to why so much land appears to be fallow. Are we, as rate paying residents, entitled to know about the track record/background of people who may well be intricately concerned in the quality of all our future lives and indeed those who will inevitably succeed us? I would like to single out two people who have done something to boost my flagging morale! Mrs Cynthia Dereli was a truly heartening sight at an otherwise dreadfully depressing meeting on Monday night. To know that we have at least one totally reliable representative is cheering. I was also impressed by the patience and courtesy extended to me by Mr Cropper, our Lancashire County Councillor, who phoned me back late on Tuesday evening after a long day because of late meetings etc. I hope that in due course Mrs Cooper will be able to give me some comments about my views and hopefully some hint that she will be doing her best for the huge majority of people in her constituency who rely upon her in stressful times such as this! I would hope that more public discussion, in a more suitable venue, will be arranged. I am well aware that councils, at parish and borough level, are convinced that adequate provision has already been made. As in so many situations where communication is of the essence, we, the public, do not share that opinion. How totally appropriate that even the beloved Victoria football ground is also in the mix. Cromwell's people were very active hereabouts in the 1640s. He was a renowned killjoy and would surely have been gratified to see his legacy lives on. ----- RE: West Lancashire Local Development Framework- Option 1- Burscough I refer to the above and wish to object to the proposed declassification of Green Belt land for the development of both residential and commercial property at the site of Yew Tree Farm, Higgins Lane, Burscough for the following reasons: General Concerns 1. The housing development alone will create thousands of additional vehicle movements per day increasing congestion and pollution on our already congested roads. During the councils exhibition held at Burscough Wharf on the 04/06/2011 one of the planning officials admitted that they had not yet undertaken a traffic review. Therefore, the council appear to be throwing weight behind developments without accurate knowledge as to the likely impact of the same. This development will significantly affect the many residents right to enjoyment of their property and the immediate area to which they live. 2. The council have failed to secure suitable transport infrastructure capable of accommodating the existing nor expected future traffic problems eg bypass and as such the proposed development is flawed. 3. The development would result in significant dust, dirt and noise for the period of the development which is expected to last a number of years. This would significantly affect the quality of residents lives who have chosen to live in a semi rural area adjacent to land thought to have been protected from such developments. 4. There is a rumour that the developer has offered financial incentives to the council well above the average for infrastructure costs. Can you confirm that the choice of development has not yet been driven by financial incentives? 5. A significant development such as this has the very real potential to affect the value of residents homes in the immediate area and may indeed prevent the sale at a reasonable value for many years to come. This is because many potential buyers are expected to wait and purchase a new home rather than purchase an existing home particularly one in which they would be required to endure all the negative effects experience during construction work. This is an unacceptable position to place the community for whom you serve particularly due to the long term timescales involved. In addition to providing generous infrastructure costs to the council is the developer prepared to set aside a compensation fund for payment to the affected residents for both the financial and personal loss?? 6. At least 1/3rd of the housing development will be designated as social housing. Previous experience has shown that contrary to claims that affordable housing would be provided to local residents in reality it would instead be provided to people living outside the immediate area who are already in such housing but would understandably prefer a nice new 'upgrade' in a better area. Burscough has already had more than its fair share of development in recent years so is it not fair that other areas share the burden? 7. The council threw out the Ormskirk option earlier in the year on the grounds that it would increase traffic in Ormskirk and would be built on high quality agricultural land. However, the same arguments apply in respect of the Burscough option. In fact unlike Ormskirk (which has a major road leading away from the proposed site directly to Junction 3 on the M58), traffic from Burscough would be required to travel through built up residential areas to Junction 27 of the M6 via Newburgh on far more unsuitable roads over a longer distance, affect a greater number of people and ultimately cause even more chaos than is currently experienced. Is it not true that the real reason why the Ormskirk option (Alty's Lane/Scarath Hill Lane) was withdrawn is that there was such significant local opposition from local residents living in this affluent area? 8. The land provides a natural break between both residential housing and commercial developments and hence urban sprawl which would be lost should the development proceed. 9. The proposed development site contains good class arable farm land in an area renowned for arable farming. The loss of such valuable land will only serve to limit production for consumption in the local area leading to an increased need to import the same from elsewhere increasing further traffic and pollution. Further, this area of the country has not been subject to the same

effects of climate change as other parts such as the South. Therefore, reducing the production capacities in this area could be viewed as negligent long term. 10. The land offers a natural habitat for wildlife which is currently thriving. The proposed development will result in the reduction of suitable habitats in the area. 11. As a local resident of Burscough I can see no personal benefit to me or my family as a result of this development and only a benefit to those already living outside the immediate area. Should the local council not look after the rights of its local council tax paying residents? Concerns relating to the council's publication entitled "Have Your Say" I have concerns that the council have little real interest in the views of the public evidenced by the following: 1. The Ormskirk option was withdrawn before full public consultation and only partially reintroduced following public pressure. 2. Option 1 (Burscough) states "new jobs" as a benefit of this option only. Surely wherever commercial developments are constructed this would increase the potential (but no guarantee) employment in the relevant area. Further, the increased employment will be proportional to the increase in population and hence overall have a zero impact on the employment prospects of existing residents. 3. Option 1 (Burscough) states "improved transport" as a benefit and yet transport is unlikely to be improved without significant investment eg long awaited bypass, to accommodate the many thousands of additional vehicle movements per day. 4. Option 1 (Burscough) states "improved drainage". This would be an essential requirement as the loss of significant farm land to absorb rain water over this vast area would clearly need to be diverted somewhere. Therefore, this is not a significant benefit and should not be stated as such. 5. Option 1 (Burscough) states "possible traffic congestion" as a weakness. Whereas Non preferred option Ormskirk states "traffic congestion in Ormskirk would be likely to get worse". Surely increased traffic and congestion are likely for both options in which case why not state the same? 6. Non preferred option "Ormskirk" states an extension of Edge Hill University as a benefit but fails to highlight the significance of this employer to the area and that an extension would likely lead to more employment and provide additional accommodation to students relieving local Ormskirk residents of the problems associated with some student behaviour. I trust the district council will give my views your most careful consideration.

Recommendation No action required

cspo-699 Gavin Rattray
 Plan Ref Policy CS3 Burscough Strategic Development Site Object
 Summary In summary I strongly oppose Options 1 and 2 .
 Response Comments noted
 Recommendation No action required

cspo-712 Crompton property developments
 Plan Ref David Crompton Burscough Strategic Development Site Support
 Summary Support for the Burscough Strategic Development Site. (s)
 Response Land considered in Dispersal option in Banks would not be Green Belt, so is not part of the Green Belt study and does not need to be "released" for development in the same way as Green Belt would. The Council can confirm that the plan provided within the CSPO paper for the Burscough Strategic Development Site is only indicative and that the site would be subject to more detailed masterplanning work and public consultation, possibly in the form of an SPD, if it is selected for inclusion in the Publication version of the Core Strategy. To say that no other sites around Burscough or Ormskirk are capable of accommodating this development would be misleading. While the Council considers that there are no other SUITABLE sites around Burscough and Ormskirk that could accommodate this scale of development, there are sites that, technically, are large enough to accommodate a strategic scale of development. Additional benefits put forward by Crompton Property Developments will be considered for inclusion in the Publication Core Strategy, should the Burscough Strategic Development Site be taken forward in the preferred strategy. In relation to highways matters, the evidence provided by Crompton Property Developments will be considered, along with the Council's own highways modelling work and evidence submitted by other parties, in assessing the highways constraints of all the options as part of the Council's deliberations in selecting a preferred location for Green Belt release.
 Recommendation No action required.

cspo-732 Bickerstaffe Trust
 Plan Ref Policy CS3 Burscough Strategic Development Site Object
 Summary Delete policy relating to Burscough Strategic Site and replace with Ormskirk Strategic Site. (S)
 Response The Council will be considering which option to select for Green Belt release and, depending on which option is selected, Policy CS3 may be retained with minor amendments, substantially changed (e.g. to refer to a different site) or may be deleted completely. However, at this time, the council's view is that the non-preferred option for an Ormskirk Strategic Development Site is not appropriate given its impacts on traffic and the Green Belt.
 Recommendation No Action Required

cspo-129	Dr Carol Stott		
Plan Ref	5.4	Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm	Object
Summary	The Burscough and Dispersal options are unacceptable. The Ormskirk or 'non preferred' option is the most suitable. (S)		
Response	Comments noted regarding the merits /disadvantages of each option. This consultation period has provided people with the opportunity to comment on the Ormskirk option. With regard to specific comments made about the Burscough option: - The Council is aware of traffic and infrastructure problems associated with the site. These need to be addressed if the site is to be chosen for development, although it is noted that traffic-related issues apply not just to Burscough. - The proposed park is required to meet deficiencies in open space provision - The new primary school is needed for the site, according to the education provided (Lancashire County Council) - The same Green Belt and agricultural land arguments do not apply equally to all three options: landscape impact and agricultural land grade are lower for the proposed Burscough site than for the non-preferred and the dispersal option sites elsewhere in the Borough. See also response to Rep. 124		
Recommendation	No further action		
cspo-133	D R Gadsby		
Plan Ref	5.4	Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm	Object
Summary	Development will increase traffic congestion, with the development creating significant dust, dirt and noise pollution. Impact on the value of residents homes in the area. Land currently offers natural habitat for wildlife. Land provides a natural break and prevents urban sprawl. Development would be built on good class arable farm land. (S)		
Response	With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as "Considerate Constructors". 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the "Have Your Say" leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst "new jobs" is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, "new, high quality business space" (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. "Improved transport" refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough's traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list "improved transport" as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase "improved drainage" refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.		
Recommendation	No further action		

cspo-134	Mr H C Massie	
Plan Ref	5.4	Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm
		Object
Summary	Object to Burscough Option. Development will increase traffic congestion, and create significant dust, dirt and noise pollution. Impact on the value of residents homes in the area. Land currently offers natural habitat for wildlife. Land provides a natural break and prevents urban sprawl. Development would be built on good class arable farm land. Strategy fails to provide secure suitable transport infrastructure. Concern that the social housing outlined in the residential development will not be allocated local residents. (S)	
Response	<p>With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as ‘‘Considerate Constructors’’. 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the ‘‘Have Your Say’’ leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst ‘‘new jobs’’ is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, ‘‘new, high quality business space’’ (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. ‘‘Improved transport’’ refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough’s traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list ‘‘improved transport’’ as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase ‘‘improved drainage’’ refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.</p>	
Recommendation	No further action	

cspo-135	Mrs Jennifer Currie	Object
Plan Ref	5.4 Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm	
Summary	Development will increase traffic congestion, and create significant dust, dirt and noise pollution. Impact on the value of residents homes in the area. Land currently offers natural habitat for wildlife. Land provides a natural break and prevents urban sprawl. Development would be built on good class arable farm land. Strategy fails to provide secure suitable transport infrastructure. Concern that the social housing outlined in the residential development will not be allocated local residents. (S)	
Response	<p>With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as ‘‘Considerate Constructors’’. 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the ‘‘Have Your Say’’ leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst ‘‘new jobs’’ is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, ‘‘new, high quality business space’’ (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. ‘‘Improved transport’’ refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough’s traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list ‘‘improved transport’’ as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase ‘‘improved drainage’’ refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.</p>	
Recommendation	No further action	

cspo-137	Mr Thomas Rawlinson	Object
Plan Ref	5.4 Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm	
Summary	Development will increase traffic congestion, and create significant dust, dirt and noise pollution. Impact on the value of residents homes in the area. Land currently offers natural habitat for wildlife. Land provides a natural break and prevents urban sprawl. Development would be built on good class arable farm land. Strategy fails to provide secure suitable transport infrastructure. Concern that the social housing outlined in the residential development will not be allocated local residents. (S)	
Response	<p>With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as ‘‘Considerate Constructors’’. 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the ‘‘Have Your Say’’ leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst ‘‘new jobs’’ is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, ‘‘new, high quality business space’’ (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. ‘‘Improved transport’’ refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough’s traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list ‘‘improved transport’’ as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase ‘‘improved drainage’’ refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.</p>	
Recommendation	No further action	

cspo-138	Mr William Davis	Object
Plan Ref	5.4 Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm	
Summary	Development will increase traffic congestion, and create significant dust, dirt and noise pollution. Impact on the value of residents homes in the area. Land currently offers natural habitat for wildlife. Land provides a natural break and prevents urban sprawl. Development would be built on good class arable farm land. Strategy fails to provide secure suitable transport infrastructure. Concern that the social housing outlined in the residential development will not be allocated local residents. (S)	
Response	<p>With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as ‘‘Considerate Constructors’’. 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the ‘‘Have Your Say’’ leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst ‘‘new jobs’’ is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, ‘‘new, high quality business space’’ (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. ‘‘Improved transport’’ refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough’s traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list ‘‘improved transport’’ as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase ‘‘improved drainage’’ refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.</p>	
Recommendation	No further action	

cspo-144	Mrs P Trowler	Object
Plan Ref	5.4 Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm	
Summary	Development will increase traffic congestion, and create significant dust, dirt and noise pollution. Impact on the value of residents homes in the area. Land currently offers natural habitat for wildlife. Land provides a natural break and prevents urban sprawl. Development would be built on good class arable farm land. Strategy fails to provide secure suitable transport infrastructure. Concern that the social housing outlined in the residential development will not be allocated local residents. (S)	
Response	<p>With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as ‘‘Considerate Constructors’’. 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the ‘‘Have Your Say’’ leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst ‘‘new jobs’’ is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, ‘‘new, high quality business space’’ (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. ‘‘Improved transport’’ refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough’s traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list ‘‘improved transport’’ as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase ‘‘improved drainage’’ refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.</p>	
Recommendation	No further action	

cspo-151	Mrs & Mr Glyn & Pat Blackledge		
Plan Ref	5.4	Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm	Object
Summary	Object to Burscough Option. Development will increase traffic congestion, and create significant dust, dirt and noise pollution. Impact on the value of residents homes in the area. Land currently offers natural habitat for wildlife. Land provides a natural break and prevents urban sprawl. Development would be built on good class arable farm land. Strategy fails to provide secure suitable transport infrastructure. Concern that the social housing outlined in the residential development will not be allocated local residents. (S)		
Response	With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as "Considerate Constructors". 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the "Have Your Say" leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst "new jobs" is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, "new, high quality business space" (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. "Improved transport" refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough's traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list "improved transport" as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase "improved drainage" refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.		
Recommendation	No further action		
cspo-152	Mr Philip Carter	Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency	
Plan Ref	5.4	Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm	Support
Summary	Sewerage capacity at the New Lane Waste Water Treatment Works (WWTW) at Burscough is a key issue that must be resolved in advance of any additional development in those areas that drain to it. (S)		
Response	Comments Noted		
Recommendation	No action required		

cspo-156	Mr John Dutton		
Plan Ref	5.4	Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm	Object
Summary	Development will increase traffic congestion, and create significant dust, dirt and noise pollution. Impact on the value of residents homes in the area. Land currently offers natural habitat for wildlife. Land provides a natural break and prevents urban sprawl. Development would be built on good class arable farm land. Strategy fails to provide secure suitable transport infrastructure. Concern that the social housing outlined in the residential development will not be allocated local residents. (S)		
Response	With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as "Considerate Constructors". 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the "Have Your Say" leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst "new jobs" is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, "new, high quality business space" (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. "Improved transport" refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough's traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list "improved transport" as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase "improved drainage" refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.		
Recommendation	No action required		
cspo-161	Ms G O'Neill		
Plan Ref	5.4	Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm	Object
Summary	Objection to development of Yew Tree Farm Site, as it is high quality agricultural land and would have adverse consequences to services, access and transport etc. (S)		
Response	Views noted. It is recognised that there are adverse impacts associated with Yew Tree Farm, and these have been taken into account when determining what are to be the preferred options.		
Recommendation	No further action		
cspo-17	Mr David Thorburn		
Plan Ref	5.4	Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm	Support
Summary	We support Option 1 on your consultation document 2027. (F)		
Response	Noted		
Recommendation	No Action Required		

cspo-175	Mr Mike Williams		
Plan Ref	5.4	Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm	Object
Summary	Objection to development as infrastructure as it currently stands could not cope with more traffic and could lead to serious congestion.(S)		
Response	Comments noted. It is recognised that there are traffic issues associated with the A59 (and other roads in Burscough), and that more development will add to local traffic. If the Yew Tree Farm site is to be developed, it is important to ensure that traffic impacts are mitigated against, and the local highway network improved where necessary to accommodate extra traffic.		
Recommendation	No change		
<hr/>			
cspo-177	Julie Dale		
Plan Ref	5.4	Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm	Object
Summary	The proposed development would permanently alter the rural character of Burscough. The development would destroy many acres of valuable arable land. The proposed development would not provide for any buffer between the site of the Industrial Estate and the surrounding housing. Both options one and two would put significant strains on the existing infrastructure. The A59 and A5209 are particularly vulnerable to congestion The proposed development (both options one and two) would represent a significant incursion into the green belt. (S)		
Response	Comments noted. Housing requirement reflect need (related to demographics, etc), but recent demand has also been taken into account to a small extent. The Ormskirk option is being consulted upon, albeit as a non-preferred option.		
Recommendation	No further action		
<hr/>			
cspo-178	Mrs Doreen Williams		
Plan Ref	5.4	Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm	Object
Summary	Object to proposals to develop at Yew Tree Farm. (S)		
Response	Comments noted. With regard to specific points raised: 1. It is accepted that new infrastructure will be necessary if this site were to go ahead. It is not assumed to go ahead before United Utilities deal with sewerage /drainage capacity for Burscough as a whole. 2. The Council is aware of traffic issues on the A59. Improvements would be necessary to cope with extra traffic if 600 new houses were built. 3. Ormskirk was rejected by Members on account of the degree of its likely negative impacts. 4. The need for housing, plus shortage of suitable non-Green Belt sites, constitute the exceptional circumstances for releasing Green Belt. 5. Noted. 6. Noted. Infrastructure provision should be bound up in a legal agreement to ensure it happens. 7. The "employment uses" will tend to be business class, rather than manufacturing types of industry. 8. All options have pros and cons. It is the degree of pros and cons that have influenced the choice of preferred options.		
Recommendation	No action required.		

cspo-180	Jenny Becksmith	
Plan Ref	5.4	Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm Object
Summary	Development will increase traffic congestion, and create significant dust, dirt and noise pollution. Land currently offers natural habitat for wildlife. Land provides a natural break and prevents urban sprawl. Development would be built on good class arable farm land. Strategy fails to provide secure suitable transport infrastructure. (S)	
Response	<p>With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as "Considerate Constructors". 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the "Have Your Say" leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst "new jobs" is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, "new, high quality business space" (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. "Improved transport" refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough's traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list "improved transport" as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase "improved drainage" refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.</p>	
Recommendation	No further action	

cspo-181	Mrs Linda Crawford	Object
Plan Ref	5.4 Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm	
Summary	Development will increase traffic congestion, and create significant dust, dirt and noise pollution. Impact on the value of residents homes in the area. Land currently offers natural habitat for wildlife. Land provides a natural break and prevents urban sprawl. Development would be built on good class arable farm land. Strategy fails to provide secure suitable transport infrastructure. Concern that the social housing outlined in the residential development will not be allocated local residents. (S)	
Response	<p>With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as ‘‘Considerate Constructors’’. 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the ‘‘Have Your Say’’ leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst ‘‘new jobs’’ is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, ‘‘new, high quality business space’’ (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. ‘‘Improved transport’’ refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough’s traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list ‘‘improved transport’’ as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase ‘‘improved drainage’’ refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.</p>	
Recommendation	No further action	

cspo-182	Mr & Mrs Frank & Beryl Johnson		
Plan Ref	5.4	Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm	Object
Summary	Development will increase traffic congestion, and create significant dust, dirt and noise pollution. Impact on the value of residents homes in the area. Land currently offers natural habitat for wildlife. Land provides a natural break and prevents urban sprawl. Development would be built on good class arable farm land. Strategy fails to provide secure suitable transport infrastructure. Concern that the social housing outlined in the residential development will not be allocated local residents. (S)		
Response	With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as "Considerate Constructors". 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the "Have Your Say" leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst "new jobs" is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, "new, high quality business space" (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. "Improved transport" refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough's traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list "improved transport" as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase "improved drainage" refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.		
Recommendation	No action required		
cspo-22	Mrs Elaine Lea		
Plan Ref	5.4	Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm	Object
Summary	feel the use of green belt land is a total waste when there are brown belt land sites available. The increase in traffic and disruption from this option would be detrimental to the whole of Burscough. (S)		
Response	All suitable land within the built-up areas of the Borough has already been accounted for in setting housing targets and this still leaves a need to deliver 600 homes, which can therefore only be accommodated in the Green Belt. Traffic implications of any proposed development will need to be resolved as much as possible by detailed design of those proposals.		
Recommendation	No Action Required		
cspo-23	LL Lewis		
Plan Ref	5.4	Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm	Support
Summary	My wife and I support preferred option 1 as we believe this will assist the regeneration and viability of Burscough and enable it to become a more independent self supporting centre. (F)		
Response	Noted		
Recommendation	No Action Required		

cspo-24	L Hanshaw		
Plan Ref	5.4	Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm	Object
Summary	We think the Ormskirk non-preferred option would cause major traffic problems. We have an area of woodland next to our house and feel that this should be preserved to protect the animals that live there. Our Preferred Option would be Burscough (S).		
Response	Comments noted - should the non-preferred option be taken forward in the future, detailed proposals to address access, highways impacts and environmental impacts will be considered.		
Recommendation	No Action Required		
cspo-263	Mr B Bennett		
Plan Ref	5.4	Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm	Object
Summary	Object to Burscough option		
Response	Housing targets are based on population projections, unmet need that has not been fulfilled as a result of the slow-down in the market, and household projections which identifies trends in house hold make up. In terms of food supply, ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. All other points noted.		
Recommendation	No action required		
cspo-264	Mr S Garrett		
Plan Ref	5.4	Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm	Object
Summary	Object to Burscough option		
Response	It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. Comments regarding Edge Hill are noted and Policy CS6 specifically addresses some of these issues.		
Recommendation	No action required		
cspo-265	Mr Chris Clandon		
Plan Ref	5.4	Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm	Object
Summary	We object to the Burscough option, due to infrastructure (S)		
Response	1) Comments noted regarding drainage and infrastructure. Development within Burscough is dependent upon waste water infrastructure improvements and this has been identified within the plan. 2) Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3) Comments noted regarding parking. 4) Lancashire County Council Pupil Forecasting have reviewed the Core Strategy proposals and confirm that the local schools have enough capacity to accommodate the majority of the increase in students. An additional 1 form entry class would be required either as a replacement to the existing 1 form entry primary school with increased capacity or through the extension to the existing primary school. This has been identified within the Core Strategy Preferred Options and would need to be delivered through development. 5) Central Lancashire Primary Care Trust has also reviewed the plans and confirms the existing provision would be able to cope with the population increase and that new development would provide an opportunity to upgrade existing health centre facilities in Burscough and improve the standard of provision for the community.		
Recommendation	No action required.		
cspo-269	Mr A Smith		
Plan Ref	5.4	Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm	Object
Summary	Support for Burscough Option.		
Response	Comments regarding support for Burscough noted. Comments relating to the Green Belt study are addressed within the Green Belt Study Consultation Report.		
Recommendation	No action required		
cspo-272	Francis Barnes		
Plan Ref	5.4	Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm	Object
Summary	Infrastructure cannot cope under Burscough option (S)		
Response	Comments noted		
Recommendation	No change		

cspo-279	Sharon Rawsthorne		
Plan Ref	5.4	Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm	Object
Summary	Object to Burscough option on basis of air pollution, traffic congestion, public opinion, infrastructure and the consultation process (S)		
Response	<p>The Council understands concerns relating to air pollution. As part of the process of locating development, traffic congestion is a key concern, particularly given the rural nature of the Borough. Therefore, focusing development on the most sustainable areas of the Borough (the main towns and key settlements) should allow people the opportunity to make sustainable transport choices. Burscough does benefit from 2 rail stations, and although the services that operate from them are not the most frequent, the infrastructure is in place, presenting opportunities to improve the services. Furthermore, as it stands, Ormskirk Town Centre is currently the only designated Air Quality Management Area within the Borough. This was one of the factors considered when the Council recommended the Ormskirk Option should be Non-Preferred. In terms of traffic congestion, this is likely to be an issue regardless of where development is located within the Borough. This is as a result of the rural nature of the Borough which leads to car dependency. Currently further work is being carried out to assess the full impact of traffic on the highways network and to give an indication of mitigation measures that may be implemented to relieve the pressure. Again this is the reason for focusing development on the most sustainable locations which benefit from some form of accessible public transport links. The majority of development coming forward over the next 15 years will be located in Skelmersdale, with the remainder being directed to Ormskirk and Burscough and then a smaller amount to the rural settlements. To choose not to locate any further development within Burscough would be ignoring the needs of future generations and limiting the housing supply which will exacerbate affordability issues. The Council has developed a relationship with United Utilities and through the local planning process has raised the awareness of the issues that currently surround Burscough and Ormskirk in relation to waste water treatment. It is intended to continue to drive this dialogue in order to push West Lancashire up the agenda with United Utilities. However, ultimately it is the responsibility of the utility company to deliver such improvements and the regulatory framework within which they work, requires a degree of certainty before bill payers money can be invested. Comments relating to the consultation process are noted. However, the Non-preferred option has also been presented to the public and comments and views on this option have been welcomed. The only key difference is that the option has been identified by the Council as being non-preferred for the specified reasons. In response to comments relating to the differences between land at Burscough and land at Ormskirk, the parcel identified to the west of Burscough is, according to the Councils evidence, of a lower grade agricultural land and more enclosed by built development (Burscough Industrial Estate) than the Ormskirk option. These reasons, along with the more acute concerns relating to traffic congestion, particularly on Ormskirk Town centre, are why the Council considers the Ormskirk Option to be "non-preferred". Notwithstanding this point, the option has been presented to the public in the same depth as the other options and comments relating to this option have been welcomed.</p>		
Recommendation	No action required		
cspo-287	Mr Simon Bjork		
Plan Ref	5.4	Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm	Object
Summary	Object to the Burscough option and the Disperal Option, both of which involve development in Burscough which is not capable of accommodating any further development. Feels that the non-preferred option has been excluded from the process too early on.		
Response	<p>The Council set out within the latest Core Strategy document which of the proposed options it prefers and why these options are beneficial along with what the negatives may be. However, the non-preferred option has also been included within this public consultation to ensure that the public can express their views regarding the Ormskirk option. In response to the comment that Aughton, Up Holland, Scarisbrick, Parbold and Rufford do not form any part of the options for delivering development in the Borough, this is to ensure the plan focuses on delivering development sustainably. The majority of the Boroughs development requirements are directed towards the most sustainable settlements to ensure the most is made of existing infrastructure and service capacity and that the impact on the environmental constraints of the smaller villages and settlements (including Scarisbrick, Parbold and Rufford) is limited. Aughton and Up Holland are included in the wider settlement areas of Ormskirk and Skelmersdale. Comments relating to the Green Belt study noted. Comments relating to Health and Safety are noted. Planning Policy Guidance 2: Green Belts, sets out five purposes of including land in Green Belt. It is clear that the policy is intended to prevent areas from merging and that this is in relation to towns rather than parcels of land belonging to the same settlement. Furthermore, landscapes are also of importance within PPG2 but this is in relation to the preserving the setting and special character of historical towns rather than "attractive landscapes near to where people live". I would agree that one of the clear purposes of the Green Belt is to protect the countryside from encroachment. However, in line with PPG2, Green Belt boundaries may be altered only when exceptional circumstances exist. The Council considers the need to meet growth targets and deliver development to meet the needs of the existing and future population to be "exceptional". Furthermore, the fact that 91% of the Borough is designated as Green Belt and the actual amount of Green Belt land required is around 0.26% contributes further to the exceptional circumstances. Rather than ignoring the advice within the commissioned studies such as the SHLAA, the Council is acting on the outcomes. The SHLAA identifies available land which will support the delivery of housing for the Borough. It is clear to see that there is not enough available land within the existing settlement boundaries to deliver housing needs for the full length of the plan and so the Council considers it necessary to review other land for delivery purposes including Green Belt. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is currently being finalised with our partners and stakeholders who are responsible for infrastructure provision in the Borough. Any shortfalls in infrastructure capacity are identified within this document which will form the basis of delivery and sit alongside the Local Development Framework. The IDP initially focuses on critical infrastructure such as utilities and roads but it does include an overview of social infrastructure which covers all of the points made in the representation. Through additional development it is expected that contributions too and direct delivery of many community facilities can be achieved. In order to ensure this is the case, some of the known requirements have already been included in Policy CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm.</p>		
Recommendation	No action required		

cspo-308	Chris and Pauline Ambrose		
Plan Ref	5.4	Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm	Object
Summary	Object to Burscough Option. State preference for the non-preferred Ormskirk Option. (S)		
Response	Comments noted. Further work is underway to assess the full impact of traffic and it is proposed that any new development would need to incorporate features to manage surface water flooding as well as a solution to improve the wider problem of flooding.		
Recommendation	No action required		
cspo-309	Mr Steve Thompson		
Plan Ref	5.4	Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm	Object
Summary	Object to Burscough Option due to: 1) Traffic congestion 2) Increased pressure on Burscough Town Centre 3) Increased traffic would create hazards for school children 4) Burscough by-pass required in advance of any new residential development 5) Additional schools needed 6) Increased pressure on Burscough Health Centre 7) Increased demand for parking at the two railways stations 8) No capacity within existing utilities infrastructure 9) Flood risk issues in this part of Burscough 10) Location of proposed park is poorly placed 11) Safety issues due to proximity to Burscough Industrial Estate (S)		
Response	1 - 4) It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough options and further work is currently underway to assess the exact impact of this. At this stage there is no proposal for a Burscough bypass in order to overcome any of the existing or potential traffic impacts of development. However, it is likely that junction improvements could improve the situation. This is subject to the further work being carried out. 5) Policy CS3 does provide for a new primary school. 6) Central Lancashire Primary Care Trust have reviewed the Core Strategy and consider the health centre would be able to support the growing population and may even benefit from some planning contributions through development in order to upgrade the existing facilities. 7) No indication has been provided at this stage as to the amount of additional parking required to support both Burscough stations. 8) There is currently a programme in place to ensure a secure water supply for West Lancashire. However, issues associated with waste water treatment have been identified within the Core Strategy Preferred options Document. 9) According to the Environment Agency flood Risk Maps, Burscough does not suffer from significant risk of flood. However, there are incidents of surface water flooding that we are aware of and this would need to be resolved through any development that is brought forward. 10) The location of any feature is purely indicative at this stage and would be subject to a master planning exercise at a later stage. The exercise would include the community. 11) Through the master planning exercise, a substantial buffer would need to be maintained between the residential and employment uses.		
Recommendation	No action required.		
cspo-310	Laura and Natalie Porter		
Plan Ref	5.4	Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm	Object
Summary	Object to Burscough Option as growth of the village is unnecessary. Traffic congestion and loss of Green Belt are major concern. Preference for Ormskirk non-preferred option.		
Response	The Core Strategy Preferred Options proposes to distribute development needs across the Borough in accordance with land availability, to support strategic objectives such as regeneration of Skelmersdale and meeting local housing need, whilst having an awareness of the environmental limits and infrastructure capacity of the area. It is recognised there is likely to be an increase in traffic regardless of where development goes and work is currently underway to establish what the exact impacts will be. The additional school is indicative and would either be a contribution to the existing primary school to extend from a 1 form entry to a 2 form entry school, or were there is no capacity to extend, replace the existing primary school with a larger one to accommodate the increase in population. It is recognised that development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. Furthermore, the Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered.		
Recommendation	No action required		
cspo-317	Mr Antony Beahan		
Plan Ref	5.4	Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm	Object
Summary	I would like to object to the proposed development of 800+ houses on the greenbelt land at Yew Tree Farm in Burscough. (F)		
Response	Comments noted		
Recommendation	No action required		

cspo-330	M Roughley		
Plan Ref	5.4	Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm	Object
Summary	Concerns over road congestion, unsuitable transport infrastructure, air pollution, unfair financial incentives from developers to the council, the affect of development on the value of residents homes, soical housing, the loss of arable farm land and a habitat for wildlife.		
Response	<p>With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as "Considerate Constructors". 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the "Have Your Say" leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst "new jobs" is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, "new, high quality business space" (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. "Improved transport" refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough's traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list "improved transport" as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase "improved drainage" refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.</p>		
Recommen- dation	No action required		

cspo-336	Anabel Addicott	
Plan Ref	5.4	Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm
		Object
Summary	Concerned about road congestion, the lack of suitable transport infrastructure, air pollution, unfair financial incentives from the developer to the council, development will impact the value of residents homes, social housing, the use of high quality agricultural land for development and impact on the habitat of wildlife.	
Response	<p>With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as "Considerate Constructors". 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the "Have Your Say" leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst "new jobs" is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, "new, high quality business space" (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. "Improved transport" refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough's traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list "improved transport" as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase "improved drainage" refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.</p>	
Recommendation	No action required	

cspo-341	Stephen Mawdsley	Object
Plan Ref	5.4 Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm	
Summary	Concerned over the increased traffic congestion, unsuitable transport infrastructure, air pollution, unfair financial incentives from the developers to the council, developments will affect the value of residents property, social housing, the use of agricultural land for development and a loss of wildlife habitat.	
Response	<p>With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as "Considerate Constructors". 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the "Have Your Say" leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst "new jobs" is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, "new, high quality business space" (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. "Improved transport" refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough's traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list "improved transport" as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase "improved drainage" refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.</p>	
Recommendation	No action required	

cspo-344	Mr. John Robert Stanley	Parish Councillor	
Plan Ref	5.4	Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm	Object
Summary	Concerned over increased road congestion, unsuitable transport infrastructure, air pollution, unfair financial incentives from developers to the council, development impacting the value of residents homes, social housing, the use of agricultural land for development and loss of wildlife habitat.		
Response	<p>With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as "Considerate Constructors". 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the "Have Your Say" leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst "new jobs" is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, "new, high quality business space" (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. "Improved transport" refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough's traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list "improved transport" as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase "improved drainage" refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.</p>		
Recommendation	No action required		
cspo-350	T.P. McVeigh		
Plan Ref	5.4	Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm	Support
Summary	I would fully support 'Option 1' as the last way forward. (F)		
Response	Comments noted		
Recommendation	No action required		
cspo-356	Julie Hotchkiss		
Plan Ref	5.4	Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm	Support
Summary	I support Preferred Option 1 - the development at Yew Tree Farm in Burscough, this seems a good rounded development, with school, shops and park, as well as the new housing. I'd be very interested to know more about the renewable energy network. As we have passed peak oil, we all have to think about on own use, and generation, of energy. I'm very pleased to see such a consideration in the LDF.		
Response	Comments noted and welcomed. More information will be provided regarding renewable energy networks either through master planning exercises which may be carried out on any strategic sites within the final Publication Core Strategy or an additional supplementary planning document designed to guide developers in this area.		
Recommendation	No Action required		

cspo-357	Julie Hotchkiss		
Plan Ref	5.4	Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm	Support
Summary	I support Preferred Option 1 - the development at Yew Tree Farm in Burscough, this seems a good rounded development, with school, shops and park, as well as the new housing. I'd be very interested to know more about the renewable energy network. As we have passed peak oil, we all have to think about on own use, and generation, of energy. I'm very pleased to see such a consideration in the LDF.		
Response	Comments noted and welcomed. More information will be provided regarding renewable energy networks either through master planning exercises which may be carried out on any strategic sites within the final Publication Core Strategy or an additional supplementary planning document designed to guide developers in this area.		
Recommendation	No action required		
cspo-362	Miss Laura Chadburn		
Plan Ref	5.4	Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm	Object
Summary	Object to Burscough option		
Response	<p>With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as "Considerate Constructors". 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the "Have Your Say" leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst "new jobs" is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, "new, high quality business space" (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. "Improved transport" refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough's traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list "improved transport" as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase "improved drainage" refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.</p>		
Recommendation	No action required		
cspo-366	Dr Annemarie Mullin		
Plan Ref	5.4	Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm	Object
Summary	I would like to express my objection to the proposal of West Lancashire Local Development Framework.Option 1 - Burscough I am unhappy that we have not been better informed of the proposals and th council have not taken time to listen to the views of the residents before putting these new developments forward. I have sent a written object to your offices and I will fight with other residents to ensure these developments do NOT go ahead!!! (F)		
Response	Comments noted. The Council makes every effort to consult with residents and has carried out 2 rounds of consultation prior to this one.		
Recommendation	No action required.		

cspo-367	Chris Whitehead		
Plan Ref	5.4	Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm	Object
Summary	The greatest concern with the proposed development however is the impact that it will have on our roads and how our schools and nurseries will cope with the additional demand. There are so many issues with this site I could mention; drainage problems, access problems, air pollution reaching unacceptable levels, resale value of homes dropping massively, sewerage issues, policing challenges, road safety for pedestrians, not to mention the huge traffic problems. (F)		
Response	Whilst the Council sympathises with the concerns of local residents in relation to house prices and views, these issues are considerations outside of the planning system. Concerns regarding traffic congestion have been noted and further work is currently ongoing to assess the full impact. All community infrastructure is planned for within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and any identified needs must be delivered in line with development. Comments noted regarding Ormskirk Option.		
Recommendation	No action required		
cspo-369	Lawrence and Janice McNabb		
Plan Ref	5.4	Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm	Object
Summary	Concerned with traffic congestion, the linking of the houses between Higgins Lane, Liverpool Road South etc. with Burscough Industrial Estate that the proposed developments would bring about, not enough community facilities for more people and drainage and sewerage problems. (S)		
Response	Concerns regarding traffic congestion are noted and further work is currently underway to examine traffic impacts in more detail. Comments regarding Health and Safety are also noted. In the event the Burscough Strategic site is the preferred option then a Master planning exercise would need to be carried out to ensure an appropriate buffer was maintained between conflicting uses. Comments regarding emissions are also noted. Community facilities are planned for through the Infrastructure Delivery plan and where there is a shortfall identified, it would need to be delivered in line with the development. Surface water drainage is a concern of the Council's and United Utilities and would need to be managed and mitigated through the development of any sites within Burscough. Policy CS3 sets out the requirement for any development on the Strategic Site to incorporate measures to address the surface water issues in Burscough.		
Recommendation	No action required		
cspo-373	Mrs J Tennison		
Plan Ref	5.4	Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm	Object
Summary	Object to Burscough site.		
Response	Comments and concerns noted and considered when assessing sites for development.		
Recommendation	No action.		
cspo-38	Mr Lee Richardson		
Plan Ref	5.4	Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm	Object
Summary	I object to the Burscough option. Green Belt needs to be preserved. (S)		
Response	Comments noted. It is intended to develop the Ainscough's Mill site (Junction Lane) whether or not the Yew Tree Farm site is chosen.		
Recommendation	No change.		
cspo-4	Ailsa Bell		
Plan Ref	5.4	Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm	Support
Summary	Supports Burscough Option with the Dispersal Option as Plan B. Non-preferred option unsuitable due to impact on traffic and insufficient infrastructure. (S)		
Response	Noted		
Recommendation	No Action Required		
cspo-403		Wirral to Wyre Team Natural England	
Plan Ref	5.4	Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm	Observations
Summary	We are disappointed that conserving and enhancing biodiversity, landscape, recreation opportunities and access to green spaces has not been included as an integral part of this policy. We'd welcome its revision to include them, especially with reference to development and the new park. This is also an opportunity to include references to green infrastructure (GI) as a broader approach to planned GI to enhance existing opportunities.		
Response	Comments noted, however these requirements are dealt with elsewhere in the plan and it is not considered necessary to repeat this information here. This policy seeks to set out the the main uses that will be located on this site.		
Recommendation	No action required.		

cspo-426	Ms Judith Nelson	English Heritage	
Plan Ref	5.4	Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm	Observations
Summary	CS3 - Neither the policy nor the justification draw attention to the existence of nearby listed buildings and it will be important to assess the importance of the open space behind these buildings to their setting.		
Response	Comments noted and protection of the nearby listed buildings will be covered by the provisions of Policy CS17. As the buildings do not fall within the site it is considered that adding such wording to Policy CS3 is inappropriate.		
Recommendation	No action.		
<hr/>			
cspo-44	Mr Tony McAteer	McAteer Associates Ltd	
Plan Ref	5.4	Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm	Object
Summary	Further consideration should be given to the Alternative Option 1 (i.e. the 'Dispersal' Option), in particular the use of non-Green Belt land in Banks, which has capacity for more than 100 dwellings. (S)		
Response	It is agreed that wherever possible, non-Green Belt land should developed before Green Belt development is contemplated. The Council also accepts that in theory, more than 100 dwellings could be accommodated on non-Green Belt and non-flood risk land within the Banks "area of search". However, the extra impact resulting from significantly more than 100 dwellings on drainage, local services, highways, etc. is considered prohibitive, and an important factor in justifying Green Belt release. It is not accepted that no reason was given for rejecting "Alternative Option 1" : paragraph 7.1.24 gives the reason for rejection as: "this approach, with its lack of control, could lead to unsustainable patterns of development, with attractive samll rural settlements likely to be more popular for developers than the main, most sustainable settlements. Skelmersdale in particular may not attract the levels of investment needed to deliver regeneration."		
Recommendation	No change		
<hr/>			
cspo-446	Mr Roger Bell		
Plan Ref	5.4	Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm	Support
Summary	Support for Burscough but number of issues need to be addressed - including infrastructure, car parking, roads and timing of delivery (S).		
Response	Comments noted. The Council is well aware of all of the issues associated with large scale development where ever it is directed within the Borough, and specifically the issues in Burscough. It is considered that these can genuinely be over come with developer contributions which will be managed carefully.		
Recommendation	No action.		
<hr/>			
cspo-5	Claire Gilby		
Plan Ref	5.4	Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm	Support
Summary	Support for Burscough option. Concerns raised about parking if Edge Hill University expands. (S)		
Response	Opinion noted for Option 1 (Burscough Strategic Development Site). Policy CS6 requires the University to incorporate measures to address traffic impacts and parking issues in any proposals they may put forward for expansion of the existing campus.		
Recommendation	No Action Required		
<hr/>			
cspo-50	Dr David Gallagher		
Plan Ref	5.4	Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm	Support
Summary	I support Option 1 (Burscough). I am totally against the non-preferred option (Ormskirk). (S)		
Response	Comments noted.		
Recommendation	No action required.		

cspo-623	K Hankins		
Plan Ref	5.4	Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm	Object
Summary	Concerned over traffic congestion due to new developments, unsuitable infrastructure which will also add to the traffic congestion, air pollution, an affect on the value of residents homes, social housing and losing valuable agricultural and Green Belt land.		
Response	<p>With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as "Considerate Constructors". 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the "Have Your Say" leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst "new jobs" is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, "new, high quality business space" (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. "Improved transport" refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough's traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list "improved transport" as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase "improved drainage" refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion</p>		
Recommendation	No action required		
cspo-628	Robert J. & K. ADA Travis		
Plan Ref	5.4	Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm	Object
Summary	Concerns over road congestion, the effects on farming and increased flooding and sewage problems.		
Response	<p>Traffic Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. Farming Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. Sewerage The Council is aware of the current capacity issues of the sewerage/waste water network and are working with industry partners United Utilities to identify solutions. This is being done through the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>		
Recommendation	No action		
cspo-65	Mrs Jeannie Pritchard		
Plan Ref	5.4	Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm	Object
Summary	I object to the Burscough option owing to flooding and traffic concerns, the length of time building will take place, and loss of Green Belt. (S).		
Response	Comments noted.		
Recommendation	No action required.		

cspo-654	Ms Judith Nelson	English Heritage	
Plan Ref	5.4	Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm	Observations
Summary	Consideration needed to listed buildings on Liverpool Road South. (S)		
Response	Comments noted, however heritage issues are dealt with elsewhere in the document and it is not considered necessary to repeat these requirements here. Given the proximity to listed buildings on Liverpool Road South, heritage policies will need to be adhered to in any case.		
Recommendation	No action required.		
cspo-664	Mr Simon Artiss	Planning Manager Bellway Homes Ltd	
Plan Ref	5.4	Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm	Observations
Summary	Policy CS3 - we have not assessed in detail the suitability of this site but support its inclusion as part of the housing land offer for the Borough. At 600 units, phasing of development will be a key consideration, especially given current slow sales rates. The infrastructure requirements associated with this scale of development will also dictate phasing and, we consider, will necessitate the need for other Greenfield sites elsewhere.		
Response	Comments noted.		
Recommendation	No action required.		
cspo-67	Michelle Blair		
Plan Ref	5.4	Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm	Object
Summary	I object to the Burscough option for a number of reasons, including impact on traffic, flooding, and on my property from building work. Are there any compelling reasons from a heritage perspective? (S)		
Response	Comments noted. Developer contributions will be required such that no extra flooding will result from the development; in fact, it is intended that existing flooding problems will be significantly reduced through the Core Strategy. With regard to heritage, we do not consider there are any compelling reasons, but if this site is chosen, building must be undertaken in such a way as to not damage existing individual properties.		
Recommendation	No action required.		
cspo-671	Mr C Smith		
Plan Ref	5.4	Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm	Support
Summary	We support the identification of the Burscough Strategic Development Site (SDS) in the Core Strategy, including the overall boundaries identified and the release of this land from the Green Belt. We support the provision of 600 dwellings and 10ha employment land. Whilst we are comfortable with its configuration of land uses identified, we object to the indicated configuration of allocated/safeguarded land, and the phasing implication of this. We consider that our client's land at the south east corner of the overall SDS should be allocated for housing development during the Core Strategy period rather than safeguarded for future development. (f)		
Response	Comments regarding Burscough strategic site and safeguarded land noted.		
Recommendation	No action required		
cspo-68	Mr Daniel Robinson		
Plan Ref	5.4	Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm	Object
Summary	We strongly disagree that any houses should be built on this greenbelt land. We agree with the park and amenities planned; however a secondary school is needed rather than a primary school. We strongly disagree with the position of the roads and accesses on to the already busy A59. There are no provisions for the massive increase of traffic this would create on the A59 which is already extremely busy. No mention of anything to do with healthcare requirements in Burscough. (S)		
Response	Comments noted. With regard to Ainscough's Mill, the Council has taken into account this and other potential development sites in Burscough (e.g. Abbey Lane) when calculating housing requirements. Health facilities have been considered as part of the Burscough site proposals. Feedback from the Primary Care trust is that GPs and the health centre could absorb any population growth from the Burscough site, although they would like to see the existing facilities improved (through a developer contribution). The PCT would not like to see a new, out-of-centre facility. Our discussions with the Education provider (Lancashire County Council) have informed us of the need for only a primary school, not a secondary school.		
Recommendation	No change required.		

cspo-684	Laura Chadburn		
Plan Ref	5.4	Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm	Object
Summary	Concerns over traffic congestion, air pollution, the effect of development on house prices, social housing and the use of agricultural land and Green Belt for development.		
Response	<p>With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as "Considerate Constructors". 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the "Have Your Say" leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst "new jobs" is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, "new, high quality business space" (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. "Improved transport" refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough's traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list "improved transport" as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase "improved drainage" refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.</p>		
Recommendation	No action required		
cspo-685	Christopher Clarke		
Plan Ref	5.4	Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm	Object
Summary	Concerns over traffic congestion, air pollution, the impact of development for people wishing to sell their home, social housing and the use of agricultural land and Green Belt for development.		
Response	Comments noted.		
Recommendation	No action required.		
cspo-687	Lynn Garrett		
Plan Ref	5.4	Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm	Object
Summary	The recent new estates have had a detrimental effect on Burscough by putting pressure on the infrastructure and village life, and you as Councillors have let us down badly by not adhering to the promises made when the plans were put forward. I have no reason to believe that these plans will be any different. In fact the enormity of the plans frightens me, as it will increase the population of Burscough by a massive amount and compromise its village status, and I have no confidence that West Lancs planning dept will put the needs of the people of Burscough as a priority.		
Response	Comments noted		
Recommendation	No action required		

cspo-688	G M Jones		
Plan Ref	5.4	Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm	Object
Summary	Concerned over the use of Green Belt for development, traffic congestion, a decreased value on residents homes, air pollution and increased pressures on services.		
Response	<p>With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as "Considerate Constructors". 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the "Have Your Say" leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst "new jobs" is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, "new, high quality business space" (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. "Improved transport" refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough's traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list "improved transport" as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase "improved drainage" refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.</p>		
Recommendation	No action required		
cspo-69	Mr Carl Gore-Herbert		
Plan Ref	5.4	Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm	Support
Summary	Support for Option 1 - Burscough as its infrastructure would be better suited to the changes suggested. No further dwellings should be allowed in Banks until United Utilities have rectified the sewerage & drainage problems. (S)		
Response	Comments noted. The Council is aware that there are infrastructure issues in Banks.		
Recommendation	No action required.		
cspo-7	Mr Bill Roberts		
Plan Ref	5.4	Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm	Support
Summary	Supports Burscough option. Banks has too many problems with infrastructure. (S)		
Response	Views Noted		
Recommendation	No Action Required		
cspo-701	Ms Gillian Bjork		
Plan Ref	5.4	Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm	Object
Summary	Improve the infrastructure first, preserve our greenbelt land and utilise brown field sites, and then the people of Burscough may be more open to discussion about development.		
Response	Comments noted		
Recommendation	No further action required		

cspo-709	Ms Wendy Whitehead		
Plan Ref	5.4	Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm	Object
Summary	I am writing to voice my concern over the planning proposals that have been put forward for the Yew Tree Farm site in Burscough		
Response	Re Traffic Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. Education From speaking to the Local Education Authority the Council have been informed that school capacity in Burscough is limited and that new developments may go above the existing capacity. For this reason the Burscough strategic site development includes a new school Health Through the Councils Infrastructure Delivery Plan the Council have been liaising with the health authority to ensure that sufficient facilities are in place/ or will be in place to cope with any new development. Infrastructure The Council are aware that there are issues with the the waste water treatment capacity and that any new development in areas such as Burscough will require upgrading the faciities. The Council has been investigating this issue as part of its Infrastructure Delivery Plan and significant development will not take place untill the issue has been resolved. Green Belt The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk.		
Recommendation	No action required		
cspo-71	Mr Mick Forth		
Plan Ref	5.4	Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm	Support
Summary	Preferred Option 1 would be my preferred option based on what it would provide for the local community and it is on a single site. There are problems associated with the other options, especially the non-preferred Ormskirk option. The Sports Village is unnecessary, as Edge Hill facilities can be used by the public. (S)		
Response	Comments noted.		
Recommendation	No change.		
cspo-87	mr john colbourn		
Plan Ref	5.4	Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm	Object
Summary	Objection to Burscough option due to the impact on traffic volumes on the A59 (S)		
Response	Comments noted. It is agreed that traffic issues exist, and need to be addressed / mitigatged against if the Burscough option is chosen.		
Recommendation	No action required.		
cspo-88	Mr Michael Whitfield		
Plan Ref	5.4	Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm	Object
Summary	I oppose any plan to build large numbers of new houses or industrial units in Burscough. Agricultural land - green belt - should be used for food production and not for urban sprawl. The A59 and surrounding roads are too busy already. More houses would mean more congestion, pollution and noise. (F)		
Response	Comments noted. It is agreed that agricultural land should be protected in principle, but given housing requirements and land availability, it is unfortunately necessary to release some agricultural land for development. The grade of agricultural land is one of the factors taken into account when choosing which site to recommend for development.		
Recommendation	No action required.		
cspo-101	Mr David W Cheetham		
Plan Ref	Policy CS4	The Economy and Employment Land	Object
Summary	No employment land in the Green Belt, particularly, south of Skelmersdale. It is too close to the Whitemoss Hazardous Waste Landfill Site		
Response	Comments noted. The 'area of search' is broad, and if a specific site is eventually chosen south of the M58, the precise findings of the Green Belt study, plus the existence of hazardous waste sites, etc. would be taken into account. With regard to the need for the land: Based on past take up rates and future economic projections, along with population projections, a future land take has been calculated for the Core Strategy period. Whilst the intention is to prioritise re-use of existing vacant employment sites or underused sites, it has been calculated that this will not be sufficient to sustain the economy of the Borough up until 2027. To this end, further employment land has been identified within the Green Belt to meet these needs. It is essential that enough employment land is identified in order that West Lancashire does not merely become a residential area for commtters working in other nearby towns and cities. This would be wholly unsustainable and would neglect the future needs of the Borough. The intention is to broaden the economic base in West Lancashire to include specialised industries linked to Edge Hill University and also the Green Economy, as well as building on existing strengths.		
Recommendation	No action.		

cspo-108	Mrs Jackie Liptrott		
Plan Ref	Policy CS4	The Economy and Employment Land	Observations
Summary	Not all strategic decisions are based on evidence. (S)		
Response	The location of new employment land to the south of Skelmersdale has been defined using various sources of evidence. The Green Belt Study identified a site to the north of Skelmersdale which was no longer fulfilling the purpose of the Green Belt, however other factors such as accessibility and sustainability need to be taken into account when selecting sites for future development. The identified area of search for new employment is considered to be sustainable and accessible given its proximity to the M58, proximity to other employment areas and proximity to a local workforce in Skelmersdale and the wider Borough.		
Recommendation	No action.		
cspo-242	Mrs EA Broad	Parish Clerk Lathom South Parish Council	
Plan Ref	Policy CS4	The Economy and Employment Land	Object
Summary	Lathom South Parish Council object to a release of Green Belt for employment land because there is already existing vacant and under-used employment land that will meet the existing need. Future needs cannot be established for certain, it is far more likely that with an ageing population, less employment land will be required. (F)		
Response	Whilst the re-use of vacant or under-used sites is prioritised within the plan, past take-up rates, future economic forecasts and population projections suggest that this will not be sufficient to sustain the economic needs of the Borough up to 2027. For this reason, the Council has identified an area of search which is appropriate for future employment development. Unfortunately, due to limited sites within the existing urban areas this has to be in the Green Belt. However, as previously stated, re-using existing employment sites will be a priority over the plan period.		
Recommendation	No action.		
cspo-591	Mr Keith Keeley		
Plan Ref	Policy CS4	The Economy and Employment Land	Object
Summary	Policy CS4 contains no employment allocations for Ormskirk, the second largest settlement in the Borough. New Development should be spread across the Borough		
Response	Appreciate the comments regarding Ormskirk and that it would be a sustainable location for new development. Ormskirk's primary issue is space for new employment development, without extending into the Green Belt. When assessing which parts of the Green Belt are most suitable for release, land surrounding Ormskirk was generally (apart from the areas identified for possible housing development to the north) considered to be of high quality and therefore it was concluded that the majority of land surrounding the Ormskirk/Aughton urban area should be protected from development over the plan period. That is not to say that smaller sites will not come forward for employment use within the existing urban area, however, large scale employment sites can not realistically be implemented in Ormskirk given the Green Belt constraints and there appears little, if any, opportunity for small-scale employment development within the urban area.		
Recommendation	No action.		
cspo-719	Crompton property developments		
Plan Ref	David Crompton	The Economy and Employment Land	Object
Summary	Object to the emphasis on regenerating/re-using existing employment sites before releasing Green Belt for employment uses. Existing employment areas don't always offer the right type of premises in the right location and therefore there should be some flexibility in allowing Green Belt to come forward so that the market is not artificially constrained. (S)		
Response	The Core Strategy promotes a sustainable approach to the development of new employment uses and this means prioritising existing areas first and ensuring that they are not under-utilised before significant sites are released in the Green Belt. The Council appreciates, however that some development proposals will not be suited to existing employment areas in scale and perhaps nature, therefore although underutilised existing sites remain a priority for future development, the policy should allow for new development on Green Belt and greenfield sites where this is deemed more appropriate and where this will facilitate economic growth.		
Recommendation	Amend policy wording to allow for greater flexibility to allow for the development of Green Belt or greenfield land in some cases, regardless of whether all brownfield land in a particular area has been developed. A strong case will need to be put forward		

cspo-164	Mr Robert Routledge	Director Whitemoss Landfill Limited	
Plan Ref	6.1	Policy Area CS4: The Economy and Employment Land	Object
Summary	I wish to object to the strategic development options identified in the Core Strategy paper on the basis that the identified options unnecessarily constrain the possible larger scale employment development of the south Skelmersdale area of search. Furthermore, it has not been adequately demonstrated that the strategy of dispersing the additional areas of employment land throughout the identified areas in the borough is correct, particularly in view of the acknowledged infrastructure issues which have been identified in the consultation paper. (S)		
Response	It is considered appropriate and sustainable to focus much of the regeneration of existing employment sites and development of new employment uses in Skelmersdale. However, it is also necessary to ensure that new employment development is suitably dispersed to some extent around the Borough. Burscough, for example, has a thriving business community and whilst existing employment sites may be smaller than those in Skelmersdale they still have an important role in terms of the Borough's economy. Such areas must be protected and enhanced in future, rather than neglected. We do appreciate support for the majority of new development to be focused in Skelmersdale, and this is indeed emphasised within the Core Strategy document, however, some employment land must be provided elsewhere in the Borough in appropriate locations.		
Recommendation	No action.		
cspo-202	Mrs Anne-Sophie Bonton	Planning Officer	
Plan Ref	6.1	Policy Area CS4: The Economy and Employment Land	Observations
Summary	Supportive of Policy CS4 and location of employment sites in rural areas, however, concern over transport issues. (s)		
Response	We appreciate the comments regarding traffic congestion and this is something that we have considered throughout the Core Strategy document, in all chapters. When deciding on the location for new development, sites or broad areas have been identified which are considered to be most sustainable in terms of access and public transport provision and this will be further clarified as specific sites are identified within subsequent development plan documents. Accessibility to jobs, particularly to the local population, is a key issue which the Core Strategy and the wider Local Development Framework seeks to address.		
Recommendation	No action.		
cspo-313	IKO Plc		
Plan Ref	6.1	Policy Area CS4: The Economy and Employment Land	Object
Summary	Suggest a less restrictive policy which allows for the release of older employment sites for residential development whilst at the same time allowing businesses to relocate to more suitable modern premises. Suggested wording included. (S)		
Response	Appreciate the thrust of the comments and viability of older existing employment sites is something that the Council is considering within emerging policy. We accept that some of the proposed changes may be helpful, for instance the sentence 'Redevelopment of employment sites for residential or mixed-uses will be supported where this is in the overall interest of economic growth, environmental improvement and housing supply' may be a useful addition. However, we are conscious that the Core Strategy sets out the broad approach to future employment development and we consider that the wording in the draft largely reflects the Council's position as the presumption will remain on protecting existing employment sites unless there is a strong viability case against this.		
Recommendation	Changes to be made to the policy to allow for greater flexibility for the redevelopment of older employment sites for residential uses where they are not part of major existing employment areas or future allocated sites, and where a viability case can be		
cspo-393	North West Skelmersdale Owners		
Plan Ref	6.1	Policy Area CS4: The Economy and Employment Land	Object
Summary	The Council's 'Area of Search' for Green Belt release is flawed. This land is remote from the main urban area, built south of M58. The land offers no long-term defensible boundary other options offer an improved prospect.		
Response	It is considered that the area of employment land to the south of Skelmersdale is appropriate for sustainable economic growth up to 2027. It is accessible in terms of proximity to M58, other significant employment areas and it is close to a sizeable workforce in Skelmersdale and beyond.		
Recommendation	No action.		
cspo-404		Wirral to Wyre Team Natural England	
Plan Ref	6.1	Policy Area CS4: The Economy and Employment Land	Object
Summary	Again, we are disappointed that conserving and enhancing biodiversity, landscape, recreation opportunities and access to green spaces has not been included as part of this policy. We'd welcome its revision to include them, especially with reference to the role of any development in planning networks of greenspace, along with the provision of such links where they can be used for sustainable transport networks. A further opportunity to include references to green infrastructure (GI) as a broader approach to planned GI to enhance existing opportunities and contribute to sustainable development. (f)		
Response	Green infrastructure, landscape and bio-diversity is dealt with through a separate policy and applies to the whole Borough, where appropriate. This reference is not considered necessary within Policy CS4.		
Recommendation	No action.		

cspo-420	Philip Rothwell	Senior Development Planning Manager Peel Holdings (Management) Limited	
Plan Ref	6.1	Policy Area CS4: The Economy and Employment Land	Observations
Summary	Peel would like the Council to reconsider its new employment allocations and distribution as stated in Policy CS4. Peel believes that the expansion of Simonswood Employment Area to include the 21 ha south of Stopgate Lane would help the Council meet its objectives as stated in the Core Strategy without the need to use Green Belt.		
Response	The Council does not consider that further employment development at Simonswood is a sustainable approach. Simonswood is not the most accessible area in the Borough being at the southern most point. Indeed, it is relatively close to the motorway network but, given its proximity to Kirkby it is likely to serve the population of Knowsley more than those from West Lancashire. Simonswood does not have adequate services or population to support major employment growth.		
Recommendation	No action.		
cspo-580	Mr Alan Hubbard	Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust	
Plan Ref	6.1	Policy Area CS4: The Economy and Employment Land	Support
Summary	Generally the approach to Employment Land as set out in this Policy is supported. (S)		
Response	Support approach to so response.		
Recommendation	No action.		
cspo-581	Mrs Margaret Wiltshire	Planning Volunteer, Treasurer CPRE (West Lancs Group)	
Plan Ref	6.1	Policy Area CS4: The Economy and Employment Land	Observations
Summary	We trust you will not work to encourage general B8 distribution industries to your new employment sites unless they are related to local agriculture and horticulture functions. They take up a huge area but produce few jobs along with large vehicles which often prove a problem to residents and other traffic. (F)		
Response	The Core Strategy seeks to promote a suitable mix of employment functions and B8 distribution units are likely to fall within this mix. We are however aware of the implications in terms of low ratio of employees to size of unit and also the traffic implications associated with distribution. The intention of the Core Strategy is to broaden the economic base of the Borough, to increase the number of offices and start up units for higher tech industries and also to develop green technologies where possible.		
Recommendation	No action.		
cspo-714	Ms Margaret Gregory		
Plan Ref	6.1	Policy Area CS4: The Economy and Employment Land	Object
Summary	With regards to the provision of land to encourage business start-ups and address employment needs; surely the focus should be on re-using, in different more economically viable ways, the units which have become available due to the recent economic downturn. Encouragement in the short term for different types of business ventures and room for expansion when necessary rather than a long term vision which might never be realised. (F)		
Response	The Core Strategy prioritises the re-use of vacant or under utilised sites before new employment sites are developed, where this is appropriate. However, we have to be careful not to restrict the potential of the Borough's economy by not providing adequate and appropriate additional land for new businesses.		
Recommendation	No action.		
cspo-114		HENRY ALTY LTD	
Plan Ref	Policy CS5	The Rural Economy	Support with conditions
Summary	Support for pragmatic approach to regeneration of specified rural employment sites. Development Brief proposed for Alty's Brickworks to identify future development aims.(S)		
Response	Agree that a Development Brief for Alty's Brickworks would assist implementation. This is not the role of the Core Strategy, however, and would need to be worked up by the land owner / developer in consultation with the Council at a later date.		
Recommendation	No action for Core Strategy. Investigate Development Brief, maybe for SADPD.		
cspo-173	Mr Martyn Coy	Planner British Waterways	
Plan Ref	Policy CS5	The Rural Economy	Support with conditions
Summary	Should be recognised that it is not always possible to locate waterway related functions adjacent to waterways. Essential to the rural economy. (S)		
Response	Points considered.		
Recommendation	No action.		

cspo-521	Mr Richard Percy	Steven Abbott Associates	
Plan Ref	Policy CS5	The Rural Economy	Observations
Summary	In summary, it is hoped that the eventual Core Strategy policy on the rural economy will be written to recognise that Green Belt restrictions may sometimes be relaxed when the economic arguments are sufficiently well made. Perhaps more importantly, these policies should be interpreted and operated in development management decisions to encourage the rural economy and not to apply what can be the dead hand of Green Belt restrictions.		
Response	Comments on the rural economy and role of the Green Belt noted and support for draft Policy CS5 also noted. It is the intention that the emerging policy will allow some flexibility to the rural economy and whilst the importance of the Green Belt is appreciated, so too is the importance of West Lancashire's successful rural economy and this must continue to be supported as a priority within the new planning policy framework.		
Recommendation	No action required.		
cspo-15	Mr P Kitchen		
Plan Ref	6.2	Policy Area CS5: The Rural Economy	Observations
Summary	Object to release of green belt as it should be being protected for agricultural uses. (S)		
Response	The use of Green Belt land is unavoidable in order to provide necessary levels of housing for the plan period, up to 2027. The options presented in the Core Strategy Preferred Options paper already takes account of all possible brownfield sites which could accommodate residential development within the existing urban areas. Additional land for housing is still required over and above this. It is important to remember that the Green Belt within West Lancashire was protected in 1987 for a period of 15-20 years, after which time a review of its protection was considered likely. 24 years have now passed since this designation and we are in a position whereby 4,500 dwellings must be provided by 2027 in order to avoid a major housing shortage in the Borough. This will unfortunately require some Green Belt land, though it will be carefully managed to ensure that any Green Belt release for housing development will be of lower agricultural value and that development of such areas will be towards the latter part of the plan period (2020 and beyond) after brownfield sites have been developed.		
Recommendation	No action.		
cspo-315	IKO Plc		
Plan Ref	6.2	Policy Area CS5: The Rural Economy	Object
Summary	Policy should be amended to facilitate the redevelopment of older or redundant employment sites for mixed uses or residential development. Suggested wording included. (S)		
Response	Agree that the proposed policy wording makes this more flexible and allows for greater rural regeneration. However, we must ensure that sites are not lost to other uses where there is continued demand for them as an employment site. A robust viability case will need to be put forward and these requirements will be dealt with as a separate Development Management policy.		
Recommendation	To amend wording to read: Employment opportunities in the rural areas of the Borough are limited, and therefore the Council will protect the continued employment use of existing employment sites. This could include any type of employment use and may not be		
cspo-405		Wirral to Wyre Team Natural England	
Plan Ref	6.2	Policy Area CS5: The Rural Economy	Object
Summary	We are disappointed that the role of the natural environment to the rural economy has not been acknowledged. We signpost you to the work of Natural England's work on the Natural Economy: http://www.naturaleconomynorthwest.co.uk/ Natural Economy North West's work has been both timely and essential. It has helped to place the natural environment and its natural services at the heart of current thinking about sustainable economic development, quality of life and quality of place in the North West.		
Response	We appreciate the importance of the natural environment to the Borough's economy and take the point of this representation.		
Recommendation	To add reference to the importance of the natural economy within CS5, linking it to tourism within the penultimate paragraph.		
cspo-427	Ms Judith Nelson	English Heritage	
Plan Ref	6.2	Policy Area CS5: The Rural Economy	Observations
Summary	CS5 This policy should also address the future of traditional farm buildings, taking a flexible approach to their sensitive adaptation and re-use. The document list could usefully refer to the English Heritage guidance The Conversion of Traditional Farm Buildings: a guide to good practice as well as PPS5. (F)		
Response	Policy CS5 refers to the sustainable diversification of farms for a wide variety of purposes and this will be encouraged, however it is considered necessary, in the interest of protecting the rural economy, that existing farm buildings will only be considered for residential re-use where it meets a specific local need and where it can be demonstrated that the building is inherently suitable for any other use. We consider that this is the best approach to protecting the rural economy, whilst at the same time allowing for some appropriate conversion to other uses where a robust case can be put forward. We note the point about the good practice guide and PPS5 and these will be referenced in the document list in support of the provisions within this policy.		
Recommendation	To add reference to the English Heritage guidance The Conversion of Traditional Farm Buildings: a guide to good practice as well as PPS5. This can be added within the supporting documents list.		

cspo-54		Church Commissioners For England		
Plan Ref	6.2	Policy Area CS5: The Rural Economy		Support with conditions
Summary	conversion of traditional unused farm buildings should be a key issue for the Council. In addition, the Core Strategy needs to address rural regeneration, especially for settlements which do not rank highly within the proposed settlement hierarchy. (S)			
Response	Agree with the general thrust of comments made and the Core Strategy Preferred Options broadly supports them. The Core Strategy sets out the vision and strategy for how we want West Lancashire to develop up to 2027. Specific development control issues regarding the conversion of derelict former farm buildings will be dealt with within subsequent DPDs. The importance of protecting the rural economy and surrounding communities is identified within the Core Strategy.			
Recommendation	No action.			
cspo-582		Mr Alan Hubbard	Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust	
Plan Ref	6.2	Policy Area CS5: The Rural Economy		Observations
Summary	The importance of the tourism economy is not emphasised within CS5 policy. A separate tourism policy would be useful. The policy should be amended to reflect the role of heritage within the tourism and visitor economies and to reflect the potential importance to the tourism and visitor economy of the Ribble Coast and Wetlands Regional Park (which encompasses the heritage features referred to above as well as a range of important natural assets). The Park is referred to in the text but with the incorrect name of Ribble Estuary Regional Park. Amended policy wording suggested. (S)			
Response	Appreciate the emphasis on heritage assets and their contribution to the rural economy, in addition to natural assets. The policy will be amended as suggested above.			
Recommendation	Amend policy wording as suggested and change name of Ribble Coast and Wetlands Regional Park on page 74.			
cspo-656		Ms Judith Nelson	English Heritage	
Plan Ref	6.2	Policy Area CS5: The Rural Economy		Observations
Summary	This policy should also address the future of traditional farm buildings, taking a flexible approach to their sensitive adaptation and re-use. The document list could usually refer to the English Heritage guidance The Conversion of Traditional Farm Buildings: a guide to good practice as well as PPS5. (F)			
Response	See CSPO_427 - repeated rep.			
Recommendation	See CSPO_427 - repeated rep.			
cspo-757		Paul Cotterill		
Plan Ref	6.2	Policy Area CS5: The Rural Economy		Object
Summary	The LDF does not offer enough support for the rural economy			
Response	Comments noted. Proposed Policy CS5 seeks to promote the rural economy, albeit in line with the wider national policy agenda, in order to allow the rural economy to prosper and diversify where appropriate. The policy specifically refers to employment, residential and community uses being suitable within rural areas, particularly those which are linked to the agricultural use of land - small and related retail functions of this nature would therefore likely be deemed appropriate. Restrictions must be imposed, however, for larger scale retail uses in such rural areas, which would contravene national policy in relation to sustainable development. It is important that aspirations for broadband internet remain part of the policy in order to improve such facilities in rural areas.			
Recommendation	No action.			
cspo-113		Mr Richard Chambers		
Plan Ref	Policy CS6	Edge Hill University		Object
Summary	I object to the expansion of the Edge Hill campus into green Belt. I am against the use of Green Belt in any context. I wish to preserve the unique nature of Ormskirk as an attractive Market Town in an agricultural setting. (S)			
Response	Comments noted. At the time of the 2005 Local Plan Inquiry, the Council considered Edge Hill had not made a robust case for the need for expansion onto Green Belt land. Since then, the Council has accepted that the University does have a robust case for needing to expand. Any removal of land from the Green Belt must be justified by "every exceptional circumstances" and the Core Strategy Preferred Options Paper proposes that the need to begin to resolve any student accommodation, highways and car parking impacts caused by Edge Hill University constitutes those very exceptional circumstances.			
Recommendation	No further action			

cspo-121	Mr G Leather		
Plan Ref	Policy CS6	Edge Hill University	Object
Summary	Objection to the expansion of Edge Hill into the Green Belt and also housing in the Green Belt. Particular concern for the Green Belt bounded by Ruff Lane, St Helens and Scarth Hill Lane. Opposed to the 'sprawl' of Edge Hill University. (S)		
Response	Edge Hill University is a major contributor to the Borough's economy, to the tune of approximately £60m. Whilst we appreciate the concerns of local residents in terms of student accommodation and services taking over the town, the Council must try to deliver a strategy which meets the needs of all local stakeholders. By identifying a limited area for expansion in the Green Belt over a 15 year period (10 ha of expansion land), the Council will not only have a greater say on the scale of future development but can also request that a greater amount of student facilities, such as new accommodation, can be provided on campus. The other alternative is that we do not provide such a policy in the Core Strategy and then expose ourselves to future applications from the University which we then cannot refuse, which could potentially have wider negative impacts on the surrounding Green Belt.		
Recommendation	No action.		
cspo-249	Mr Paul W		
Plan Ref	Policy CS6	Edge Hill University	Support
Summary	Edge Hill Uni should collaborate and develop with Ormskirk. (S)		
Response	No comments - support.		
Recommendation	No action.		
cspo-256	Mr Francis Williams	member Ormskirk Friends of the Earth	
Plan Ref	Policy CS6	Edge Hill University	Observations
Summary	We look to continued uncertainty in the HE sector, and counsel caution in considering demands on adjacent land placed by the University. (S)		
Response	Concerns in relation to the future of Edge Hill University are noted and indeed it remains unknown how student numbers will fair in the immediate future. The Core Strategy does, however, need to deal with development up to 2027 and in this time it is expected that the University will need some additional land, even if student numbers stay broadly the same. All of the options presented in the Core Stratgy allow for 10ha of expansion land at Edge Hill. It is considered that this will allow for managed and minimal levels of expansion into the Green Belt. The other alternative is that we do not provide such a policy in the Core Strategy and then expose ourselves to future applications from the University which we then cannot refuse, which could potentially have wider negative impacts on the surrounding Green Belt. Lastly, the University is a major contributor to the Borough's economy and the Council seeks to support its future plans, whilst attempting to reduce any detrimental impact on local people.		
Recommendation	No action.		
cspo-323	Edge Hill Universtiy	Edge Hill University	
Plan Ref	University	Edge Hill University	Support with conditions
Summary	Overall support with some recommended changes to wording including additional clarification.		
Response	Points noted and agree broadly with the proposed minor changes to policy wording. Clarification within the supporting text also noted.		
Recommendation	Policy wording to be amended, along with clarification points raised within supporting text (as above).		
cspo-469	Mr Edward Hunt		
Plan Ref	Policy CS6	Edge Hill University	Object
Summary	I wish to object to the proposed extension of Edge Hill into the green belt area up to Scarth Hill Lane and Ruff Lane. A market town is being changed into a University town without notice being taken of the Ormskirk population wishes. (F)		
Response	The Core Strategy Preferred Option document is not suggesting built development up to Scarth Hill Lane and Ruff Lane. The plan which shows a new university sports facility up to Scarth Hill Lane, which would remain in the Green Belt, is the Council's non-preferred option for Green Belt release as it is considered to be the least sustainable of all the Green Belt options. A 10ha expansion site for Edge Hill is identified within all of the options, however, this 'area of search' sits alongside the existing built up area and does not reach as far as Scarth Hill Lane. By identifying a small area for expansion of the built part of the University campus, the Council can manage the level of development on this site and request facilities such as student accommodation on campus, thereby reducing some negative impacts on the town of Ormskirk. The alternative is that we do not allow for any expansion into the Green Belt within the Core Strategy and this way the Council is opening itself up to unmanaged growth at the University and the potential receipt of planning applications which it may not be able to refuse. This could lead to more development and a greater impact on the Green Belt.		
Recommendation	No action.		

cspo-501	Mr Brian Marsh		
Plan Ref	Policy CS6	Edge Hill University	Object
Summary	I object most strongly to the release of 10 hectares (25 acres) of land to the east of Edge Hill University. This is an unnecessary and excessive release of green belt land. E.H.U. must be told to be more flexible in its views on where to expand its facilities e.g. elsewhere in the borough of Liverpool. The future of higher education is very uncertain in the current economic time and this massive release of land seems unnecessary and very premature.		
Response	Whilst we appreciate the concerns regarding expansion land at Edge Hill University, the Core Strategy has to consider development over the next 15 year period up to 2027. We have been working closely with the University to ascertain details on predicted student numbers over this period. Whilst it is difficult to be precise with the current changing nature of the Higher Education sector, the University considers that even without growth in student numbers further development will be required to ensure it has the facilities it requires on campus to operate efficiently and improve its offer. For example, some of this additional land is likely to be developed for on-campus student accommodation, relieving pressure on housing in Ormskirk more generally. If we do not allocate some land for Green Belt release in order to ensure a managed approach to development at Edge Hill University, we may open the area up to more significant development in the Green Belt as the Council could be challenged on the refusal of any broader planning applications for not allowing for some development within the adopted development plan. This could have significant detrimental impacts on the Green Belt and is something we want to avoid by agreeing an approach upfront with the University.		
Recommendation	No action.		
cspo-595	Mr Keith Keeley		
Plan Ref	Policy CS6	Edge Hill University	Object
Summary	Alternative sites for a satellite campus should be considered across the district and possibly Southport to spread economic benefits across the Borough. (S)		
Response	Edge Hill promotes itself as a single campus University and this is embedded in its approach to Higher Education which distinguishes it from the other mainly city centre universities. Whilst this is an option that has been considered, it is felt that with minimal development into the Green Belt, the University's needs can be accommodated for the foreseeable future. Regardless of this, the Core Strategy seeks to spread the benefits of having this major institution in Ormskirk throughout the remainder of the Borough. This is to be achieved by linking the University with growing employment sectors and providing more jobs generally within the Borough either through directly working for the University, or working within one of the key service areas which has developed as a result of the University.		
Recommendation	No action.		
cspo-697	Mr L McFarlane		
Plan Ref	Policy CS6	Edge Hill University	Object
Summary	Objections raised to Edge Hill University's expansion and to development on Green Belt (S)		
Response	We appreciate the comments and concerns about the expansion plans and indeed the Council operates in order to achieve a common ground for all stakeholders and needs to balance the benefits of the University with the loss of open Green Belt. Edge Hill University is a major contributor to the Borough's economy, contributing in excess of £60 million per year and therefore is a major consideration in terms of the Core Strategy going forward. However, we agree that the town of Ormskirk should not be 'consumed' by the University and we consider that the best approach is to allow for small-scale managed growth within the Core Strategy document. The Core Strategy covers a 15 year period until 2027 and must plan for requirements within this time. The University has undergone a major redevelopment programme over the last 10 years in order to make better use of existing space, however it has identified that even without growth in student numbers a small amount of additional land will be required up to 2027 in order for the University to operate most effectively. One potential use for the additional land is to provide more on-campus student accommodation, thereby relieving some of the existing pressures on the Ormskirk housing market. The alternative to allowing for some small-scale expansion in the Core Strategy is to not provide for any and then open ourselves up to criticism, challenge and the risk of receiving planning applications for larger scale development in the Green Belt which we may not be able to refuse. The approach adopted is therefore considered to be the best way to manage and limit development at the University and wider impacts on the town, whilst ensuring that it continues to be a major contributor to the local economy. It is intended that any expansion plans will also need to provide necessary infrastructure to alleviate traffic problems.		
Recommendation	No action.		
cspo-85	Mr Ian Yates		
Plan Ref	Policy CS6	Edge Hill University	Object
Summary	I oppose the proposal that we should allow Edge Hill to develop into the Green Belt. (S)		
Response	We consider that the approach identified in the Core Strategy is the best means of ensuring a managed approach to the growth of the University. By identifying a limited area for expansion over a 15 year period (10 ha of expansion land), the Council will not only have a greater say on the scale of future development but can also request that a greater amount of student facilities, such as new accommodation, can be provided on campus. Without this provision, the Council will have no policy on which to refuse future planning applications that the University may submit and could be exposed to much bigger expansion plans with a much greater impact on the surrounding Green Belt.		
Recommendation	No action.		

cspo-11	Mrs Amanda Boulton		
Plan Ref	6.3	Policy Area CS6: Edge Hill University	Support
Summary	The University is our areas best asset and offers local residents access to leisure and entertainment as well as training professionals who often stay and work around the West Lancashire area. We should be proud of having such an asset within West Lancashire and help it to continue to grow.		
Response	Comments Noted.		
Recommendation	No action.		
cspo-111	Mrs Jackie Liptrott		
Plan Ref	6.3	Policy Area CS6: Edge Hill University	Support
Summary	Since Edge Hill University underpins much of the economy in Ormskirk its development should be encouraged. This would alleviate pressure on housing in the area, increase employment opportunities and disperse traffic. (S)		
Response	Comments noted.		
Recommendation	No action.		
cspo-120	Mr Steve Mansell		
Plan Ref	6.3	Policy Area CS6: Edge Hill University	Object
Summary	Totally against: 1. Increase in housing by 600 dwellings 2. Increase in student numbers 3 Destruction of Green belt for profit I wish to remain in Ormskirk and bring up my young family here for many years but feel people will be driven away if it becomes a soulless ghost town of a place. A bypass is needed. (S)		
Response	Much of the above comment is in relation to the Green Belt options - comments noted. However, in relation to the comments on Edge Hill University, which it is stated should not be allowed to expand, the response is as follows: Edge Hill University is a major contributor to the Borough's economy, to the tune of approximately £60m. Whilst we appreciate the concerns of local residents in terms of student accommodation and services taking over the town, the Council must try to deliver a strategy which meets the needs of all local stakeholders. By identifying a limited area for expansion over a 15 year period (10 ha of expansion land), the Council will not only have a greater say on the scale of future development but can also request that a greater amount of student facilities, such as new accommodation, can be provided on campus.		
Recommendation	No action.		
cspo-136	mr steven hopkin		
Plan Ref	6.3	Policy Area CS6: Edge Hill University	Object
Summary	Further expansion will have such a negative impact on the real tax paying people living in Ormskirk in many, many ways. NO to build upon GREEN BELT. It's outrageous to even consider this. (S)		
Response	Edge Hill University is a major contributor to the Borough's economy, to the tune of approximately £60m, and the Council seeks to support its future plans, whilst attempting to reduce any detrimental impact on local people. Concerns in relation to the future of Edge Hill University are noted and indeed it remains unknown how student numbers will fair in the immediate future. The Core Strategy does, however, need to deal with development up to 2027 and in this time it is expected that the University will need some additional land, even if student numbers stay broadly the same. It is considered that the area of land identified within the draft Core Strategy will allow for managed and minimal levels of expansion into the Green Belt. The other alternative is that we do not provide such a policy in the Core Strategy and then expose ourselves to future applications from the University which we then cannot refuse, which could potentially have wider negative impacts on the surrounding Green Belt.		
Recommendation	No action.		

cspo-172	Mr Gerard Latham		
Plan Ref	6.3	Policy Area CS6: Edge Hill University	Object
Summary	Firstly, EHU must accept that enough is enough - the vast majority of Ormskirk residents have become weary of its endless, obdurate 'expansion' saga. Secondly, the Council should close the door on any expansion by EHU into green belt, before it is too late, and insist that EHU make more intensive use of existing facilities.		
Response	Edge Hill University is a major contributor to the Borough's economy, to the tune of approximately £60m, and the Council seeks to support its future plans, whilst attempting to reduce any detrimental impact on local people. Concerns in relation to the future of Edge Hill University are noted and indeed it remains unknown how student numbers will fair in the immediate future. The Core Strategy does, however, need to deal with development up to 2027 and in this time it is expected that the University will need some additional land, even if student numbers stay broadly the same. It is considered that the area of land identified within the draft Core Strategy will allow for managed and minimal levels of expansion into the Green Belt. The other alternative is that we do not provide such a policy in the Core Strategy and then expose ourselves to future applications from the University which we then cannot refuse, which could potentially have wider negative impacts on the surrounding Green Belt. The Draft Green Belt Study which identifies land bounded by Ruff Lane and St Helens Road and adjacent to Edge Hill as ORM.07 is an evidence base document and not a policy document. What this means is that the study was carried out in order to inform planning policy which will be developed through the Local Development Framework process. The important difference is that what is identified within the evidence base may not in all circumstances be carried through as policy and ultimately, the Green Belt Study itself cannot remove land from the Green Belt. It is the Core Strategy which identifies areas of land to be removed from Green Belt and within the latest version, the Core Strategy Preferred Options Paper, the proposals do not propose to remove the whole of the parcel of land known as ORM.07 from the Green Belt. The proposal is for a much smaller area of land (10ha) within the parcel that is directly adjacent to the existing Green Belt boundary. Furthermore, any removal of land from the Green Belt must still be justified by 'every exceptional circumstances' and the Core Strategy Preferred Options Paper proposes that the need to begin to resolve any student accommodation, highways and car parking impacts caused by Edge Hill University constitutes those very exceptional circumstances. In relation to space utilisation, the University has been through a programme of redeveloping and improving its existing campus as part of the University's estates strategy. Whilst this is still being completed to improve utilisation of the campus, it is considered by the university that a further 10ha of land will be required up until 2027 regardless of changes in student numbers.		
Recommendation	No action.		
cspo-195	Mrs EA Broad	Parish Clerk Lathom South Parish Council	
Plan Ref	6.3	Policy Area CS6: Edge Hill University	Object
Summary	The Parish Council object to the proposal to remove from Green Belt all of the land up to Scarth Hill Lane owned by Edge Hill. It would be better for West Lancashire if any expansion of the university is accommodated in the Skelmersdale area. This would stop the current policy of concentrating higher educational opportunities and consequently better quality employment in Ormskirk and creating a 'them and us' scenario. It would also relieve the traffic issues around the university. (S)		
Response	The reference to an area of housing fronting Ruff Lane is taken from the Ormskirk 'non-preferred' option for development in the Green Belt. The Council has identified this as a non-preferred option due to traffic and sustainability issues and also due to the value of the Green Belt in this area, particularly land around Alty's Lane. This means that at the current time the Council does not wish to pursue this option. Edge Hill University is a major contributor to the Borough's economy, to the tune of approximately £60m, and the Council seeks to support its future plans, whilst attempting to reduce any detrimental impact on local people. The Core Strategy does, however, need to deal with development up to 2027 and in this time it is expected that the University will need some additional land, even if student numbers stay broadly the same. It is considered that the area of land identified within the draft Core Strategy will allow for managed and minimal levels of expansion into the Green Belt. The other alternative is that we do not provide such a policy in the Core Strategy and then expose ourselves to future applications from the University which we then cannot refuse, which could potentially have wider negative impacts on the surrounding Green Belt. The Core Strategy sets broad policy themes and identifies 'areas of search' for particular uses. Land allocations are indeed not fixed until a later stage. Whilst the idea of locating some of the University facilities in Skelmersdale has much merit, the University are opposed to such a course of action.		
Recommendation	No action.		
cspo-212	Mr Paul Greenwood		
Plan Ref	6.3	Policy Area CS6: Edge Hill University	Support
Summary	I strongly support the further expansion of Edge Hill and all the financial, employment and community engagement benefits that it will bring (S)		
Response	No comments - support.		
Recommendation	No action.		
cspo-215	Mr Gareth Lougher		
Plan Ref	6.3	Policy Area CS6: Edge Hill University	Support
Summary	Allow each application to encroach into Green Belt areas to be judge on the merits of the application. (s) Allowing Edge Hill to prosper and continue to progress will enable Ormskirk and the borough to gain the benefits of a University town.		
Response	No comments - support.		
Recommendation	No action.		

cspo-275	Sue Evans		
Plan Ref	6.3	Policy Area CS6: Edge Hill University	Observations
Summary	Further expansion of the university into the green belt should be abandoned until future trends can be more easily predicted. (S)		
Response	Concerns in relation to the future of Edge Hill University are noted and indeed it remains unknown how student numbers will fair in the immediate future. The Core Strategy does, however, need to deal with development up to 2027 and in this time it is expected that the University will need some additional land, even if student numbers stay broadly the same. All of the options presented in the Core Stratgy allow for 10ha of expansion land at Edge Hill. It is considered that this will allow for managed and minimal levels of expansion into the Green Belt. The other alternative is that we do not provide such a policy in the Core Strategy and then expose ourselves to future applications from the University which we then cannot refuse, which could potentially have wider negative impacts on the surrounding Green Belt. Lastly, the University is a major contributor to the Borough's economy and the Council seeks to support its future plans, whilst attempting to reduce any detrimental impact on local people. Options such as having a split campus have been raised with the University in the past, however, it is not considered to be viable at the current time.		
Recommen- dation	No action.		
cspo-276	Ray Craig		
Plan Ref	6.3	Policy Area CS6: Edge Hill University	Object
Summary	Objection to expansion of Edge Hill Uni using green belt release. (S)		
Response	Edge Hill University is a major contributor to the Borough's economy, to the tune of approximately Â£60m. Whilst we appreciate the concerns of local residents in terms of student accommodation and services taking over the town, the Council must try to deliver a strategy which meets the needs of all local stakeholders. By identifying a limited area for expansion in the Green Belt over a 15 year period (10 ha of expansion land), the Council will not only have a greater say on the scale of future development but can also request that a greater amount of student facilities, such as new accommodation, can be provided on campus. The other alternative is that we do not provide such a policy in the Core Strategy and then expose ourselves to future applications from the University which we then cannot refuse, which could potentially have wider negative impacts on the surrounding Green Belt. The University has confirmed that functioning on a split campus is not economically viable.		
Recommen- dation	No action.		
cspo-281	Mary Hill		
Plan Ref	6.3	Policy Area CS6: Edge Hill University	Object
Summary	I object to the proposed release of 10ha of Green Belt Land for yet more development by the university. University development should be spread to other towns (S)		
Response	We appreciate the concerns of local residents regarding the changing nature of Ormskirk and the Core Strategy recognises the needs of all stakeholders. The University is a major contributor to the Borough's economy and the Council seeks to support its future plans, whilst attempting to reduce any detrimental impact on local people.. All of the options presented in the Core Stratgy allow for 10ha of expansion land at Edge Hill. It is considered that this will allow for managed and minimal levels of expansion into the Green Belt. The other alternative is that we do not provide such a policy in the Core Strategy and then expose ourselves to future applications from the University which we then cannot refuse, which could potentially have wider negative impacts on the surrounding Green Belt. Appreciate the comments on directing further expansion of the University to other parts of the Borough and the Council has previously suggested this course of action to the University, however, it is not considered financially viable or attractive to propective students given the already peripheral location of Edge Hill University.		
Recommen- dation	No action.		
cspo-286	Mr David Berry	Ormskirk Green Belt Conservation Group	
Plan Ref	6.3	Policy Area CS6: Edge Hill University	Object
Summary	Given the economic climate and the results of the 2005 Public Inquiry, the release of green belt land should not proceed within this ldf plan. (S)		
Response	Concerns in relation to the future of Edge Hill University are noted and indeed it remains unknown how student numbers will fair in the immediate future. The Core Strategy does, however, need to deal with development up to 2027 and in this time it is expected that the University will need some additional land, even if student numbers stay broadly the same. All of the options presented in the Core Stratgy allow for 10ha of expansion land at Edge Hill. It is considered that this will allow for managed and minimal levels of expansion into the Green Belt. The other alternative is that we do not provide such a policy in the Core Strategy and then expose ourselves to future applications from the University which we then cannot refuse, which could potentially have wider negative impacts on the surrounding Green Belt. Lastly, the University is a major contributor to the Borough's economy and the Council seeks to support its future plans, whilst attempting to reduce any detrimental impact on local people.		
Recommen- dation	No action.		

cspo-289	Alastair Hill		
Plan Ref	6.3	Policy Area CS6: Edge Hill University	Object
Summary	Object to CS6. Whatever benefits it gives are far outweighed by traffic congestion, parking, noise , litter anti social Behaviour, and the change in character not only of certain streets via student housing, but of the whole town. If it is to grow, and no HEI can be certain of future growth, given the present economic constraints in Higher Education, with funding and fees, then any future growth should be directed away from its present highly developed site, to other locations in the Borough for example Skelmersdale. (S)		
Response	Edge Hill University is a major contributor to the Borough's economy, to the tune of approximately Â£60m. Whilst we appreciate the concerns of local residents in terms of student accommodation and services taking over the town, the Council must try to deliver a strategy which meets the needs of all local stakeholders. By identifying a limited area for expansion over a 15 year period (10 ha of expansion land), the Council will not only have a greater say on the scale of future development but can also request that a greater amount of student facilities, such as new accommodation, can be provided on campus. This will in turn take pressure off the town providing these facilities independently. Concerns in relation to the future of Edge Hill University are noted and indeed it remains unknown how student numbers will fair in the immediate future. The Core Strategy does, however, need to deal with development up to 2027 and in this time it is expected that the University will need some additional land, even if student numbers stay broadly the same. All of the options presented in the Core Stratgy allow for 10ha of expansion land at Edge Hill. It is considered that this will allow for managed and minimal levels of expansion into the Green Belt. The other alternative is that we do not provide such a policy in the Core Strategy and then expose ourselves to future applications from the University which we then cannot refuse, which could potentially have wider negative impacts on the surrounding Green Belt. Directing some of the University campus to areas such as Skelmersdale would be ideal from a regeneration perspective, however the University wishes to remain on one campus due to cost and reputation.		
Recommendation	No action.		
cspo-292	Sheila and David Roberts		
Plan Ref	6.3	Policy Area CS6: Edge Hill University	Object
Summary	Disgusted at the proposed use of Green Belt to facilitate growth of the University.		
Response	The Draft Green Belt Study which identifies land bounded by Ruff Lane and St Helens Road and adjacent to Edge Hill as ORM.07 is an evidence base document and not a policy document. What this means is that the study was carried out in order to inform planning policy which will be developed through the Local Development Framework process. The important difference is that what is identified within the evidence base may not in all circumstances be carried through as policy and ultimately, the Green Belt Study itself cannot remove land from the Green Belt. It is the Core Strategy which identifies areas of land to be removed from Green Belt and within the latest version, the Core Strategy Preferred Options Paper, the proposals do not propose to remove the whole of the parcel of land known as ORM.07 from the Green Belt. The proposal is for a much smaller area of land (10ha) within the parcel that is directly adjacent to the existing Green Belt boundary. Furthermore, any removal of land from the Green Belt must still be justified by "every exceptional circumstances" and the Core Strategy Preferred Options Paper proposes that the need to begin to resolve any student accommodation, highways and car parking impacts caused by Edge Hill University constitutes those very exceptional circumstances. The Green Belt study features a methodology which uses criteria to assess land against each purpose of the Green Belt. The study applies the methodology and the outcome is that which is recorded within the draft study document. As previously mentioned the draft study is not policy nor is it a formal opinion of the Council. It is evidence which shows how the criteria within the methodology have been uniformly applied to all parcels under assessment. The methodology was devised in collaboration with the neighbouring authorities, Sefton and Knowsley, and has been validated by Lancashire County Council. The Council is confident that the Green Belt study methodology has been accurately applied to ORM.07, along with all other Green Belt parcels, and this has been verified by Lancashire County Council.		
Recommendation	No action.		
cspo-295	Mr P Tyrer		
Plan Ref	6.3	Policy Area CS6: Edge Hill University	Object
Summary	Edge Hill proposals should be removed from the document until the position of the University in terms of future student numbers is fully understood. (S)		
Response	Concerns in relation to the future of Edge Hill University are noted and indeed it remains unknown how student numbers will fair in the immediate future. The Core Strategy does, however, need to deal with development up to 2027 and in this time it is expected that the University will need some additional land, even if student numbers stay broadly the same. All of the options presented in the Core Stratgy allow for 10ha of expansion land at Edge Hill. It is considered that this will allow for managed and minimal levels of expansion into the Green Belt. The other alternative is that we do not provide such a policy in the Core Strategy and then expose ourselves to future applications from the University which we then cannot refuse, which could potentially have wider negative impacts on the surrounding Green Belt. Lastly, the University is a major contributor to the Borough's economy and the Council seeks to support its future plans, whilst attempting to reduce any detrimental impact on local people.		
Recommendation	No action.		

cspo-3	Mr Steven Jones		
Plan Ref	6.3	Policy Area CS6: Edge Hill University	Support
Summary	Support in full the options document recommendations for Edge Hill University so that learning at Edge Hill and student facilities can be further enhanced and continue to support the local economy of the University town of Ormskirk, that places the least possible impacts on local residents.		
Response	Comments Noted		
Recommendation	No action.		
<hr/>			
cspo-333	Mr Roger Clayton		
Plan Ref	6.3	Policy Area CS6: Edge Hill University	Observations
Summary	The wording is ambiguous between the first and second bullet points. 1) Does the policy allow for expansion beyond 10 hectares of Green Belt land or not and 2) does the borough accept the demands of Edge Hill to continue submitting applications for expansion into Green Belt areas before it will join in any masterplanned approach? (F)		
Response	Appreciate the point re ambiguity of the first and second bullet points. The expansion or 10ha of land into the Green Belt will comprise of releasing this parcel of land from Green Belt restrictions and therefore allowing it to become part of the built-up area of the University. This could comprise further academic buildings or residential accommodation. In addition to this the University is able to submit planning applications for development within the Green Belt beyond this 10ha parcel, though acceptable uses here will be limited to those suitable within the Green Belt (in this case likely to be for sports and recreation). The Masterplanned approach identified within the policy is how the Council would ideally like see any further development on the site come forward over the plan period and the University agrees that this is the best approach.		
Recommendation	No proposed change.		
<hr/>			
cspo-34	Dr Anthony Evans		
Plan Ref	6.3	Policy Area CS6: Edge Hill University	Object
Summary	Given tuition fees, will Edge Hill remain viable? Expansion plans should be put on hold indefinitely. (S)		
Response	Concerns in relation to the future of Edge Hill University are noted and indeed it remains unknown how student numbers will fare in the immediate future. The Core Strategy does, however, need to deal with development up to 2027 and in this time it is expected that the University will need some additional land, even if student numbers stay broadly the same. All of the options presented in the Core Strategy allow for 10ha of expansion land at Edge Hill. It is considered that this will allow for managed and minimal levels of expansion into the Green Belt. The other alternative is that we do not provide such a policy in the Core Strategy and then expose ourselves to future applications from the University which we then cannot refuse, which could potentially have wider negative impacts on the surrounding Green Belt. Lastly, the University is a major contributor to the Borough's economy and the Council seeks to support its future plans, whilst attempting to reduce any detrimental impact on local people.		
Recommendation	No action.		
<hr/>			
cspo-361	New Way Tenants Residents		
Plan Ref	6.3	Policy Area CS6: Edge Hill University	Support with conditions
Summary	As far as possible students must be taken out of residential areas; Edgehill Uni should be given permission to build STUDENT ACCOMODATION ONLY on green belt land adjacent to the campus; W.L.B.C. should seek strategies and policies to monitor and control the number of H.M.O.'s in any one area; More Affordable Housing , particularly for young families and first time buyers. (s)		
Response	Comments noted and the Core Strategy seeks to address these concerns, though more detail will follow in some cases in further LDF documents.		
Recommendation	No action.		
<hr/>			
cspo-474	Ms Erika Price	CPRE	
Plan Ref	6.3	Policy Area CS6: Edge Hill University	Object
Summary	Object to release of green belt for EHU (S)		
Response	Edge Hill University has a single campus philosophy which it does not wish to alter. Contributing over Â£60m to the Borough's Economy, the Council needs to work with Edge Hill to ensure the best outcome is reached for all stakeholders. All of the options within the Core Strategy Preferred Options document allow for 10ha of expansion land into the Green Belt at Edge Hill University. The University has undergone a process of refurbishment and improving its space utilisation on campus over the last 10 years and it now requires a small area of land into the Green Belt which the Council agrees is necessary to meet the University's needs over the next 15 years. This parcel of land is required regardless of any growth in student numbers and can be used to provide student accommodation and other facilities which would greatly relieve some pressure on facilities in Ormskirk. The University is committed to reducing the reliance upon car use where it is practically possible and has introduced a range of measures in order to make other modes of transport more appealing. However, there will always be a relatively high dependency on the car to access the University given its location and student catchment area. The important thing is managing these car users to ensure that they only come to the campus when absolutely necessary. Providing adequate parking on site will stop on-street parking which is a real nuisance to local people.		
Recommendation	No action.		

cspo-495	Mr M Abrams		
Plan Ref	6.3	Policy Area CS6: Edge Hill University	Object
Summary	Objection to the expansion of Edge Hill University due to the impacts in the community such as traffic congestion, social impacts and loss of Green Belt. (S)		
Response	By identifying a small area for expansion (10ha over 15 years) of the built part of the University campus, the Council can manage the level of development on this site and request facilities such as student accommodation on campus, thereby reducing some negative impacts on the town of Ormskirk. The alternative is that we do not allow for any expansion into the Green Belt within the Core Strategy and this way the Council is opening itself up to unmanaged growth at the University and the potential receipt of planning applications which it may not be able to refuse. This could lead to more development and a greater impact on the Green Belt.		
Recommendation	No action.		
cspo-500	Martin Walsh		
Plan Ref	6.3	Policy Area CS6: Edge Hill University	Object
Summary	Objects to expansion of Edge Hill University in light of changing role of universities. Do not want to allow expansion then have redundant buildings to deal with following the demise of the University. (S)		
Response	Whilst we appreciate the concerns regarding expansion land at Edge Hill University, the Core Strategy has to consider development over the next 15 year period up to 2027. We have been working closely with the University to ascertain details on predicted student numbers over this period. Whilst it is difficult to be precise with the current changing nature of the Higher Education sector, the University considers that even without growth in student numbers further development will be required to ensure it has the facilities it requires on campus to operate efficiently and improve its offer. For example, some of this additional land is likely to be developed for on-campus student accommodation, relieving pressure on housing in Ormskirk more generally. Edge Hill University is in a very strong financial position, and it has been suggested that with an increase in tuition fees students will opt to live at home with parents and study at a local university, Edge Hill has a high proportion of students who already do this and it could be argued that it will continue to attract high numbers of students. Obviously this is something that will be monitored closely throughout the Core Strategy period.		
Recommendation	No action.		
cspo-585	Mrs Margaret Wiltshire	Planning Volunteer, Treasurer CPRE (West Lancs Group)	
Plan Ref	6.3	Policy Area CS6: Edge Hill University	Observations
Summary	Concerned over Edge Hill- they must build on their own available land first and then build on green belt only if the development is kept small.		
Response	We appreciate the concerns regarding loss of Green Belt land in this location. The proposed strategy to allow for the release of 10ha of Green Belt land over the Core Strategy period up until 2027 has been worked out in consultation with Edge Hill. The University has undergone a redevelopment process over the last 10 years whereby the existing campus has been made more efficient in terms of space utilisation. The University is now at a stage where remaining development opportunities on site are limited and, albeit there are still some small plots remaining, looking forward to the next 15 years more land will be required for development. The University maintains that even without growth in student numbers the 10ha of additional land would assist in helping the campus operate more efficiently and it would help to meet some of the desperately needed on site student accommodation - this would in turn reduce the negative impact on housing within Ormskirk. If this 10ha site is not identified within the emerging Core Strategy then the Council may be open to greater challenge by the University and this could result in a far greater proportion of Green Belt being developed that we consider is appropriate. Therefore, we strongly feel that agreeing this approach with the University up front makes the boundaries clear and will protect the local environment over the next 15 years.		
Recommendation	No action.		
cspo-60	Mr Norman Smith		
Plan Ref	6.3	Policy Area CS6: Edge Hill University	Object
Summary	Edge Hill should not be allowed to expand. (S).		
Response	Much of the above comment is in relation to the Green Belt options. However, in relation to the comments on Edge Hill University, which it is stated should not be allowed to expand, the response is as follows. Edge Hill University is a major contributor to the Borough's economy, to the tune of approximately £60m. Whilst we appreciate the concerns of local residents in terms of student accommodation and services taking over the town, the Council must try to deliver a strategy which meets the needs of all local stakeholders. By identifying a limited area for expansion over a 15 year period (10 ha of expansion land), the Council will not only have a greater say on the scale of future development but can also request that a greater amount of student facilities, such as new accommodation, can be provided on campus.		
Recommendation	No action required.		
cspo-625	Mrs Joanna Eley		
Plan Ref	6.3	Policy Area CS6: Edge Hill University	Support
Summary	Support for expansion plans at Edge Hill University. Plans would ease congestion and student housing issues and facilitate significant economic growth. (S)		
Response	Comments noted.		
Recommendation	No action.		

cspo-635	Mr David Brown		
Plan Ref	6.3	Policy Area CS6: Edge Hill University	Object
Summary	Object to expansion of Edge Hill into Green Belt. (S)		
Response	Edge Hill university has a single campus philosophy which is an important element of its higher education offer. Having redeveloped the majority of the campus over the last 10 years in order to improve space utilisation, the University has almost reached a point whereby it needs further land in order to operate effectively, this additional land will certainly be needed over the 15 year period which the Core Strategy deals with. Whilst it is never ideal to develop in the Green Belt, there are wider concerns which allowing some minimal development will help to address. For example, it is intended that part of the land to be released would be used for on-campus student accommodation, thereby relieving some of the existing pressures on Ormskirk town centre. By allowing for this expansion in the Core Strategy, the Council has a greater ability to control future development, without this provision the area could be exposed to more significant Green Belt release.		
Recommendation	No action.		
<hr/>			
cspo-686	John Evans		
Plan Ref	6.3	Policy Area CS6: Edge Hill University	Object
Summary	EHU policies have short timescales, up to 10years. There needs to be a balancing force, having a timescale greater than 20 years and possibly up to 100 years, which considers what is in the best interests of Ormskirk in the future. History shows that once the Green Belt has gone, it has gone forever. I believe it is the Council's role to be this balancing force.		
Response	Appreciate the comments and indeed the Council operates in order to achieve a common ground for all stakeholders. Edge Hill University is a major contributor to the Borough's economy, contributing in excess of £60 million per year and therefore is a major consideration in terms of the Core Strategy going forward. However, we agree that the town of Ormskirk should not be 'consumed' by the University and we consider that the best approach is to allow for small-scale managed growth within the Core Strategy document. The Core Strategy covers a 15 year period until 2027 and must plan for requirements within this time. The University has undergone a major redevelopment programme over the last 10 years in order to make better use of existing space, however it has identified that even without growth in student numbers a small amount of additional land will be required in order for the University to operate most effectively. One potential use for the additional land is to provide more on-campus student accommodation, thereby relieving some of the existing pressures on the Ormskirk housing market. The alternative to allowing for some small-scale expansion in the Core Strategy is to not provide for any and then open ourselves up to criticism and the risk of planning applications for larger scale development in the Green Belt. The approach adopted is therefore considered to be the best way to manage development at the University and wider impacts on the town, whilst ensuring that it continues to be a major contributor to the local economy.		
Recommendation	No action.		
<hr/>			
cspo-693	Phil Southern		
Plan Ref	6.3	Policy Area CS6: Edge Hill University	Object
Summary	I do not oppose the university, but it has already eroded much of what was/is our historic market town. Too much litter, student housing issues and too many shops catering for students and not the community. If it continues, the community will no longer be a community and the town will have been completely out grown by the university. The council needs to act on behalf of the community they represent and oppose any further expansion before we lose our market town.		
Response	Appreciate the comments and indeed the Council operates in order to achieve a common ground for all stakeholders. Edge Hill University is a major contributor to the Borough's economy, contributing in excess of £60 million per year and therefore is a major consideration in terms of the Core Strategy going forward. However, we agree that the town of Ormskirk should not be 'consumed' by the University and we consider that the best approach is to allow for small-scale managed growth within the Core Strategy document. The Core Strategy covers a 15 year period until 2027 and must plan for requirements within this time. The University has undergone a major redevelopment programme over the last 10 years in order to make better use of existing space, however it has identified that even without growth in student numbers a small amount of additional land will be required in order for the University to operate most effectively. One potential use for the additional land is to provide more on-campus student accommodation, thereby relieving some of the existing pressures on the Ormskirk housing market. The alternative to allowing for some small-scale expansion in the Core Strategy is to not provide for any and then open ourselves up to criticism and the risk of planning applications for larger scale development in the Green Belt. The approach adopted is therefore considered to be the best way to manage development at the University and wider impacts on the town, whilst ensuring that it continues to be a major contributor to the local economy.		
Recommendation	No action.		

cspo-695	Mr John Lloyd		
Plan Ref	6.3	Policy Area CS6: Edge Hill University	Object
Summary	I do not think that the Council should allow the release of the 10 hectares of Green Belt land on the eastern side of the University for 'built facilities'. I cannot see any 'compelling evidence' for this to happen and the University has other options if it chooses to use them. (s)		
Response	Whilst we have explored the option of expanding onto another campus with the University, they maintain that they have a single campus philosophy which, if altered, and considered along with the relatively inaccessible location of Edge Hill (particularly in terms of public transport access when compared with other universities), will severely impact the student intake. We appreciate the comments and concerns about the expansion plans and indeed the Council operates in order to achieve a common ground for all stakeholders. Edge Hill University is a major contributor to the Borough's economy, contributing in excess of £60 million per year and therefore is a major consideration in terms of the Core Strategy going forward. However, we agree that the town of Ormskirk should not be 'consumed' by the University and we consider that the best approach is to allow for small-scale managed growth within the Core Strategy document. The Core Strategy covers a 15 year period until 2027 and must plan for requirements within this time. The University has undergone a major redevelopment programme over the last 10 years in order to make better use of existing space, however it has identified that even without growth in student numbers a small amount of additional land will be required up to 2027 in order for the University to operate most effectively. One potential use for the additional land is to provide more on-campus student accommodation, thereby relieving some of the existing pressures on the Ormskirk housing market. The alternative to allowing for some small-scale expansion in the Core Strategy is to not provide for any and then open ourselves up to criticism, challenge and the risk of receiving planning applications for larger scale development in the Green Belt which we may not be able to refuse. The approach adopted is therefore considered to be the best way to manage and limit development at the University and wider impacts on the town, whilst ensuring that it continues to be a major contributor to the local economy.		
Recommendation	No action.		
cspo-739	Mr Richard Jones		
Plan Ref	6.3	Policy Area CS6: Edge Hill University	Object
Summary	Object to expansion of Edge Hill (S)		
Response	Comments noted. The option which identifies all land up to Ruff Lane, St Helens Road and Scarth Hill Lane is the Council's non-preferred option as it is considered the least sustainable. In every option, 10ha of land at Edge Hill is included for expansion and this is to allow for a managed approach to future development at the University over the next 15 years. If this managed approach is not adopted then the Council could be subject to challenge resulting in much more development in the Green Belt over the next 15 years.		
Recommendation	No action.		
cspo-740	Mr Ed Dickinson		
Plan Ref	6.3	Policy Area CS6: Edge Hill University	Support
Summary	Support for development of Green Belt for sports facilities as EHU (S)		
Response	Comments noted.		
Recommendation	No action.		
cspo-741	Alan and Sarah Bowness		
Plan Ref	6.3	Policy Area CS6: Edge Hill University	Object
Summary	Object to Edge Hill University expansion. (S)		
Response	Comments noted. The option which identifies all land up to Ruff Lane, St Helens Road and Scarth Hill Lane is the Council's non-preferred option as it is considered the least sustainable. In every option, 10ha of land at Edge Hill is included for expansion and this is to allow for a managed approach to future development at the University over the next 15 years. If this managed approach is not adopted then the Council could be subject to challenge resulting in much more development in the Green Belt over the next 15 years.		
Recommendation	No action.		
cspo-742	Mr Chris Whitfield		
Plan Ref	6.3	Policy Area CS6: Edge Hill University	Object
Summary	Object to Edge Hill (S)		
Response	Comments noted. The option which identifies all land up to Ruff Lane, St Helens Road and Scarth Hill Lane is the Council's non-preferred option as it is considered the least sustainable. In every option, 10ha of land at Edge Hill is included for expansion and this is to allow for a managed approach to future development at the University over the next 15 years. If this managed approach is not adopted then the Council could be subject to challenge resulting in much more development in the Green Belt over the next 15 years.		
Recommendation	No action.		

cspo-743	Mr M Abrams		
Plan Ref	6.3	Policy Area CS6: Edge Hill University	Object
Summary	Object to Edge Hill expansion. (S)		
Response	Comments noted. The option which identifies all land up to Ruff Lane, St Helens Road and Scarth Hill Lane is the Council's non-preferred option as it is considered the least sustainable. In every option, 10ha of land at Edge Hill is included for expansion and this is to allow for a managed approach to future development at the University over the next 15 years. If this managed approach is note adopted then the Council could be subject to challenge resulting in much more development in the Green Belt over the next 15 years.		
Recommendation	No action.		
<hr/>			
cspo-744	Mr Eric Vrain		
Plan Ref	6.3	Policy Area CS6: Edge Hill University	Object
Summary	Object to expansion at Edge Hill University (S)		
Response	Comments noted. The option which identifies all land up to Ruff Lane, St Helens Road and Scarth Hill Lane is the Council's non-preferred option as it is considered the least sustainable. In every option, 10ha of land at Edge Hill is included for expansion and this is to allow for a managed approach to future development at the University over the next 15 years. If this managed approach is note adopted then the Council could be subject to challenge resulting in much more development in the Green Belt over the next 15 years.		
Recommendation	No action.		
<hr/>			
cspo-745	R Nanson		
Plan Ref	6.3	Policy Area CS6: Edge Hill University	Object
Summary	Object to Edge Hill University expansion. (S)		
Response	Comments noted. The option which identifies all land up to Ruff Lane, St Helens Road and Scarth Hill Lane is the Council's non-preferred option as it is considered the least sustainable. In every option, 10ha of land at Edge Hill is included for expansion and this is to allow for a managed approach to future development at the University over the next 15 years. If this managed approach is note adopted then the Council could be subject to challenge resulting in much more development in the Green Belt over the next 15 years.		
Recommendation	No action.		
<hr/>			
cspo-746	Mr Dave Mutch	Environmentla Group Ormskirk Community Partnership	
Plan Ref	6.3	Policy Area CS6: Edge Hill University	Object
Summary	Object to Edge Hill expansion (S)		
Response	Comments noted. The option which identifies all land up to Ruff Lane, St Helens Road and Scarth Hill Lane is the Council's non-preferred option as it is considered the least sustainable. In every option, 10ha of land at Edge Hill is included for expansion and this is to allow for a managed approach to future development at the University over the next 15 years. If this managed approach is note adopted then the Council could be subject to challenge resulting in much more development in the Green Belt over the next 15 years.		
Recommendation	No action.		
<hr/>			
cspo-747	Sue Butterworth		
Plan Ref	6.3	Policy Area CS6: Edge Hill University	Object
Summary	Object to expansion of Edge Hill (S)		
Response	Comments noted. The option which identifies all land up to Ruff Lane, St Helens Road and Scarth Hill Lane is the Council's non-preferred option as it is considered the least sustainable. In every option, 10ha of land at Edge Hill is included for expansion and this is to allow for a managed approach to future development at the University over the next 15 years. If this managed approach is note adopted then the Council could be subject to challenge resulting in much more development in the Green Belt over the next 15 years.		
Recommendation	No action.		
<hr/>			
cspo-748	Mr Austen Robinson		
Plan Ref	6.3	Policy Area CS6: Edge Hill University	Object
Summary	Object to Edge Hill expansion (S)		
Response	Comments noted. The option which identifies all land up to Ruff Lane, St Helens Road and Scarth Hill Lane is the Council's non-preferred option as it is considered the least sustainable. In every option, 10ha of land at Edge Hill is included for expansion and this is to allow for a managed approach to future development at the University over the next 15 years. If this managed approach is note adopted then the Council could be subject to challenge resulting in much more development in the Green Belt over the next 15 years.		
Recommendation	No action.		

cspo-749	Susan Dunn	Secretary West Lancashire Civic Trust	
Plan Ref	6.3	Policy Area CS6: Edge Hill University	Object
Summary	Object to Edge Hill expansion. (S)		
Response	Comments noted. The option which identifies all land up to Ruff Lane, St Helens Road and Scarth Hill Lane is the Council's non-preferred option as it is considered the least sustainable. In every option, 10ha of land at Edge Hill is included for expansion and this is to allow for a managed approach to future development at the University over the next 15 years, including allowing for some development of student accommodation on site. If this managed approach is not adopted then the Council could be subject to challenge resulting in much more development in the Green Belt over the next 15 years.		
Recommendation	No action.		
cspo-82	Mr Matthew Robinson		
Plan Ref	6.3	Policy Area CS6: Edge Hill University	Support
Summary	Expansion of Edge Hill University is supported. (S)		
Response	Comments noted		
Recommendation	No action required.		
cspo-118	Mr & Ms K Jennings & Moffatt		
Plan Ref	Chapter 7	Core Strategy Preferred Options: Providing for Housing and Residential Accommodation	Observations
Summary	Non-preferred option (but without University expansion) seems the best available. Need to address problems with HMOs and provide more purpose-built student accommodation. Any plan that provided better facilities, more employment opportunities, more affordable housing, and a restraint on students in residential areas would be good but we are unsure as to whether any of the 3 plans put forward would truly address these. (S)		
Response	Comments noted. With regard to student HMOs, the Council's powers are limited. Policy CS9 seeks to restrain future conversions to HMOs. A 5% limit is proposed for most streets, but it is considered that 10% or 15% would be appropriate in certain streets.		
Recommendation	No action required		
cspo-171	Mr Peter Banks		
Plan Ref	Chapter 7	Core Strategy Preferred Options: Providing for Housing and Residential Accommodation	Object
Summary	The agricultural land in West Lancashire is some of the most fertile in the country and should be retained as a valuable resource for food production, and to conserve wildlife. Edge Hill University should free up existing housing (HMOs) by building additional on-campus accommodation. (S)		
Response	It is agreed that prime agricultural land is an important resource that must be protected wherever possible. Unfortunately, the amount of non-agricultural housing land available is not enough to meet housing requirements to 2027, and thus some agricultural land will need to be developed. Taking into account a wide range of considerations, the Plan is seeking to meet its requirements by allocating land that will provide as high a level of benefits as possible, whilst simultaneously causing as little harm as possible. In terms of University accommodation, see response to Representation CSPO-169.		
Recommendation	No change.		
cspo-203	Mrs Anne-Sophie Bonton	Planning Officer	
Plan Ref	Chapter 7	Core Strategy Preferred Options: Providing for Housing and Residential Accommodation	Observations
Summary	Student HMOs have a significant impact on Ormskirk town centre, with the associated increase in car users being a major problem. The University should consider a Travel Plan to solve this problem. (S)		
Response	Comments noted.		
Recommendation	No change.		
cspo-241	Mr Andrew Taylor	Planning Director David Wilson Homes	
Plan Ref	Chapter 7	Core Strategy Preferred Options: Providing for Housing and Residential Accommodation	Object
Summary	Over emphasis of housing numbers in Skelmersdale. Such housing figures are not deliverable commercially. Provision needs to be made elsewhere for the inevitable shortfall. This will require greater Green Belt releases. Such releases should be proposed on a sustainability criteria following a thorough re-examination of the possible sites. (S)		
Response	Comments noted. The Council has paid careful attention to the comments made in the developers' forum, and it is agreed that the Core Strategy must be demonstrated to be deliverable. The Skelmersdale figure should be reduced from 3,000 dwellings to a more deliverable figure.		
Recommendation	Reduce the Skelmersdale / Up Holland housing requirement from 3,000 dwellings to 2,400 dwellings.		

cspo-247	Mr D Rimmer		
Plan Ref	Chapter 7	Core Strategy Preferred Options: Providing for Housing and Residential Accommodation	Support with conditions
Summary	Policy CS7 Generally support this policy particularly with regards to development in the Key and Rural Sustainable Villages, however the number should be increased at the expense of Skelmersdale. (F)		
Response	Comments noted. It is agreed that the target of 3,000 dwellings for Skelmersdale may be unachievable, and it is proposed to be reduced, along with the recalculation of targets for villages, taking into account sites with extant planning permissions.		
Recommendation	Reduce the Skelmersdale / Up Holland housing requirement from 3,000 dwellings to 2,400 dwellings. Amend villages figures as follows: Northern Parishes 400 dwellings; Eastern Parishes 100 dwellings; Western Parishes 150 dwellings.		
cspo-359	Mr Robert W. Pickavance		
Plan Ref	Chapter 7	Core Strategy Preferred Options: Providing for Housing and Residential Accommodation	Observations
Summary	New Road site, Rufford would be suitable for development (S).		
Response	Comments noted. The Northern Parishes housing figure allows for some development in Rufford. It is evident that constraints exist in Banks, Tarleton and Hesketh Bank, although there is still expected to be some development in these villages over the Plan period.		
Recommendation	No change.		
cspo-488	Mr B Howard	Clerk of the Council Newburgh Parish Council	
Plan Ref	Chapter 7	Core Strategy Preferred Options: Providing for Housing and Residential Accommodation	Support
Summary	Small, controlled development is welcome to make sure that the stock of houses continues to meet the needs of the village, particularly its growing retired population, and to sustain its amenities, eg school, PO, pub, bus services.		
Response	Comments noted.		
Recommendation	No change.		
cspo-579	Mr Peter Vernon	Director Vernon & Co	
Plan Ref	Chapter 7	Core Strategy Preferred Options: Providing for Housing and Residential Accommodation	Object
Summary	1. Housing land supply may be overstated. The requirement should be raised to 5,500 to reflect the period 2010-12. 2. The requirement should be able to be exceeded. 3. There is an over-reliance on development in Skelmersdale. 4. It is not appropriate to restrict development in the early years of the Core Strategy period. (S)		
Response	1. Development between 2010-2012, along with the RSS deficit from 2003, has been taken into account in housing land requirement calculations. This will be specified in the updated Plan. 2. It is recognised that the target may be exceeded. The wording of the updated Plan will be amended to reflect this. 3. It is agreed that the housing figure for Skelmersdale must be deliverable and should be reduced from 3,000 in the light of comments received. The Council will take into account all representations made on this matter, in addition to its evidence base. 4. Given the current economic circumstances and infrastructure constraints in the Borough, it is appropriate to have lower development targets in the early years of the Core Strategy. Given infrastructure constraints and other factors, it is also considered appropriate to restrict the development of certain sites in order to encourage the development of other sites, and to facilitate a sustainable pattern of development. (However, the restrictions associated with the "Management of housing land supply" part of Policy CS7 in early years of the Core Strategy will be extremely unlikely to apply in early years of the Core Strategy, given the current completions deficit, infrastructure problems and economic situation.)		
Recommendation	1. Specify that the Plan takes into account development requirements and performance from 2003 onwards. 2. Specify that housing targets are minimum targets and can be exceeded. 3. Reduce Skelmersdale target from 3,000 to 2,400. 4. Retain the scope for the		
cspo-610	Hollins Strategic Land LLP		
Plan Ref	Chapter 7	Core Strategy Preferred Options: Providing for Housing and Residential Accommodation	Observations
Summary	It is essential for there to be an adequacy of genuinely developable housing sites from the plan's inception. (S)		
Response	Comments noted.		
Recommendation	No change		
cspo-621		Centre Model Developments	
Plan Ref	Chapter 7	Core Strategy Preferred Options: Providing for Housing and Residential Accommodation	Observations
Summary	It is essential for there to be an adequacy of genuinely developable housing sites from the plan's inception		
Response	Comments noted		
Recommendation	No change		

cspo-753	Paul Cotterill		
Plan Ref	Chapter 7	Providing for Housing and Residential Accommodation	Object
Summary	1. Objection to proposed housing distribution and location within Skelmersdale, which is based on outdated planning ideas; 2. Housing density assumptions underpinning the Plan are incorrect; 3. Affordable housing should not be treated the same way as specialist housing. (S)		
Response	1. Whilst total remodelling of Skelmersdale might seem a good idea in theory, the Core Strategy must be shown to be deliverable, and there is simply not the time nor the money (and possibly not the will) to remodel the whole town's estates and road system. The proposals for the town centre regeneration, including a net increase of 800 dwellings in and around the centre, are along the lines of what is suggested by the Objector. Open space is an important feature of Skelmersdale (not 'wasted'), and much of this is unsuitable for residential development. Even taking into account the potential for higher density development (see 2), allocated /safeguarded land in north Skelmersdale is still considered necessary to help meet the Borough's housing requirements. Using such land reduces the need for Green Belt development elsewhere. Whilst non-car transport links to and from new and existing estates need to be improved, the current road system works well and is not considered to be in need of remodelling. 2. The housing density figure in paragraph 4.3.2 is simply a 'ball park' figure based on the former national minimum density requirement in PPS3. It is recognised that this density could (and should) be exceeded wherever appropriate, taking into account issues such as decreasing average household sizes, as mentioned by the Objector. However, there are a number of caveats: - For "suburban" type developments, densities much higher than 30dw/ha are not usually achievable (e.g. the market for typical high density housing, i.e. apartments and townhouses, is now very weak). Recent development at Ashurst is typically at a density of 20-22 dw/ha; - Allowances need to be made e.g. for access roads, open space, and any land that cannot be built upon (e.g. undermined land in Skelmersdale); - Housing should be in keeping with the surrounding area, and high density development will often be inappropriate in many areas; - Even taking into account the potential for densities higher than 30 dw/ha to be achieved, this will not negate (nor even significantly lessen) the need for Green Belt release. It should be noted that the major housebuilders have not objected to the assumption that new housing will typically be at a density in the order of 30 dwellings per hectare. A more detailed residential density Development Management policy will be included in the LDF. 3. It is agreed that affordable housing should be treated as a key component of housing development. However, for clarity, it is considered preferable to list affordable housing requirements in a separate policy. The Dynamic Viability model is too detailed to include in the Core Strategy, and thus it will be outlined in an SPD. This is not an 'afterthought'. The appropriateness of including the DV model within an LDF was not certain at the time of writing the Core Strategy Preferred Options document, but the model has recently been "found sound" in the Shropshire LDF examination.		
Recommendation	No change.		
cspo-78	Mrs Ellen Dickinson		
Plan Ref	Chapter 7	Core Strategy Preferred Options: Providing for Housing and Residential Accommodation	Object
Summary	3900 new homes are not needed. Green Belt should not be released. Agricultural land should be used for food production (S)		
Response	The housing requirement is based upon nationally agreed figures published by government, and takes into account changing demographics (people living longer, more people living on their own, etc) as well as migration and travel to work patterns, etc. The Council considers that the requirement of 300 new dwellings per annum is appropriate. In any case, at present the Council is required by law to use the RSS (Regional Plan) housing requirement, so in that sense, the figure is non-negotiable. It is agreed that prime agricultural land should be protected wherever possible. Ideally we would not need to release any such land for development, but owing to infrastructure and other constraints, there is unfortunately a need to release some land. In selecting a preferred site, the quality of agricultural land is one of the important factors being taken into account, and where land is released, it should be of the lowest possible agricultural grade.		
Recommendation	No change.		
cspo-10	Mr Howard Courtley	Courtley Consultants Ltd	
Plan Ref	Policy CS7	Residential Development	Object
Summary	The Council's "Key & Rural Sustainable" Settlements should include those locations adjacent to existing sustainable settlements. (S)		
Response	The existing small areas of development adjacent to the Southport/Birkdale/Ainsdale boundary are already included within the hierarchy of settlements in Policy CS1. In arriving at the preferred options for Green Belt release, consideration was given to including within these settlement boundaries some adjacent areas of Green Belt, and sites in the locations mentioned by the Objector have been assessed through the Green Belt Study. The Council is safeguarding some Green Belt sites as 'Plan B' sites that would be considered for development if delivery rates fall more than 20% below housing requirements over the periods 2012-17 and 2017-22. Fine Jane's Farm can be considered as one of these 'Plan B' sites.		
Recommendation	Propose the Fine Jane's Farm site as a potential 'Plan B' site.		

cspo-191	Mrs EA Broad	Parish Clerk Lathom South Parish Council	
Plan Ref	Policy CS7	Residential Development	Object
Summary	1. 3,000 houses in Skelmersdale is a disproportionately high figure, and gives the lowest return in terms of affordable housing. 2. Housing in Skelmersdale is likely to be for people from other Boroughs or immigrants, and will not solve housing need problems. 3. There is no mention of bringing empty homes back into use, nor matching development to local needs. (S)		
Response	1. Skelmersdale is the highest settlement in the West Lancashire settlement hierarchy and thus it is appropriate to locate the largest proportion of development there. There is land and, crucially, infrastructure capacity to accommodate the proposed amount of development. 2. The housing need figures have been calculated to meet West Lancashire's needs. Whilst a small proportion of this need is to accommodate in-migration, it is not true that the majority of housing in Skelmersdale will be occupied by people from outside the Borough or abroad. It is recognised that there are needs in the rest of the Borough, which is why a number of dwellings have been assumed for these areas. Housing locations are influenced not just by need, but by availability of sites, infrastructure and services. 3. The proportion of empty homes in West Lancashire is exceptionally low, and the scope for contribution towards housing land supply from this source is limited. Bringing empty homes back into use can be mentioned in the residential development policy justification.		
Recommendation	Mention in the policy justification the bringing back into use of empty properties.		
<hr/>			
cspo-208		Escalibur Ltd	
Plan Ref	Policy CS7	Residential Development	Object
Summary	To enable a sustainable pattern of development, new housing should also be allowed in sustainable settlements in the Eastern Parishes such as Appley Bridge. (S)		
Response	Appley Bridge is considered to have limited sustainability, with only a few dispersed services, although it is recognised that there are some facilities in neighbouring Wigan Borough. Furthermore, the SHLAA shows few suitable housing sites within the village. The Core Strategy housing figure for the Eastern Parishes assumes the development of all the suitable SHLAA sites in the Eastern Parishes. Green Belt release is not considered appropriate around Appley Bridge, given such factors as landscape impact, and the sustainability of the settlement itself.		
Recommendation	No change.		
<hr/>			
cspo-232	Mr Shaun Taylor	Planning Associate Director G L Hearn Property Consultants	
Plan Ref	Policy CS7	Residential Development	Object
Summary	The distribution of housing growth is not deliverable as written. The distribution needs to be reconsidered by reducing the requirement for Skelmersdale during this plan period and by considering further green belt release across a greater number of more medium sized sites around Ormskirk and Burscough. (s)		
Response	Comments noted. The Council has paid careful attention to the comments made in the housing developers' forum, and it is agreed that the Core Strategy must be demonstrated to be deliverable. It is agreed that the figure for Skelmersdale should be less than 3,000. It is not agreed, however, that Green Belt release will in principle need to be early in the Core Strategy period, although there may be exceptional cases where this is appropriate. Land east of Ormskirk suffers from sewerage infrastructure constraints, as does land at Burscough, and it is unlikely that development can take place there before 2020, unless infrastructure constraints are addressed sooner.		
Recommendation	Reduce Skelmersdale housing target from 3,000 to 2,400.		
<hr/>			
cspo-233	Mrs EA Broad	Parish Clerk Lathom South Parish Council	
Plan Ref	Policy CS7	Residential Development	Object
Summary	Land at Firwood Road is described as a key site for Skelmersdale. Firwood Road is in Lathom, a rural settlement and development here should not count as part of Skelmersdale's 3,000 dwellings. (F)		
Response	The land at Firwood Road has been safeguarded in the current Local Plan to meet longer-term development needs. This land is required in the forthcoming Core Strategy period. Being adjacent to Skelmersdale, it is considered appropriate to count any housing developed on this site as part of the total for Skelmersdale.		
Recommendation	No change.		
<hr/>			
cspo-271	Anglo International Up Holland Ltd		
Plan Ref	Policy CS7	Residential Development	Observations
Summary	Policy CS7 should be expanded to provide a policy basis to facilitate development in Protected Open Land / Green Belt in cases where the developments would secure wider heritage benefits. (S)		
Response	The special circumstances relating to St Joseph's College are acknowledged, in particular the Inspector's ruling in 2007 that the need to save the listed St Joseph's College building was an overriding consideration when assessing proposals for 205 new 'enabling' dwellings in the Green Belt. If a subsequent enabling scheme were submitted as a planning application, the particular circumstances and planning history of this site, including the 2007 appeal decision, would be taken into consideration. It is not considered necessary to amend Policy CS7 to specify the fact that the saving of heritage assets could be a circumstance in which enabling residential development would be judged appropriate, nor is it considered necessary or appropriate to name specific heritage assets. The Core Strategy is a general overarching document, rather than a detailed, site-specific document.		
Recommendation	No change.		

cspo-599	Mr Keith Keeley		
Plan Ref	Policy CS7 Residential Development		Observations
Summary	Please see previous comments in respect to Policy CS1 and CS3		
Response	Please see Mr Keeley's other representations on Policy CS1 and CS3		
Recommendation	No Action		
<hr/>			
cspo-717	Ms Deborah McLaughlin	Executive Director North West Homes and Communities Agency	
Plan Ref	Policy CS7 Residential Development		Support with conditions
Summary	The HCA welcomes the principle of 3,000 new dwellings in Skelmersdale. The Whalleys site (including Cobbs Clough) could eventually deliver up to 50 completions per annum in favourable economic conditions. HCA is willing in principle for the Whalleys site to cross-subsidise development at Firbeck /Findon, subject to conditions. Further clarification is necessary regarding how the development of greenfield sites should 'directly support the Town Centre regeneration programme'.		
Response	Comments noted. The wording of the policy with regard to greenfield sites is to change, and the reference to 'directly support' removed. Section 106 funding is likely to be used to contribute towards Town Centre regeneration.		
Recommendation	Alter wording of residential development policy with regard to greenfield sites directly supporting the Skelmersdale Town Centre regeneration programme.		
<hr/>			
cspo-720	Crompton property developments		
Plan Ref	David Crompton Residential Development		Support with conditions
Summary	Support the requirements for residential development, but is concerned about 1. Deliverability in Skelmersdale 2. The Council's intention to control supply of housing and 3. The requirement to meet the Lifetime Homes Standard. (S)		
Response	1. The Council agrees that flexibility is required in the Core Strategy to cope with eventualities such as Skelmersdale not being delivered as anticipated. The [revised] Plan will contain a "Plan B" setting out alternative sites and triggers for the Plan B to be implemented. 2. In the light of the government's new Growth Agenda, the Council will review the section on management of housing land supply (and the related section in Appendix E), to tone down the section to say something along the lines of, "The Council may consider restraint...". Given the current housing completions deficit, economic situation, and infrastructure constraints, it is unlikely that the Council is going to be in a position where there is an unacceptable oversupply of deliverable housing land, and where restraint would be necessary, at least not for several years. However, the Plan spans a long period, and it is considered prudent for there to be a "hook" that could be used, if necessary in extreme circumstances, to restrain housing development if circumstances change radically at some point during the Plan period, even if this "hook" turns out never to be needed. Restraint may be needed for individual settlements, even if not for the Borough as a whole. 3. Comments regarding the Lifetime Homes standard noted.		
Recommendation	a) Prepare a more robust 'Plan B' with clear triggers, timescales and actions for its implementation. b) Tone down the "Management of housing land supply" section of the Policy, and remove the 'mechanism' section in Appendix E. b) Allow for the Lifetime H		
<hr/>			
cspo-733	Bickerstaffe Trust		
Plan Ref	Policy CS7 Residential Development		Object
Summary	1. Table p.82, replace 'Total Dwellings' column with 'minimum dwellings'; 2. Replace figures for Ormskirk/Aughton with 900 whatever the scenario; 3. Replace figures for Burscough with 200, whatever the scenario; 4. Change city and rural sustainable villages figure to read 400 (delete 500 and the word 'total'); 5. Delete the section of the policy on 'Management of housing land supply'.. (S)		
Response	With regard to the specific requests: 1. The dwelling targets for each settlement area will be treated as a minimum requirement. 2/3/4. The totals for Ormskirk /Aughton, Burscough and the villages will be amended in the light of the sites chosen for allocation and updated housing land supply figures, although not to the figures recommended by the objector. 5. In the light of the government's new Growth Agenda, the Council will review the section on management of housing land supply (and the related section in Appendix E). The section will be toned down to say something along the lines of, "The Council may consider restraint...". Given the current housing completions deficit, economic situation, and infrastructure constraints, it is unlikely that the Council is going to be in a position where there is over seven years' supply of deliverable housing land, and where restraint would be necessary, at least not for several years. However, the Core Strategy spans a long period, and it is considered prudent for there to be a "hook" that could be used, if necessary in extreme circumstances, to restrain housing development if circumstances change radically at some point during the Plan period, even if this "hook" turns out never to be needed.		
Recommendation	Amend settlement development targets in the light of the revised development strategy and updated housing land supply figures. Specify that these targets are a minimum. Amend (tone down) the "Management of housing land supply" section of the residential d		
<hr/>			
cspo-115		Messrs Ramsbottom, Halliwell, & Jacton Etc.	
Plan Ref	7.1	Policy Area CS7: Residential Development	Support
Summary	Support for identification of Firswood Road as one of the key sites for residential development in Skelmersdale. (S)		
Response	Comments noted. This land was safeguarded in the previous (2006) Local Plan to meet development needs beyond 2016, and it is now proposed as a housing site to meet development needs during the Plan period (2012-2027).		
Recommendation	No action required.		

cspo-116	Mr David Gray		
Plan Ref	7.1	Policy Area CS7: Residential Development	Object
Summary	Concern that part of Option B which proposes the development of 200 houses near Greetby Hill Primary School will contribute to an unacceptable increase in traffic in an area that is already congested. (S)		
Response	Comments noted. The Council has taken account of the traffic issues associated with the Nursery Farm area of search for housing. In the light of these issues, the land behind Nursery Avenue is no longer being promoted as a housing site through this emerging Plan.		
Recommendation	Remove "Area of Search" designation from Nursery Avenue site.		
<hr/>			
cspo-162	Mr & Mrs P Suggett		
Plan Ref	7.1	Policy Area CS7: Residential Development	Object
Summary	Strong objection against more houses being built in Burscough and on the Green Belt. Concern that traffic and congestion will increase and that there aren't enough services in the area to meet the demand if more housing was built. (S)		
Response	Comments noted. The planning permission at Ainscough's Mill has been taken into account when considering housing land supply. Whilst the market is not buoyant at the moment, housing need remains (based on demographics, etc.), which is why hundreds of new houses are needed. Open space standards exist for housing development, and these will be met for all future schemes.		
Recommendation	No change.		
<hr/>			
cspo-167	Messrs R & J Pickavance	Messrs R & J Pickavance	
Plan Ref	7.1	Policy Area CS7: Residential Development	Object
Summary	1. In summary, the Core Strategy as a whole appears to my clients to be about right in most respects, other than the failure to recognise the merits of Rufford as a focus for development in the northern parishes and the retention of the arbitrary limit of 10 dwellings on greenfield sites in the villages. The latter should be removed for those sites which currently lie within the settlement limits and are shown in the adopted Local Plan as being within an existing residential area. (S)		
Response	With regard to specific numbered points made by the Objector: 3,13-15: National policy prioritises brownfield development over greenfield. This Plan attempts to do the same. However, in the light of the NPPF, and the low number of greenfield sites capable of accommodating more than 10 units which are within settlement boundaries and not subject to other policies, it is now considered appropriate to remove the limit of 10 dwellings on such greenfield sites. 5,7-12: Comments noted. It is recognised that the Northern Parishes area is subject to various constraints. The total for this area takes into account extant and pending permissions for housing, as well as "acceptable" SHLAA sites. Comments made during the consultation regarding the capacity of Banks to take more development have been taken into account. Some housing is being assumed to be delivered in Rufford in recognition of the village's reasonable sustainability. 6. In previous local plans, the principle of the development of safeguarded land for longer-term needs has been agreed. The land is needed now to meet these "longer-term needs", and it is considered entirely appropriate to assign it the same status as greenfield land within the Key Service Centres and Key /Rural Sustainable Villages. Safeguarded land is counted as being within settlements.		
Recommendation	Remove the limit of 10 dwellings on greenfield sites in Key and Rural Sustainable Villages in the Residential Development policy.		
<hr/>			
cspo-184	Mr Stephen Barron		
Plan Ref	7.1	Policy Area CS7: Residential Development	Support with conditions
Summary	Carefully managed small development is required in the larger villages, and this should not be stifled due to the Council's priority of regenerating Skelmersdale. Making land available for development in Skelmersdale does not necessarily mean it will happen. (F)		
Response	Comments noted. The residential development policy allows for housing within the larger villages. It is agreed that land allocated in Skelmersdale (as elsewhere) needs to be demonstrated to be deliverable over the Plan period.		
Recommendation	No change.		
<hr/>			
cspo-250	Mr D Rimmer		
Plan Ref	7.1	Policy Area CS7: Residential Development	Object
Summary	(1) Para. 7.1.8: Housing should not be used as "enabling development" for Skelmersdale regeneration. (2) Para. 7.1.17: To make all homes Lifetime Homes is inappropriate. (3) Para. 7.1.25-27: Support for [rejected] "Alternative option 2", and for SHLAA site BA.024. (S)		
Response	(1) Whilst it is agreed that, ideally, regeneration should take place before new housing, in reality the current economic situation means that contributions from housing are necessary to aid regeneration, and the two must happen simultaneously. It is not agreed that restricting supply in Skelmersdale will increase demand and make regeneration happen. Skelmersdale is the highest settlement in the hierarchy, and it is appropriate to direct development there. (2) Comments noted. Implementing the Lifetime Homes standard at design /build stage requires relatively minor work, and is considered worthwhile, even if not every house is used by an elderly or disabled person. It is agreed that it would be undesirable for an elderly person to under-occupy a 4 or 5 bedroom home. The policy wording can be changed to allow exceptions to the Lifetime Homes Standard if it is clearly demonstrated that it would be inappropriate to meet the Standard. (3) Comments noted.		
Recommendation	Change policy wording to allow exceptions to meeting the Lifetime Homes Standard, provided it is demonstrated that it would clearly be inappropriate to meet the Standard.		

cspo-257	Mr Francis Williams	member Ormskirk Friends of the Earth	
Plan Ref	7.1	Policy Area CS7: Residential Development	Observations
Summary	Priority should be given for affordable homes as it is the greatest need. (S)		
Response	Comments noted. The Council agrees that affordable housing is a priority.		
Recommendation	No change.		
<hr/>			
cspo-291	Mr Alexis De Pol		
Plan Ref	7.1	Policy Area CS7: Residential Development	Object
Summary	1. More development should be directed to key and rural sustainable villages. 2. The limit of 10 units on greenfield sites should be removed. 3. The requirement for brownfield sites to be considered before non-allocated greenfield sites should be amended. 4. The policy should clarify what constitutes "major greenfield development". (S)		
Response	1. Comments noted; this issue is being addressed in the overarching sustainable development framework policy. 2. Taking into account latest government policy and statements, it is agreed that within the boundaries of reasonably sustainable settlements, it would be appropriate to allow the development of greenfield sites, provided they are not subject to other policies that would limit development, for example open space designations. 3. It is agreed that the residential development policy should be amended to remove the 'sequential approach' with regard to the development of greenfield sites within sustainable settlements. 4. Rather than defining what constitutes "major" greenfield development, the policy should be amended to remove the word "major".		
Recommendation	1. Amend development targets for settlement areas. 2. Remove the limit of 10 dwellings for development on greenfield sites within Key Service Centres and Key / Rural Sustainable Villages. 3. Amend the policy wording to remove the requirement for a sequent		
<hr/>			
cspo-307	Mr John Lloyd		
Plan Ref	7.1	Policy Area CS7: Residential Development	Observations
Summary	Less Green Belt could be released if already committed developments are taken into account. (S)		
Response	Yes, already committed developments have been taken into account, and have been assumed to contribute towards the housing targets for each area. In fact, the number of units with outstanding planning permission is over 1,000, although not all of these units are certain to come forward.		
Recommendation	No change to housing figures in the Plan, but specify in technical paper that commitments have been taken into account.		
<hr/>			
cspo-316	IKO Plc		
Plan Ref	7.1	Policy Area CS7: Residential Development	Support with conditions
Summary	Support the prioritisation of development brownfield land for housing, subject to housing numbers being amended as set out under 'spatial strategy'. (S)		
Response	Comments noted. The Council has paid careful attention to the comments made by the various individuals and organisations during the consultation programme, and the target number of dwellings for Skelmersdale is proposed to be reduced from 3,000 to 2,400, whilst the target for villages is to increase from 400 to 650 (of which 100 are for the Eastern Parishes area, which includes Appley Bridge). With regard to housing development on employment sites, the general approach is to protect employment land. The employment land policy should be amended to cover proposals for residential development on employment sites.		
Recommendation	Amend target numbers of dwellings for settlement areas in the Borough. (This will be set out in the Sustainable Development Framework policy, rather than the Residential Development policy.) Amend employment development policy to cover proposals for resid		
<hr/>			
cspo-32	Mr Tony McAteer	McAteer Associates Ltd	
Plan Ref	7.1	Policy Area CS7: Residential Development	Object
Summary	It is not accepted that "the Council is unable to influence ... [elderly persons' accommodation] schemes coming forward..." as stated in para 7.1.16. To fall back onto the suggested wording in Policy CS7, and the Lifetime Homes Standard is ignoring the problem in West Lancashire. (S)		
Response	The current evidence base does not cover what percentage of elderly accommodation is necessary and / or viable, otherwise a figure would have been included in the Policy. 2008-based household projections state that 43% of households in West Lancashire could comprise people aged over 65 by 2033. A requirement that 40% of new dwellings be designed for the elderly would almost certainly be undeliverable, but a requirement of 20% is proposed for the next round of consultation.		
Recommendation	Amend residential development policy to include a requirement that 20% of homes in developments of 15 units or more be designed specifically for the elderly.		

cspo-334	Mr Roger Clayton		
Plan Ref	7.1	Policy Area CS7: Residential Development	Object
Summary	1. Object to the total of 3,000 dwellings for Skelmersdale. 2. Firwood Road is in Lathom and should not be part of the Skelmersdale target. 3. Apparent contradictions with regard to the wording for greenfield development within Skelmersdale: clarify. 4. Clarify the wording in the policy with regard to protected open land and Green Belt. Some clarification needed on terminology and references (S)		
Response	Comments noted. 1. Skelmersdale is the top settlement in the hierarchy, with sufficient infrastructure capacity to accommodate more development, and it is therefore considered appropriate to direct most development there. It is accepted that the target of 3,000 is too high and should be reduced. 2. The land at Firwood Road was safeguarded in the Local Plan for development needs beyond 2016. The land is now required to help meet the Borough's development needs to 2027. It is considered appropriate, given its location directly adjacent to Skelmersdale, for this land to contribute towards the Skelmersdale target. 3. The wording of the policy with regard to the development of greenfield sites in Skelmersdale is considered to be unambiguous. The policy is to be re-worded with regard to greenfield development in Skelmersdale, and this section can be clarified if necessary. 4. With regard to protected open land and Green Belt, affordable housing will be allowed, subject to there being no sites in "higher order settlements". The limit is per site, not per settlement. Minor amendments to the wording of the policy will be considered to make this more clear.		
Recommendation	Reduce Skelmersdale's housing target from 3,000 to 2,400 to take account of deliverability concerns expressed during CSPO consultation. Reword the Policy with regard to greenfield development in Skelmersdale. Clarify wording with regard to "very limited"		
cspo-355	Mr Robert W. Pickavance		
Plan Ref	7.1	Policy Area CS7: Residential Development	Observations
Summary	Comments on suitability of New Road site.		
Response	Comments noted. This site is not considered large enough for a specific allocation in the Plan. The Nothern Parishes total allows for housing development in Rufford.		
Recommendation	No change required.		
cspo-375	Ms Kathleen M Prince		
Plan Ref	7.1	Policy Area CS7: Residential Development	Observations
Summary	Banks Parish Council, in its submission document assessing housing needs states that account has been taken only of the demand for houses and not the supply of properties which might be empty and available for occupation. This is clearly unsound from the viewpoint of economic analysis and, if other parishes in the Borough have used the same method of calculation will have resulted in a serious overstatement of housing needs. This certainly appears to be the case in Banks, as evidenced by the fact that both the recent Housing Association developments of "affordable housing"™ are occupied, in the main, by people who were not resident in the village before those developments took place. (F)		
Response	Comments noted. It is correct to take account of empty properties when calculating housing requirements. A small number of empty properties are necessary for the housing market to function efficiently. Overall, West Lancashire's proportion of empty homes is much lower than average (the lowest in the north of England), and the scope for reducing housing requirements as a result of filling empty homes is very limited. Empty homes can be mentioned in the policy justification.		
Recommendation	Mention in the policy justification the bringing back into use of empty properties. See also rep 191.		
cspo-406		Wirral to Wyre Team Natural England	
Plan Ref	7.1	Policy Area CS7: Residential Development	Observations
Summary	Would like to see garden land protected more from development. (s)		
Response	The principle of garden development was considered in spring 2010 when the Interim Housing Policy was being prepared. The amount of garden development in West Lancashire has been relatively low over recent years (contrary to incorrect government statistics released in 2010), and it is not considered to be a significant issue. Thus Policy CS7 allows garden development in principle, subject to various safeguards. If it becomes evident that a significant amount of garden development is taking place, the policy can be reviewed in future. The policy can be amended to require that development of greenfield sites (which include gardens) must be in accordance with other Plan policies (which include policies relating to the natural environment, green infrastructure, climate change, etc.). The justification text could be amended to make reference to some of the points raised by the Objector, although cross-reference to other policies is not considered appropriate.		
Recommendation	Amend policy to require that development of greenfield sites must be in accordance with other Plan policies.		
cspo-428	Ms Judith Nelson	English Heritage	
Plan Ref	7.1	Policy Area CS7: Residential Development	Observations
Summary	CS7: The section of the policy on the development of garden land should also include consideration of impacts on the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting. It is suggested that "heritage" is added after "biodiversity".		
Response	Impact on the setting of heritage assets is covered in national policy and does not need to be repeated in the Core Strategy. The phrase in CS7: "including, but not limited to" allows for heritage to be considered.		
Recommendation	No change.		

cspo-436	Mr Andrew Thorley	Strategic Land Manager Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd	
Plan Ref	7.1	Policy Area CS7: Residential Development	Observations
Summary	Taylor Wimpey considers that the restrictions on the delivery of the housing target should be based on a robust and credible evidence base justifying the reduced release over the early years of the plan. (S)		
Response	Comments noted. An evidence base exists relating to the extent of site constraints, but to record all this information in the Core Strategy would make the document over-long. The issues mentioned by the Objector can instead be set out in detail in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. It is recognised that mechanisms such as attenuating and storing water on site could be used to allow some development in advance of wastewater treatment works upgrades, and the Council will support such works where feasible and appropriate and supported by the Environment Agency and United Utilities in order to deliver the Plan's housing requirement.		
Recommendation	Consider the issues mentioned by the Objector in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.		
cspo-444	Mr Andrew Thorley	Strategic Land Manager Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd	
Plan Ref	7.1	Policy Area CS7: Residential Development	Object
Summary	High Lane should be identified as a Strategic Site or Area of Search for housing. Objections: 1. Too much housing is assumed for Skelmersdale, which suffers from poor market conditions. 2. More housing should be directed to Ormskirk / Aughton. 3. There is a need to identify the strategy for release of Green Belt and greenfield sites. 4. Object to requirement to meet the Lifetime Homes Standard without sound evidence base. (S)		
Response	Comments noted with regard to High Lane (Grove Farm). With regard to the specific objections: 1. Skelmersdale should be the primary focus for development, although it is agreed that the housing target for Skelmersdale must be achievable over the lifetime of the Plan. 3,000 is likely to be unachievable, and a target of 2,400 is more realistic. 2. It is agreed that Ormskirk is a highly sustainable location. In response to representations received on housing and related matters, the Council will revisit the housing targets for the various settlements. 3. It is agreed that the strategy for releasing Green Belt and greenfield sites needs to be set out. Once the choice of sites has been finalised, and the infrastructure delivery plan completed, such a strategy can be devised. 4. The evidence the Council possessed suggests that the cost of achieving Lifetime Homes standards if incorporated at design stage is relatively low (<£1,500 per dwelling). Also, the population is ageing, and people of retirement age will comprise roughly a third of the population by 2030, and 40% of households in West Lancashire by 2033. It is considered that a robust policy on the Lifetime Homes Standard is prudent at this stage, although it is accepted that it may not always be appropriate to require the Lifetime Homes Standard for every dwelling.		
Recommendation	Mark Grove Farm as a proposed housing allocation. 1. Reduce Skelmersdale's housing target from 3,000 to 2,400 to take account of deliverability concerns expressed through CSPO consultation. 2. Revise Ormskirk /Aughton housing totals. 3. Add more detail to		
cspo-448	Mr Andrew Thorley	Strategic Land Manager Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd	
Plan Ref	7.1	Policy Area CS7: Residential Development	Support
Summary	Taylor Wimpey UK Limited supports the proposed management of the housing land supply in Policy CS7 in order to maintain targets and manage delivery of housing in accordance with national guidance contained in PPS3. (F)		
Response	Comments noted.		
Recommendation	No change.		
cspo-45	Mr Tony McAteer	McAteer Associates Ltd	
Plan Ref	7.1	Policy Area CS7: Residential Development	Object
Summary	The approach to residential development in the Key Sustainable Villages should be different to that in the Rural Sustainable Villages to support the sequential approach set out in Policy CS 1. In Key Sustainable villages the approach should be to permit development of more than 10 units on Brownfield sites and on Greenfield sites not protected by other policies, rather than as stated in the policy. (F)		
Response	Given the relatively small number of greenfield sites not protected by other policies in Key Sustainable Villages in West Lancashire, and the provisions of the emerging National Planning Policy Framework, it is considered acceptable to amend the policy as requested by the Objector.		
Recommendation	Amend residential development policy to allow for the development of greenfield sites of more than 10 units within Key Sustainable Villages, provided these sites are not protected by other policies.		
cspo-55		Church Commissioners For England	
Plan Ref	7.1	Policy Area CS7: Residential Development	Support with conditions
Summary	We would raise concerns over the restrictive level of development within the Rural Service Villages. Flexibility is needed with regard to underused agricultural buildings - see CS1 response also. (S)		
Response	Support for the "Plan B" noted. With regard to development in villages and agricultural building conversions, please see response to the same issue raised in Rep. 52 (Policy CS1). Barn conversions and live-work units are permissible under the Rural Economy policy.		
Recommendation	No change to residential development policy. (But see Rep. 52 regarding conversion of redundant rural buildings.)		

cspo-587	Mrs Margaret Wiltshire	Planning Volunteer, Treasurer CPRE (West Lancs Group)	
Plan Ref	7.1	Policy Area CS7: Residential Development	Observations
Summary	Can assurance be given that any neighbouring borough's housing needs are not going to be met in West Lancashire?		
Response	The housing requirement in the Core Strategy is to meet West Lancashire's housing needs only. If any formal approach were ever made to this Council by a neighbouring Borough to meet part of their housing needs, this would presumably require an alteration to the Core Strategy, and would be subject to full consultation / environmental appraisal, etc. as well as requiring approval by Members.		
Recommendation	No change		
cspo-604	Mr Alan Hubbard	Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust	
Plan Ref	7.1	Policy Area CS7: Residential Development	Object
Summary	Should include a specific cross-reference to Policy CS1. (S)		
Response	The Core Strategy aims to keep cross-references to specific policies to a minimum. As such, a cross-reference to the provisions of Policy CS1 from Policy CS7 is not considered appropriate, especially given the overarching phrase, "Subject to other relevant policies being satisfied".		
Recommendation	No change.		
cspo-658	Ms Judith Nelson	English Heritage	
Plan Ref	7.1	Policy Area CS7: Residential Development	Observations
Summary	The section of the policy on the development of garden land should also include consideration of impacts on the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting. It is suggested that heritage is added after biodiversity. (S)		
Response	This appears to be a duplicate of Ref 428. Same response: Impact on the setting of heritage assets is covered in national policy and does not need to be repeated in the Core Strategy. The phrase in CS7: "including, but not limited to" allows for heritage to be considered. The word 'Heritage' could be added to the policy justification.		
Recommendation	No change.		
cspo-665	Mr Simon Artiss	Planning Manager Bellway Homes Ltd	
Plan Ref	7.1	Policy Area CS7: Residential Development	Observations
Summary	We consider that Ormskirk, as the second largest town, with a proposed share of just 300 units (just 6% of total supply), must be allocated a greater proportion of total new housing to reflect its status and the fact that it is a sustainable location. Realistically, a reduced level to Skelmersdale Town centre and Burscough Strategic Site will merit an increased need for more housing land in Ormskirk. (s)		
Response	Comments noted. The various targets for the Borough's settlements are to be revised in the light of updated housing land supply figures, and comments received during the Consultation period.		
Recommendation	Revise housing requirements for the Borough's settlement areas.		
cspo-673	Mr C Smith		
Plan Ref	7.1	Policy Area CS7: Residential Development	Support with conditions
Summary	We support Policy CS7 only if it includes a total of not less than 800 dwellings for Burscough and facilitates residential development on Green Belt covered by a Strategic Development Site.		
Response	Comments noted.		
Recommendation	No change.		

cspo-729	Wainhomes Developments		
Plan Ref	7.1	Policy Area CS7: Residential Development	Object
Summary	- All references to Skelmersdale in policies CS1 and CS7 (and throughout the Core Strategy) should be referred to as Skelmersdale (Up Holland). What this means is that Up Holland is part of the Key Service Centre and is not a Key Sustainable Village. - Th		
Response	<p>1. It is agreed that Skelmersdale and Up Holland are to be treated together as a Key Service Centre, rather than Up Holland as a Key Sustainable Village. This should be explicitly stated in the Plan, although not necessarily at every reference to Skelmersdale. 2. Development requirements and housing completions from 2010-2012 (in fact from 2003-2012) are being taken into account in the Core Strategy housing calculations. 3. Currently, it is agreed that the Core Strategy should be in conformity with the RSS. If this is the case at the time of the CS examination, then housing targets would need to be increased. However, if as expected, the RSS has been abolished by the time of the examination, the Council considers it is more appropriate to take account of the most recent evidence available, i.e. the 2008-based household projections, along with the RSS deficit from 2003-2012, as the housing requirement. 4. See above. It may not be feasible to meet the RSS deficit in the shorter term, given infrastructure constraints, and the ability of the market to deliver the required number of dwellings in the current economic situation. It is more realistic to spread the deficit over the Plan period, rather than the short term - an approach agreed by the Inspector at the Central Lancashire Core Strategy examination. 5. The appeal decisions quoted are noted. In the light of the government's new Growth Agenda, the Council will review the section on management of housing land supply (and the related section in Appendix E). This is likely to lead to the section being toned down to say something along the lines of, "The Council may consider restraint...". Given the current housing completions deficit, economic situation, and infrastructure constraints, it is unlikely that the Council is going to be in a position where there is an unacceptable oversupply of deliverable housing land, and where restraint would be necessary, at least not for several years. However, the Core Strategy spans a long period, and it is considered prudent for there to be a "hook" that could be used, if necessary in extreme circumstances, to restrain housing development if circumstances change radically at some point during the Plan period, even if this "hook" turns out never to be needed. Housing targets for the different parts of the Borough are not enough in themselves to restrain development, especially as these totals can be exceeded. When considering supply, it is *deliverable* supply that is assessed (sites with permission are not necessarily deliverable), and thus undeliverable sites, even those with planning permission, should not stifle development as claimed by the objector. 6. Now that the Council is pursuing a Local Plan, sites will be proposed for allocation in a shorter timescale than anticipated for a Site Allocations DPD. Applications submitted before the adoption date of the Plan on sites proposed for allocation will be treated on their merits, taking into account a range of factors including land supply, infrastructure, and current /emerging policy. 7. A requirement of 3,675 dwellings for Skelmersdale /Up Holland is considered undeliverable over the Core Strategy period, given market constraints in particular. Amending Policy CS7 to state that current "Protected" (Policy DS4) land in Skelmersdale /Up Holland can be developed is not considered appropriate. Whatever the merits of the Objector's Client's Chequer Lane site, there is DS4 land adjacent to Dalton that would appear to be inappropriate to develop for a number of reasons. Policy DS4 land is being reviewed as part of the Local Plan preparation process, and it is anticipated that most such land will remain protected from development or safeguarded for development beyond 2027.</p>		
Recommendation	1. Amend CS1 to reflect Skelmersdale / Up Holland being treated as one Key Service Centre. 2. Clarify the Plan's wording to specify that development requirements and performance from 2010-12, as well as the RSS deficit, is being taken into account. 3. Ton		
cspo-462	Mr D Tunstall		
Plan Ref	Policy CS8	Affordable and Specialist Housing	Support
Summary	Housing specially designed for elderly - yes but the term 'some' is a very loose term. Small terrace properties preferrably bungalows this would allow pensioners to downsize, freeing up large houses onto the market but would have to be as in 'a' above, ie affordable. (F)		
Response	Comments noted. It is agreed that smaller properties are more suitable for elderly people, especially those living alone. Elderly accommodation should include affordable accommodation. Using Household Projection figures, the Council is considering replacing "an appropriate proportion" with a specific percentage requirement.		
Recommendation	Introduce a requirement for a specific proportion of dwellings to be designed specifically for the elderly (in the residential development policy, rather than the affordable housing policy).		
cspo-235	Mr Shaun Taylor	Planning Associate Director G L Hearn Property Consultants	
Plan Ref	7.2	Policy Area CS8: Affordable & Specialist Housing	Object
Summary	Affordable housing threshold should be set at 15 or more dwellings to ensure viability and therefore deliverability of smaller sites that form an important part of the Borough's housing land supply. (S)		
Response	<p>The Council's evidence on viability concludes that an affordable housing requirement could be applied to developments as small as 3 units whilst maintaining viability. To raise the threshold to 15 would result in the loss of a significant potential number of affordable housing units. The proposed threshold of 8, more than double the minimum viable figure, is considered to strike an appropriate balance between securing as much affordable housing as possible from market schemes, and maximising the provision of housing in general. As the Objector states, the policy allows for lower percentages of affordable housing if it is demonstrated that a scheme would not be viable with the proposed affordable housing policy requirement. Furthermore, the use of the Dynamic Viability model should ensure that only a viable proportion of affordable housing is required for each housing proposal. The Objector has not submitted any evidence to back up his claim that viability information is unlikely to be obtained for developments of under 15 units. It is expected that developers would undertake some sort of viability assessment themselves when deciding whether or not to carry out a particular scheme.</p>		
Recommendation	No change.		

cspo-243	Mr Andrew Taylor	Planning Director David Wilson Homes	
Plan Ref	7.2	Policy Area CS8: Affordable & Specialist Housing	Object
Summary	Threshold too low, percentages too high. (s)		
Response	Comments noted. The Council's evidence on viability concludes that an affordable housing requirement could be applied to developments as small as 3 units whilst maintaining viability. To raise the threshold to 15 would result in the loss of a significant potential number of affordable housing units. The proposed threshold of 8, more than double the minimum viable figure, is considered to strike an appropriate balance between securing as much affordable housing as possible from market schemes, and maximising the provision of housing in general. The affordable housing policy allows for lower percentages of affordable housing if it is demonstrated that a scheme would not be viable with the proposed policy requirement. Furthermore, the use of the Dynamic Viability model should ensure that only a viable proportion of affordable housing is required for each housing proposal.		
Recommendation	No change.		
cspo-252	Mr D Rimmer		
Plan Ref	7.2	Policy Area CS8: Affordable & Specialist Housing	Object
Summary	CS8 - 35% affordable housing provision is too high. This will deter landowners releasing land and affect developers sales rates. (F)		
Response	The evidence base (Viability Study) concludes that 35% is viable. Each case will be treated on its merits, and any robust viability information provided by the applicant that demonstrates that the Core Strategy requirement would make that particular scheme unviable will be taken into account.		
Recommendation	No change.		
cspo-33	Mr Tony McAteer	McAteer Associates Ltd	
Plan Ref	7.2	Policy Area CS8: Affordable & Specialist Housing	Object
Summary	Specific allocation of sites for elderly accommodation is needed (S)		
Response	In writing the policy, the expectation was that accommodation for the elderly would be provided as market conditions dictate. The allocation of sites specifically for affordable and / or old people's housing has been considered, but judged unnecessary. Affordable and older people's accommodation will instead be achieved through the requirements for such accommodation as a percentage of the overall number of units in market housing developments, as set out in the relevant policies, and through schemes specifically for such accommodation being submitted and approved. (100% affordable housing schemes have been delivered in West Lancashire over recent years.) Elderly persons' accommodation and affordable housing schemes would be expected to be within settlements, rather than in the countryside.		
Recommendation	No change required to the affordable housing policy.		
cspo-335	Mr Roger Clayton		
Plan Ref	7.2	Policy Area CS8: Affordable & Specialist Housing	Object
Summary	By planning for so much development in Skelmersdale (with maximum provision of 20% and no provision at all on sites of fewer than 15 units) the 35% target would be very significantly under-achieved across the borough. What's more, the council proposes a 'get out' clause for developers to avoid these requirements by saying that their schemes would be unviable if they were to include provision of affordable housing. In our view, it is up to the Council to enforce such requirements, not to provide for developers to drive a coach and horses through the policy. (S)		
Response	Whilst the Housing Needs study suggests an annual need which is 70% of the overall housing requirement, the Viability Study states that 35% is the maximum requirement for which schemes will be viable. PPS3 and subsequent Case Law make clear that affordable housing targets must be demonstrated to be viable /deliverable, hence the overall limit of 35%, the lower requirement in Skelmersdale, and the allowance for viability of individual schemes to be taken into account. Taking account of viability will not usually result in there being no affordable housing, but evidently there will be less than 35% overall.		
Recommendation	No change		
cspo-358	Mr Robert W. Pickavance		
Plan Ref	7.2	Policy Area CS8: Affordable & Specialist Housing	Support with conditions
Summary	Need to review affordable housing policy.		
Response	Comments noted. There are a number of reasons as to why less affordable housing than needed has been built in West Lancashire over recent years. It is not considered necessary to change the paragraphs referred to by the Objector. Policies CS7 and CS8 take into account viability, and allow for schemes comprising a mix of development in settlements such as Rufford. The Core Strategy "leaves the door open" for the allocation of sites for 100% affordable housing (which can be viable, or else can be made deliverable with external funding), but it does not make the decision to do so. This decision will be made as part of the Site Allocations DPD process.		
Recommendation	No change		

cspo-453	Mr Andrew Thorley	Strategic Land Manager Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd	
Plan Ref	7.2	Policy Area CS8: Affordable & Specialist Housing	Object
Summary	Support for a varying target based on development size. Object to the requirement for 35% affordable housing on sites of 15+ units. 30% is a more realistic target in the current economic climate. Support for a tenure split with majority social rented. (S)		
Response	1. Support for graded affordable housing requirement noted. 2. The 35% target is a maximum, and is intended for the plan period as a whole. Market conditions, whilst difficult at present, are likely to improve over coming years, and thus a target of 35% is expected to be viable for the majority of the plan period. Policy CS8 allows for the viability of individual schemes to be taken into account, and thus if 35% is not viable at present, this can be recognised when dealing with planning applications in the near future. It is considered that the more challenging target of 35% is more appropriate, as this is likely to procure more affordable housing units overall. 3. Comments regarding tenure split noted. This may need to be revised in the light of "affordable rent".		
Recommendation	No change with regard to affordable housing requirements. Changes to the policy to reflect the effects of affordable rent will be necessary.		
cspo-461	Mr D Tunstall		
Plan Ref	7.2	Policy Area CS8: Affordable & Specialist Housing	Object
Summary	20-35% affordable housing is too low and should be increased. (S)		
Response	The requirement of up to 35% reflects the findings of the Council's viability study carried out on our behalf by specialists in affordable housing viability. Targets above 35% are likely to be unviable, which could render the Core Strategy unsound. However, if the economy improves, the use of the proposed "Dynamic Viability" model could result in requirements of over 35% for some developments in future.		
Recommendation	No change.		
cspo-56		Church Commissioners For England	
Plan Ref	7.2	Policy Area CS8: Affordable & Specialist Housing	Support with conditions
Summary	1. The threshold should be increased from 8 to 10 units or more, in line with the current interim housing policy. 2. Smaller schemes should not be rendered unviable by tenuous affordable housing thresholds, particularly during current economic times. 3. The flexibility proposed for possible "off-site" provision is supported. 4. 100% affordable housing sites are generally unviable for landowners. We would advise that an element of market housing needs to be introduced into such schemes to ensure their deliverability. (S)		
Response	1. Our evidence base concludes the threshold for requiring affordable housing could go as low as 3. Given the proposed threshold is most than twice this amount already, it is not considered appropriate to raise it further. A higher threshold will result in the opportunity to procure affordable housing being missed in a greater number of housing development schemes. 2. As per the above answer, a threshold of 8 is not considered tenuous. The evidence base study was undertaken during the current difficult economic times. The proposed Dynamic Viability model should help ensure that affordable housing requirements reflect the economic climate at the time, and the viability of each scheme will be taken into account when assessing development proposals. 3. Noted. 4. The majority of affordable housing being granted permission and completed in the Borough in recent years has been through 100% affordable housing schemes. Grant funding can make schemes viable, and the new "affordable rent" tenure should also increase viability and, possibly as a consequence, land values. Allowing market housing as part of affordable housing schemes would be inappropriate in some areas, e.g. Green Belt. It is considered that the residential development policy allows market housing in an appropriately wide range of settlements, and that this range does not need to be expanded.		
Recommendation	No change.		
cspo-588	Mrs Margaret Wiltshire	Planning Volunteer, Treasurer CPRE (West Lancs Group)	
Plan Ref	7.2	Policy Area CS8: Affordable & Specialist Housing	Observations
Summary	Concerned that the policy on affordable housing is not stringent enough and much needed affordable housing will not be delivered. (s)		
Response	The Housing Needs Study sets out numbers of affordable houses per annum necessary to meet newly arising needs, as well as to remove the backlog in affordable housing provision. However, PPS3 and Case Law require that affordable housing targets be viable if the Core Strategy is to be found sound. The Council's Housing Viability Study states that the maximum viable target is 35%, even though the need is for a higher percentage. Consideration has been given to a lower threshold than 8, but taking into account all relevant factors, including the likelihood of developers bringing forward small schemes if an element of affordable housing were required, the threshold of 8 is considered most appropriate. 100% affordable housing schemes are still encouraged and expected during the Plan period. p196 refers to relaxing other requirements for providers of 100% affordable housing (for example the Lifetime Homes requirement) in order to make it easier for them to deliver affordable housing. It is not about relaxing affordable housing requirements.		
Recommendation	No change		

cspo-666	Mr Simon Artiss	Planning Manager Bellway Homes Ltd	
Plan Ref	7.2	Policy Area CS8: Affordable & Specialist Housing	Observations
Summary	Policy CS8 - we welcome the account to be taken to viability which continues to play a significant role in delivering development including affordable homes.		
Response	Comments noted.		
Recommendation	No change required.		
cspo-674	Mr C Smith		
Plan Ref	7.2	Policy Area CS8: Affordable & Specialist Housing	Object
Summary	We object to policy CS8 and its requirement to deliver a minimum proportion of 35% affordable housing. We consider that this is not sufficiently flexible inclusion in the Core Strategy and that it may have a significant impact on the deliverability of housing through the plan period.		
Response	The 35% requirement is based on the findings of the West Lancashire Viability Study. There is flexibility, both on account of the viability of individual schemes being taken into account, and the proposed use of the Dynamic Viability model.		
Recommendation	No change.		
cspo-311	Ms Linda Hill	Ormskirk Community Partnership	
Plan Ref	Policy CS9	Provision of Student Accommodation in Ormskirk and Aughton	Support with conditions
Summary	Support proposals to tighten controls on student HMOs. However would like to see local resident and community groups consulted regarding students HMOs in order to draw from first hand experience. (S)		
Response	Comments noted. The Council is engaging with resident and community groups with regard to the student HMO issue.		
Recommendation	No change.		
cspo-321	Mr Ron Rowles		
Plan Ref	Policy CS9	Provision of Student Accommodation in Ormskirk and Aughton	Support
Summary	I am totally in favour of restricting the student occupancy of housing in the town to a maximum of 15%.		
Response	Comments noted.		
Recommendation	No change.		
cspo-79	Mr Robert Kewley		
Plan Ref	Policy CS9	Provision of Student Accommodation in Ormskirk and Aughton	Object
Summary	1. New student accommodation must not result in increased numbers of students at the University. 2. Greenfield land should not be released for University expansion whilst brownfield sites are available. 3. Tuition fees may have an impact on student numbers in future. (S)		
Response	1. The Council is aware of the possibility of new accommodation meaning that the University can increase the number of first year students, who would subsequently need accommodation in their remaining years, which could exacerbate current problems. The student accommodation policy has a requirement that new on-campus accommodation would only be supported if evidence of the need for increased provision was demonstrated. Accommodation elsewhere must be shown to demonstrably reduce demand for the conversion of existing dwelling houses to HMOs. Wording to the policy justification can be added to the effect that the Council will seek reassurance that any extra student accommodation provided on the campus will not lead to an increase in demand for HMOs in residential areas, for example from students staying in on-campus accommodation in their first year and needing to find off-campus accommodation elsewhere in subsequent years. 2. Only a small number of brownfield sites are available within walking distance of the University, and these tend to be part of the housing land supply. Whilst student accommodation may be acceptable on such sites, losing these sites to student accommodation would result in a need for more housing land, probably on greenfield sites, giving a similar net result. 3. The Council accepts that the increased tuition fees may result in a drop in student numbers, and / or in shorter courses. This situation needs to be closely monitored over the next few years, and policies written at this point in time with respect to Edge Hill University carefully worded so that any greenfield land allocated or safeguarded for University expansion remains undeveloped unless the University robustly demonstrates the need for more land at some point in the future.		
Recommendation	Add the following to the policy justification: The Council will seek reassurance that any extra student accommodation will not lead to an increase in demand for HMOs in residential areas (for example from students staying in on-campus accommodation in the		
cspo-169	Mr Peter Banks		
Plan Ref	7.3	Policy Area CS9: Provision of Student Accommodation in Ormskirk	Observations
Summary	Additional student accommodation should be built on campus to eliminate student occupation of HMOs. (S)		
Response	Comments noted. The Student Accommodation Policy supports the provision of accommodation on campus, although the amount of development land within the campus is limited. The Council has no legal powers to influence the conversion of student HMOs back to residential use.		
Recommendation	No change.		

cspo-258	Mr Francis Williams	member Ormskirk Friends of the Earth	
Plan Ref	7.3	Policy Area CS9: Provision of Student Accommodation in Ormskirk	Object
Summary	Objects to Council's policy to limit student HMOs (S)		
Response	An "outright ban" is not considered appropriate - some student HMOs can be accommodated within residential areas without an unacceptable effect on amenity. There is a need for a limited amount of student accommodation in Ormskirk. The proposed policy sets stringent limits on the number of HMOs that would be allowed in particular streets (in most cases 5%). Many streets already exceed that proportion, and thus in such cases, the policy is tantamount to an "outright ban".		
Recommendation	No change.		
<hr/>			
cspo-329		Edge Hill University	
Plan Ref	7.3	Policy Area CS9: Provision of Student Accommodation in Ormskirk	Support
Summary	Overall support for the policy with some recommended changes, in particular: Para. 7.3.5 - reference to "growth" is misleading - the University is concentrating on meeting current un-met needs for existing students - amendment to wording requested. Revised policy wording supplied.		
Response	Comments noted. The clarification on student numbers and the University's approach is welcomed, and appropriate changes will be made to the wording of the paragraphs referred to, in order to reflect this clarification. However, the Council considers it appropriate to retain within the policy the requirement that the need for increased provision of student accommodation associated with Edge Hill University should be demonstrated by evidence.		
Recommendation	Change the "Context" and "Justification" sections of this policy area to reflect the University's clarification regarding current and future student numbers. Replace the word "expansion" with "extension" in the first sentence of the Policy.		
<hr/>			
cspo-363	Ms Jane Thompson		
Plan Ref	7.3	Policy Area CS9: Provision of Student Accommodation in Ormskirk	Observations
Summary	When considering %s on certain streets of HMOs, the Council should also take into account the number of students in the HMOs. (S) e.g. an HMO may only have 3 occupants however an HMO may have 24 or more occupants (I ask you to look at 198 Burscough Street , who firstly wanted 36 students , then 24 students- never mind parking issues). There are other examples . The number of students in one HMO alone could unbalance a community . (F)		
Response	Comments noted. The term "HMO", as used in the Core Strategy, refers to the central government definition of HMO, which limits numbers to between 3 and 6 students. The proposed accommodation at 198 Burscough Street falls within a different Use Class, and would be assessed differently. It is agreed that an HMO for 6 students would have a greater impact than an HMO for 3 students, and that the potential numbers of students in any proposed HMO would be taken into account when assessing planning applications for HMOs.		
Recommendation	Amend wording of policy justification to highlight that HMOs or purpose-built student accommodation of differing sizes have differing impact on their surroundings.		
<hr/>			
cspo-464	Mr D Tunstall		
Plan Ref	7.3	Policy Area CS9: Provision of Student Accommodation in Ormskirk	Object
Summary	Unsatisfactory to have poorly maintained student housing in Ormskirk (S)		
Response	Comments noted. This is one reason why the proportion of dwellings allowed to convert to HMOs is set relatively low.		
Recommendation	No change.		
<hr/>			
cspo-507	New Way Tenants Residents		
Plan Ref	7.3	Policy Area CS9: Provision of Student Accommodation in Ormskirk	Observations
Summary	Better control over student accommodation is required. More family and affordable housing is urgently required in Ormskirk. (s)		
Response	Comments noted. With regard to specific points raised: 1. A small percentage of students is considered appropriate within residential areas, to achieve mixed communities, but it is agreed that the number should be limited. 2. The Council agrees that the most appropriate place for purpose-built student accommodation is on the University Campus, but may not go as far as restricting development on any campus extension solely to student accommodation. 3. The Council does not have the legal powers to reduce the numbers of HMOs, only to limit their increase. If the "other authorities' policies" are available, this Council would be interested to see them. An amendment to the student accommodation policy to discourage clustering would be appropriate. 4. Similarly, it is beyond planning powers to require HMO owners to apply to the Council to continue use of a building as an HMO if it changes hands. 5. Comment noted - the Council agrees that there is a need for affordable housing. Loss of cheaper properties to HMOs exacerbates this problem.		
Recommendation	Amend Student Accommodation Policy to presume against "clustering", even within the percentage limits.		

cspo-30	Mrs Alice de la Rue	NFGLG	
Plan Ref	Policy CS10	Provision for Gypsies & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople	Object
Summary	Object to setting limits on number of pitches and number of sites, which should be determined by need and considered against criteria set out in a policy in the Core Strategy not the Development Management DPD. Concerned over restricting sites to 'broad locations', especially if this applies to planning applications, but if there is need arising in these areas it is acceptable to prioritise search for allocations in those areas.		
Response	Although the Core Strategy provides a maximum number of pitches the policy also states that sites should be able to accommodate a compound increase of 3% between 2016 and 2027. The targets set are based on locally determined targets based upon local evidence including local need. West Lancashire currently has no authorised sites for gypsies and travellers and has not decided to expand the existing unauthorised sites. The Core Strategy is a strategic document and does not allow for individual sites to be identified. Although Circulars 01/2006 and 04/2007 do say that the Core Strategy should set out criteria for the location of sites the Council believe that a criteria based policy would be more appropriate in the Development Management DPD. Instead the broad locations identified are based upon established need within the Borough.		
Recommendation	Criteria for Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Sites will be added to the Core Strategy Policy in accordance with the advice contained within Circulars 01/2006 and 04/2007. This guidance will incorporate advice contained within the Government		
cspo-590	Mrs Margaret Wiltshire	Planning Volunteer, Treasurer CPRE (West Lancs Group)	
Plan Ref	7.4	Policy Area CS10: Provision for Gypsies & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople	Observations
Summary	If your implicit intention is to retain the existing long-term sites (7.4.2), authorize them and be able to exercise some control over conditions when required, it should not cause undue alarm or problems to nearby residents. We note that the two gypsy sites are in the Green Belt.		
Response	Comments Noted.		
Recommendation	No Further Action Required.		
cspo-607	Mr Alan Hubbard	Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust	
Plan Ref	7.4	Policy Area CS10: Provision for Gypsies & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople	Observations
Summary	The intended approach as set out here is noted and appears appropriate subject to subsequent detailed consideration of criteria as part of the Development Management DPD. (F)		
Response	Comments Noted		
Recommendation	No Further Action Required		
cspo-758	Paul Cotterill		
Plan Ref	7.4	Policy Area CS10: Provision for Gypsies & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople	Object
Summary	Object to location of Gypsy site at White Moss simply because it is an unauthorised site.		
Response	The Core Strategy does not allocate any specific sites in order to provide for Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople. It simply identifies broad areas of search based on evidence base which suggests that the areas identified are either known through routes used by Gypsies, Travellers or Travelling Showpeople or where there is an established or settled family or group within the area.		
Recommendation	No action required		
cspo-253	Mr D Rimmer		
Plan Ref	Policy CS11	Maintaining Vibrant Town and Village Centres	Support
Summary	CS11 - Support to promote development in Banks Village Centre, Currently the village has suffered massive decline and dispersment of services away from the village centre. If increased residential land is released in this area it would increase the viability and therefore vitality of the village centre. (F)		
Response	Comments noted. It is important to ensure that residents of new housing provided are encouraged to integrate with the existing community, for example by using local services. An improved Centre should help this cause.		
Recommendation	No change.		

cspo-706	Ms Rose Freeman	Planning Assistant The Theatres Trust	
Plan Ref	Policy CS11	Maintaining Vibrant Town and Village Centres	Object
Summary	This policy focuses on retail matters and does not provide guidance for other town centre uses that contribute to vibrant town centres reflecting PPS4. (F)		
Response	Policy CS11 states that "Retail and other appropriate town centre uses will be encouraged..." Thus the policy guidance amounts to a presumption in favour of appropriate town centre uses. The Policy does not imply or assume that only the provision of shops can provide vibrancy for a town or village. The Core Strategy should not repeat national policy (PPS4), so it is not considered necessary for Policy CS11 to contain more detail on other town centre uses. Consideration will be given to amending the policy justification to make clear that other appropriate uses in addition to retail can provide vibrancy for a town or village centre.		
Recommendation	Amend policy justification to state that uses other than retail can contribute towards a town, local or village centre's vitality / viability.		
cspo-721	Crompton property developments		
Plan Ref	David Crompton	Maintaining Vibrant Town and Village Centres	Support
Summary	Policy CS11 is generally supported. (s)		
Response	Comments Noted		
Recommendation	No Action Required		
cspo-756	Paul Cotterill		
Plan Ref	Policy CS11	Maintaining Vibrant Town and Village Centres	Observations
Summary	1. Housing should be supported in Ormskirk Town Centre. 2. The Council should consider partial de-pedestrianisation in order to alleviate traffic congestion.		
Response	1. It is agreed that residential development in the town centre (in particular above shops) should be encouraged. A more detailed policy on town centre development is being prepared, and this will support a diversity of uses, including residential, in town centres. 2. In terms of de-pedestrianising Ormskirk Town Centre, It would appear contrary to national transport guidance to do this given paragraph 6.8 states that local authorities should "give priority to people over ease of traffic movement and plan to provide more road space to pedestrians, cyclists and public transport in town centres".		
Recommendation	Amend town centres policy to provide support for residential and other uses above shops and in other appropriate locations in town centres.		
cspo-592	Mrs Margaret Wiltshire	Planning Volunteer, Treasurer CPRE (West Lancs Group)	
Plan Ref	8.1	Policy Area CS11: Maintaining Vibrant Town and Local Centres	Observations
Summary	8.1.1 We would support West Lancs in its caution over allowing change-of-use from retail to non-retail uses.		
Response	Comments noted		
Recommendation	No action required		
cspo-174	Mr Martyn Coy	Planner British Waterways	
Plan Ref	Policy CS12	Enabling Sustainable Transport Choice	Object
Summary	Specific reference should be made in Policy CS12 to the use of towpaths in providing alternative means of walking and cycling facilities. Suggested wording provided. (S)		
Response	Comments regarding footpaths noted; consideration will be given to amending the policy wording and Fig 8.1 as suggested.		
Recommendation	Policy wording to be amended to include reference to canals and the towpath network. Fig 8.1 to be amended to include reference to canal network 'Improve community health and well-being by providing alternative means of transport such as walking and cycli		
cspo-209		Escalibur Ltd	
Plan Ref	Policy CS12	Enabling Sustainable Transport Choice	Support with conditions
Summary	Policy CS12 is supported but should acknowledge the potential for Appley Bridge railway station to be the focal point for the provision of sustainable growth based upon sustainable transport. (F)		
Response	Comments noted however the purpose of the policy is to shape transport choices through development. It is not entirely necessary to note the function of all existing transport modes within the Core Strategy, this level of detail and summary is more appropriate in the evidence base documents such as the infrastructure delivery plan.		
Recommendation	No action required.		

cspo-255	Mr D Rimmer		
Plan Ref	Policy CS12 Enabling Sustainable Transport Choice		Observations
Summary	Applauds the aims but is concerned about execution and funding. To realistically suggest places like Skelmersdale should have massive growth before regenerating the town centre and providing a railway station is unlikely to happen and therefore opportunities for development elsewhere in the Borough will be missed. (F)		
Response	Comments noted however the aim of this policy is to shape transport choices through development. It is not entirely necessary to note the function of all existing transport modes within the Core Strategy, this level of detail and summary is more appropriate in the evidence base documents such as the infrastructure delivery plan.		
Recommendation	No Further Action Required		
cspo-605	Mr Keith Keeley		
Plan Ref	Policy CS12 Enabling Sustainable Transport Choice		Observations
Summary	There is no reference to IDP/CIL or Policy CS3 or how proposed infrastructure will be delivered. There is no mention of a Burscough By-Pass. (s)		
Response	Policy CS12 makes it clear that the Council supports any proposals to improve rail infrastructure serving Burscough. However, the Council cannot guarantee its delivery, nor can it say that such improvements will be essential to accommodate new development until a final decision has been made on how much development will be promoted in Burscough or whether such rail improvements will actually create a benefit in relation to highways traffic. Should these improvements be feasible or required, more detail will be provided in the IDP. A Burscough by-pass is not being promoted by the Council at this time.		
Recommendation	No Action		
cspo-722	Crompton property developments		
Plan Ref	David Crompton Enabling Sustainable Transport Choice		Support
Summary	Policy CS12 is generally supported. (s)		
Response	Comments noted		
Recommendation	No action required		
cspo-92	Mr David W Cheetham		
Plan Ref	Policy CS12 Enabling Sustainable Transport Choice		Support with conditions
Summary	I support this policy and in particular improvements to the rail linkages across the Borough and the proposed branch line to Skelmersdale Town Centre. 1. Improvements to park and ride facilities supported. 2. Consideration should be given to providing park and ride facilities for people commuting out of Skelmersdale. 3. Any rail route to Skelmersdale should be accompanied by electrification of the Kirkby - Wigan railway. 4. The Burscough Curves reinstatement and electrification of the two Burscough lines is supported. (S)		
Response	Comments noted. Improvements to transport infrastructure are supported by the Council; the main issue is funding. Re. park and ride: Policy CS12 says that the Council will support 'Any potential park and ride schemes associated with public transport connections'. This may include extensions and improvements to existing as well as new park and ride at facilities at train stations.		
Recommendation	No Further Action Required		
cspo-204	Mrs Anne-Sophie Bonton	Planning Officer	
Plan Ref	8.2	Policy Area CS12: Enabling Sustainable Transport Choice	Observations
Summary	References to LTP should be updated as LTP3 (2011-2021) was adopted by the Full Council on Thursday 28th May 2011. It probably ought to state that funding for local major transport schemes is currently limited, and that DfT expects future priorities for investment to be strongly influenced by Local Enterprise Partnerships. (S)		
Response	Comments Noted regarding LTP3 and future funding sources		
Recommendation	Suggested changes will be included including updating to document to include the now adopted LTP3 and also mention of funding sources.		
cspo-259	Mr Francis Williams	member Ormskirk Friends of the Earth	
Plan Ref	8.2	Policy Area CS12: Enabling Sustainable Transport Choice	Observations
Summary	We welcome this policy with the exception of the need for an Ormskirk bypass. We believe need for a railway station in Skelmersdale is urgent. (S)		
Response	Comments noted		
Recommendation	No action required		

cspo-267	Town Planning Team LNW	Network Rail	
Plan Ref	8.2	Policy Area CS12: Enabling Sustainable Transport Choice	Observations
Summary	WLBC should have regard to the RUS when formulating the Core Strategy.		
Response	Comments Noted. However consideration was given to the RUS when formulating this Policy. Schemes for the reinstatement of the Burscough Curves and an appropriate link to Skelmersdale were taken from the Merseyside and Lancashire and Cumbria RUS 2009 and 2008 respectively.		
Recommendation	No Further Action Required		
cspo-337	Mr Roger Clayton	South Lathom Parish Council	
Plan Ref	8.2	Policy Area CS12: Enabling Sustainable Transport Choice	Support with conditions
Summary	Object to an Ormskirk bypass. Amend the Lathom boundary on fig 8.1. (S)		
Response	The Ormskirk bypass is a longstanding aspiration for the Council and although there may not currently be available funding this is a strategic plan lasting for up to 15 years when funding may be available. Fig 8.1 does not specifically mention Skelmersdale or Lathom instead both are included within the eastern parishes. Only the built up areas are shaded on the map and as Lathom is located on the boundary of Skelmersdale they appear as one area (along with Up Holland)		
Recommendation	No Further action Required		
cspo-407		Wirral to Wyre Team Natural England	
Plan Ref	8.2	Policy Area CS12: Enabling Sustainable Transport Choice	Support
Summary	We welcome inclusion of a sustainable transport policy to enhance and presser ve sustainable transport in the borough to give travellers a range of sustainable transport options. We also welcomethe list of specific delivery priorities to give the Borough a locally meaningful policy direction to deliver on the ground and in turn be monitored.		
Response	Comments noted		
Recommendation	No further action required		
cspo-412	C Clex		
Plan Ref	8.2	Policy Area CS12: Enabling Sustainable Transport Choice	Observations
Summary	Support and implement Burscough curves and have more frequent rail services (S)		
Response	Comments Noted.		
Recommendation	No further action required		
cspo-445	Mr Roger Bell		
Plan Ref	8.2	Policy Area CS12: Enabling Sustainable Transport Choice	Observations
Summary	It is clear that the major commuting routes are to Liverpool, Sefton and Greater Manchester. Currently rail provides good service from Ormskirk to Liverpool, and from Burscough to Southport and Greater Manchester. This leaves some significant gaps. It is suggested that a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) has the potential to assist in delivering at least part of these new rail connections. (S)		
Response	comments noted With regards to 2.1.20 regarding patterns of movement for travel to work the Council have classed Wigan as seperate to the rest of Greater Manchester as Wigan is particularly close to West Lancashire being a neighbouring authority and has an important role to play in its own right. This is a consistent approach the Council have taken with Sefton and St Helens also being classed seperately from the Liverpool City Region and also Central Lancashire being classed seperately from the rest of Lancashire. Comments regarding costing of schemes noted.		
Recommendation	No further action		
cspo-451	Mr Roger Bell		
Plan Ref	8.2	Policy Area CS12: Enabling Sustainable Transport Choice	Observations
Summary	In terms of Skelmersdale, a number of options are being examined by the rail industry. We strongly believe that a central station, as near to the town centre as possible, is by far the preferred option. For the Burscough option, it is clear that extension of the electric train service from Liverpool to Ormskirk into Burscough would provide a strong solution. While improved rail service is vital in connecting communities in West Lancashire with opportunities for employment, shopping and leisure, it is equally important that for shorter distance travel within communities that an adequate bus service is provided.		
Response	Comments Noted		
Recommendation	No Further Action Required		

cspo-458	Mr Andrew Thorley	Strategic Land Manager Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd	
Plan Ref	8.2	Policy Area CS12: Enabling Sustainable Transport Choice	Observations
Summary	Support sustainable modes of transport but Policy CS12 requires a long list of infrastructure and delivery is unclear. Infrastructure Delivery Plan required. (S)		
Response	As identified the Infrastructure delivery plan will help identify which schemes are deliverable in the short to medium term, however, the CS document is a strategic document with a 15 year life span and during the life of the CS funding for these schemes may become available.		
Recommendation	No further action required		
cspo-463	Mr D Tunstall		
Plan Ref	8.2	Policy Area CS12: Enabling Sustainable Transport Choice	Observations
Summary	Edge Hill University, this facility is not provided with adequate public transport from Tarleton and Hesketh Bank for students hence more young people will use cars. (F)		
Response	The CS proposes to limit use by car to Edge Hill and encourage sustainable forms of transport. Policy CS12 contains a number of proposals which may help improve transport in the northern parishes including supporting public transport in rural parts of the Borough and preparing and actively promoting travel plans for new developments which would be required for any large development at Edge Hill. However as the Core Strategy is a strategic document there are no specific references to schemes linking the northern parishes to Edge Hill		
Recommendation	No further action required		
cspo-593	Mrs Margaret Wiltshire	Planning Volunteer, Treasurer CPRE (West Lancs Group)	
Plan Ref	8.2	Policy Area CS12: Enabling Sustainable Transport Choice	Observations
Summary	8.2.1 LTP3 is now up and running. Please update paragraph.		
Response	At the time of publication the Lancashire LTP3 had not been published		
Recommendation	Paragraph relating to LTP2 to be updated to include LTP3		
cspo-612	Mr Alan Hubbard	Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust	
Plan Ref	8.2	Policy Area CS12: Enabling Sustainable Transport Choice	Support
Summary	The stance set out in Policy CS12 is supported by National Trust having regard to its previous submissions and especially the need to address climate change issues by reducing the need to travel and encouraging more sustainable modes of transport where practicable. (F)		
Response	Comments noted		
Recommendation	no further action required		
cspo-759	Paul Cotterill		
Plan Ref	8.2	Policy Area CS12: Enabling Sustainable Transport Choice	Object
Summary	Ormskirk bus station should not be considered unsuitable because of overgrown pathways which could be cleared by the Council. Provision should be made for Simonswood Ind Estate to accommodate a rail station in keeping with the Merseytravel plan, in case it not feasible to build one on the other side of the Kirkby/Simonswood border		
Response	Consideration given to changing wording in Paragraph 8.27		
Recommendation	Reword paragraph 8.2.7		
cspo-109	Mrs Jackie Liptrott		
Plan Ref		Policy CS13 Accessibility and Provision of Local Services and Infrastructure	Observations
Summary	The Ormskirk Bypass should be identified within the Core Strategy to support the objectives of the strategy (S)		
Response	As funding for this scheme is not guaranteed the Core Strategy cannot commit to its delivery. However, the Ormskirk bypass is the first scheme within the list of schemes in Policy CS12 that is supported by the Council (should funding become available).		
Recommendation	No action required		
cspo-153	Mr Philip Carter	Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency	
Plan Ref		Policy CS13 Accessibility and Provision of Local Services and Infrastructure	Support
Summary	Policy CS13 is supported as it will ensure the sewerage capacity issue at New Lane, Burscough is resolved in line with new development (S).		
Response	Comments Noted		
Recommendation	No action required		

cspo-176	Mr Martyn Coy	Planner British Waterways	
Plan Ref	Policy CS13 Accessibility and Provision of Local Services and Infrastructure		Support with conditions
Summary	Policy CS13 will support protection and enhancement of inland waterways. Additional information is available to assist with decision making and planning conditions. (S)		
Response	Comments noted		
Recommendation	Distribute information to planning teams to raise awareness of wider guidance.		
cspo-210		Escalibur Ltd	
Plan Ref	Policy CS13 Accessibility and Provision of Local Services and Infrastructure		Support with conditions
Summary	CS13 should acknowledge the benefits of developing other sustainable settlements such as Appley Bridge which have spare capacity. (S)		
Response	The Councils current evidence base work suggests that whilst Appley Bridge benefits from reasonable proximity to Wigan, service infrastructure in general is not the most sustainable. Furthermore, the draft Green Belt study did not identify any parcels of land which do not fulfil at least one purpose of the Green Belt as set out in PPG2.		
Recommendation	Further infrastructure work still being carried out along with refining work to the Green Belt Study.		
cspo-606	Mr Keith Keeley		
Plan Ref	Policy CS13 Accessibility and Provision of Local Services and Infrastructure		Object
Summary	The policy is toothless unless it is backed up by a Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Major development should not be allowed to proceed in phases unless the total infrastructure requirements are known.		
Response	The Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan first draft should be completed by the end of the summer and will be shared with all infrastructure providers to ensure it is accurate and realistic. The document will then be made publicly available during the next round of consultation alongside the Publication Core Strategy. It is intended that this document will be a living tool to assist in the future delivery of infrastructure and directing revenue that is received through the Community Infrastructure Levy. It will be an important component to the Local Development Framework and will assist in guiding development. The time taken now to establish a robust and maintainable process for infrastructure planning will result in greater longevity of the process throughout the life of the plan.		
Recommendation	No action required in relation to Core Strategy. Infrastructure Delivery Plan first draft to be finalised.		
cspo-723	Crompton property developments		
Plan Ref	David Crompton Accessibility and Provision of Local Services and Infrastructure		Observations
Summary	United Utilities have a statutory duty to deliver appropriate waste water capacity and the Council should work within the context of this. (s)		
Response	Comments noted		
Recommendation	No action required		
cspo-154	Mr Philip Carter	Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency	
Plan Ref	8.3 Policy Area CS13: Accessibility and Provision of Local Services and Infrastructure		Observations
Summary	Support for this part of the policy		
Response	Noted		
Recommendation	No action required		
cspo-370	Ms Kathleen M Prince		
Plan Ref	8.3 Policy Area CS13: Accessibility and Provision of Local Services and Infrastructure		Observations
Summary	Certain key aspects of the infrastructure, notably sewerage and electricity, which are now completely inadequate and failing to meet the demands of existing properties in Banks, remains a serious public health issue and ANY extra development will cause additional problems. (s)		
Response	Upgrade and improvement of utility infrastructure is the responsibility of the utility providers such as United Utilities and Electricity North West. This is largely out of the Councils hands and when granting planning permission it is difficult for planners to refuse permission for development on the grounds of utility infrastructure deficiencies as other legislation governs the delivery of such requirements. However, the Council is aware of the pressure on this fundamental infrastructure and through the Infrastructure Delivery plan process is engaging with all utility providers. This information is helping to direct development to places where infrastructure capacity exists and in instances where capacity is limited it sets out what improvements are required and how they will be delivered.		
Recommendation	No action required.		

cspo-394	Mr Alex Naughton	Merseytravel	
Plan Ref	8.3	Policy Area CS13: Accessibility and Provision of Local Services and Infrastructure	Support with conditions
Summary	Support the general strategic direction of the Core Strategy subject to the following: 1. Reference to reinstatement of the Burscough Curves 2. Reference to the electrification extension from Ormskirk to Burscough 3. Reference and support for a rail link to Skelmersdale 4. Support for new real time information system - working together though may not need specific reference? (S)		
Response	Comments noted. All of the noted schemes are identified within Policy CS12 Enabling Sustainable Transport Choice.		
Recommendation	No action required		
cspo-408		Wirral to Wyre Team Natural England	
Plan Ref	8.3	Policy Area CS13: Accessibility and Provision of Local Services and Infrastructure	Observations
Summary	We would welcome additional text to give more clarity on definition of infrastructure and services and provision / access to green infrastructure. We are disappointed that the policy wording makes it generic and has little meaningful delivery for West Lancs. (s)		
Response	The Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan first draft should be completed by the end of the summer and will be shared with all infrastructure providers to ensure it is accurate and realistic. The document will then be made publicly available during the next round of consultation alongside the Publication Core Strategy. Given the amount of varying pieces of infrastructure that can be considered within each of the infrastructure typologies, it is intended to place the detail within the IDP and make broad reference to infrastructure types within the policy. This will ensure what is considered infrastructure is not limited, thus reducing the flexibility of the policy which must last 15 years.		
Recommendation	No action required		
cspo-443	Mr Roger Bell		
Plan Ref	8.3	Policy Area CS13: Accessibility and Provision of Local Services and Infrastructure	Observations
Summary	In meetings with United Utilities, it has been stated that a housing development of sufficient size could generate a sound business case for a substantial investment in the type of improvements that would go a long way to resolving this issue. Either the Burscough or Ormskirk options appear to satisfy this need " but not the Dispersed Option. (S)		
Response	Comments noted		
Recommendation	No action required		
cspo-486	Mr Damien Holdstock	Consultant for National Grid National Grid	
Plan Ref	8.3	Policy Area CS13: Accessibility and Provision of Local Services and Infrastructure	Observations
Summary	The Preferred Options document identifies the potential to remodel the Simonswood Industrial Estate, to provide an additional 5 hectares of employment land. National Grid's ZU line crosses through the south eastern corner of the industrial estate. National Grid requests that consideration be given to these assets through planning and that they are consulted on any future DPDs and planning applications which may impact on their infrastructure.		
Response	Comments noted		
Recommendation	no action required		
cspo-594	Mrs Margaret Wiltshire	Planning Volunteer, Treasurer CPRE (West Lancs Group)	
Plan Ref	8.3	Policy Area CS13: Accessibility and Provision of Local Services and Infrastructure	Support
Summary	8.3.6 We are pleased to see Green Infrastructure featuring explicitly in the strategy.		
Response	Comments noted		
Recommendation	no action required		
cspo-626	Mrs Joanna Eley		
Plan Ref	8.3	Policy Area CS13: Accessibility and Provision of Local Services and Infrastructure	Support
Summary	Support for any plans to look at public transport routes around the region, in particular the joining of the railway lines between Southport and Burscough (The Burscough Curves). (S)		
Response	Comments noted		
Recommendation	No action required		

cspo-707	Ms Rose Freeman	Planning Assistant The Theatres Trust	
Plan Ref	8.3	Policy Area CS13: Accessibility and Provision of Local Services and Infrastructure	Support with conditions
Summary	we would suggest that an additional paragraph be inserted to read The loss of an existing facility will be resisted unless it can be demonstrated that the facility is no longer needed, or it can be established that the services provided by the facility can be served in an alternative location or manner that is equally accessible by the community.		
Response	Comments noted		
Recommendation	Include the protection of community facilities which may be at risk through change of use.		
cspo-718	Jillian Walker	United Utilities	
Plan Ref	8.3	Policy Area CS13: Accessibility and Provision of Local Services and Infrastructure	Observations
Summary	Thank you for your Core Strategy Options Paper. We can look at each application on an individual basis as they are submitted. In relation to the Skelmersdale area we would not be able to supply additional waters into the area until our proposed Royal Oak WTW is constructed. We do have areas of low pressure but within standards of service around the Tarleton area due to the late spring/summer draw offs for the local market gardens. With regards to Edge Hill University we do have several trunk mains in the vicinity of the site which proposed development may impact on our easements. Again we would look at this on an individual basis through the consultation process.(F)		
Response	comments noted		
Recommendation	no action required		
cspo-750	David Sherratt	Local Development Framework Lead United Utilities	
Plan Ref	8.3	Policy Area CS13: Accessibility and Provision of Local Services and Infrastructure	Observations
Summary	Water Resource Planning is carried out by United Utilities and the plan was published 2009. Early consultation for development is encouraged amongst developers and planners. Increasing the capacity of sewers comes at a cost to developers upto the point of treatment. Local capacity information is available for planners and developers to review but this is only available on a case by case basis.		
Response	Comments noted. However, the fact that detailed capacity information is only available on a case by case basis limits the information available in shaping the LDF.		
Recommendation	No action required		
cspo-752	David Sherratt	Local Development Framework Lead United Utilities	
Plan Ref	8.3	Policy Area CS13: Accessibility and Provision of Local Services and Infrastructure	Observations
Summary	UUW cannot confirm if capacity is available until the connection point[s] and flows are confirmed, therefore the LPA should work closely with UUW and other utility providers to ensure funding and infrastructure plans are secured with their Regulators before granting planning approval. There are a number of waste water capacity issues in West Lancashire which require comprehensive planning. Surface water requires sustainable solutions and on previously developed land, a reduction of at least 30% will be sought, rising to a minimum of 50% in critical drainage areas. Development adjacent too or impacting infrastructure assets should be discouraged.		
Response	The LPA have built up a strong working relationship with United Utilities and intends to progress this continually alongside the LDF process. Development of a joint partnership agreement is designed to assist with delivering a comprehensive approach to the infrastructure difficulties associated with waste water treatment in and around the Ormskirk and Burscough settlement areas. It is disappointing that UUW cannot give greater detail regarding capacity as this would assist with the infrastructure planning process and support the evidence for delivery of the Core Strategy.		
Recommendation	Continue to work closely with United Utilities in the production of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.		
cspo-110	Mrs Jackie Liptrott		
Plan Ref	Policy CS14	Developer Contributions	Object
Summary	Developers who propose to enhance employment opportunities in the borough should not pay developer contributions. In order to encourage potential developers/employers to choose this area there should not be a financial penalty for bringing jobs. (F)		
Response	A full viability assessment will be carried out in order to inform the CIL charging schedule, this will ensure that rates set for each type of development and geographical area are realistic and affordable and will not stifle the delivery of development.		
Recommendation	No action required		
cspo-155	Mr Philip Carter	Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency	
Plan Ref	Policy CS14	Developer Contributions	Support
Summary	We support the use of developer contributions for flood prevention and sustainable drainage measures. (F)		
Response	Comments Noted		
Recommendation	No action required		

cspo-197	Mr Brian Sheasby	Principal Planning Review and Planning Contributions Officer Lancashire County	
Plan Ref	Policy CS14 Developer Contributions		Observations
Summary	The County Council raises concerns as to the significant impact upon its library service of the planned residential expansion of Burscough and the need to explicitly acknowledge this by reference to its policies CS3 and CS14. (S)		
Response	Specific facility requirements will be picked up within the Infrastructure Delivery plan and in particular the Infrastructure Delivery Schedule. This will be used to inform the expenditure of S106 and CIL monies. From liaison with the County Council we understand that Skelmersdale library has recently been improved but requires accessible public toilets. This will also be identified within the IDP. In terms of its inclusion within the Skelmersdale Town Centre Regeneration, this will be explored further through the master planning of the town centre which will take place separately to the Core Strategy.		
Recommendation	No action required		
cspo-214	Mr Martyn Coy	Planner British Waterways	
Plan Ref	Policy CS14 Developer Contributions		Support with conditions
Summary	Suggest modification to Policy CS14 to fully acknowledge the inland waterway and canal network. (S)		
Response	Comments noted		
Recommendation	Text to be amended to include "canal" in the description of transport infrastructure.		
cspo-236	Mr Shaun Taylor	Planning Associate Director G L Hearn Property Consultants	
Plan Ref	Policy CS14 Developer Contributions		Observations
Summary	Contributions should relate to the impact of development in question and should not be of detriment to viability and deliverability. (S)		
Response	Greater clarification on CIL is now available and will allow us to refine the wording of the policy in line with the broader developer contributions framework. Furthermore, a full viability assessment will be carried out in order to inform the CIL charging schedule. This will ensure that rates set for each type of development and geographical area are affordable and do not stifle the delivery of development.		
Recommendation	Review the wording of Policy CS14 in line with the latest emerging guidance on S106 and CIL regulations.		
cspo-724	Crompton property developments		
Plan Ref	David Crompton Developer Contributions		Observations
Summary	CIL cannot be implemented through an SPD. (s)		
Response	Greater clarification on CIL is now available and the Council is aware that and SPD will not be appropriate to set out the requirements of CIL. This will be achieved through a CIL Charging Schedule.		
Recommendation	Remove reference to a CIL SPD		
cspo-338	Mr Roger Clayton		
Plan Ref	8.4	Policy Area CS14: Developer Contributions	Object
Summary	We support the principle of developer contributions but object to the proposal that Skelmersdale Town Centre could have a lower standard applied. We object generally to financial contributions being provided instead of meeting the standard on, or close to, the particular development site concerned. (s)		
Response	A full viability assessment will be carried out in order to inform the CIL charging schedule. This will ensure that rates set for each type of development and geographical area are affordable and do not stifle the delivery of development. In terms of the expenditure of CIL, although a formal process for this is yet to be established, it is likely that revenue generated through CIL receipts will be spent on infrastructure within the area that has received the development.		
Recommendation	No action required		
cspo-413		Wirral to Wyre Team Natural England	
Plan Ref	8.4	Policy Area CS14: Developer Contributions	Observations
Summary	We note the list of matters for which contributions would be requested. We ask that you consider the inclusion of conserving and enhancing biodiversity; landscape (including townscape) character and quality; and public realm in the list.		
Response	How CIL contributions are spent will be subject to regulations which control the CIL and what the Council sets out within its list of infrastructure to be funded. Green Infrastructure is included within the the infrastructure list which will assist in supporting the conservation and enhancement of biodiversity. The expenditure of CIL must be on infrastructure, it is difficult to make direct links between the definition of infrastructure and landscape quality. However, other policies in the Core Strategy are capable of protecting and enhancing landscape quality.		
Recommendation	Include public realm in the list of infrastructure.		

cspo-429	Ms Judith Nelson	English Heritage	
Plan Ref	8.4	Policy Area CS14: Developer Contributions	Observations
Summary	CS14 The policy should include a bullet point covering developer contributions relating to the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment, for example mitigating adverse impacts on the historic environment or enhancing the public realm. It is also important that the definition of green infrastructure acknowledges the important contribution of the historic environment, through, for example, registered parks and garden, the grounds of listed buildings or green spaces in conservation areas. (f)		
Response	Given the amount of varying pieces of infrastructure that can be considered within each of the infrastructure typologies, it is intended to place the detail within the IDP and make broad reference to infrastructure types within the policy. This will ensure what is considered infrastructure is not limited, thus reducing the flexibility of the policy which must last 15 years.		
Recommendation	No action required		
cspo-460	Mr Andrew Thorley	Strategic Land Manager Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd	
Plan Ref	8.4	Policy Area CS14: Developer Contributions	Observations
Summary	Taylor Wimpey UK Limited considers that any requirement for financial contributions must be fully justified and based on a credible and robust evidence base which identifies actual need for the facilities. (S)		
Response	A full viability assessment will be carried out in order to inform the CIL charging schedule. This will ensure that rates set for each type of development and geographical area are affordable and do not stifle the delivery of development.		
Recommendation	No action required		
cspo-492	Mr B Howard	Clerk of the Council Newburgh Parish Council	
Plan Ref	8.4	Policy Area CS14: Developer Contributions	Observations
Summary	We assume that an appropriate infrastructure for basic water, waste treatment, energy and heat supply would be a pre-requisite. Beyond the essentials, it is important that any funding of non-essentials is spread across the Borough as a whole, including the rural areas. Provision of, and access to, facilities for children and young people is particularly important.		
Response	The requirement for all infrastructure including that listed as "basic" here, is set out within Policy CS13. How CIL contributions are spent will be subject to regulations which control the CIL and what the Council sets out within its list of infrastructure to be funded. However, due consideration will be given to the points made in terms of spreading the funds across the Borough.		
Recommendation	No action required.		
cspo-57		Church Commissioners For England	
Plan Ref	8.4	Policy Area CS14: Developer Contributions	Support with conditions
Summary	Flexibility is therefore required with regard to developer contributions to ensure that the scheme is still viable following potential Section 106 agreements or CIL requirements. Gaining planning consent for a proposed development is one thing; however, delivering the actual scheme is another. The Council must assess each scheme of their individual merits to ensure development can and will take place. (S)		
Response	A full viability assessment will be carried out in order to inform the CIL charging schedule; this will ensure that rates set for each type of development and geographical area do not stifle the delivery of development. Policy CS14 includes flexibility for developers to deliver infrastructure themselves rather than financial contributions, it also makes provision for reduced contributions in order to support development within Skelmersdale. Viability is a key issue with all S.106 obligations and all policy areas requiring obligations are caveated with the ability to take account of development viability.		
Recommendation	No Action required		
cspo-608	Mr Keith Keeley		
Plan Ref	8.4	Policy Area CS14: Developer Contributions	Observations
Summary	The Core Strategy should not be directing development to areas with known infrastructure constraints unless an accompanying infrastructure delivery plan explains what these constraints are. The Council should prepare a Community Infrastructure Levy document. (s)		
Response	Wider sustainability benefits can include the need to support and create a sustainable local economy or housing supply in areas where existing infrastructure capacity may require some upgrades. Greater clarification on CIL is now available and will allow us to refine the wording of the policy in line with the broader developer contributions framework. Several references to the IDP are already made within the justification for Policy CS14 and Policy CS13. Furthermore, Paragraph 8.4.7 makes direct cross linkages with other policies in the Core Strategy for which, Policy CS14, will be a delivery mechanism. Now that Central Government have confirmed their support for CIL, the Council are exploring the preparation of a CIL Charging Schedule and will either submit it for consideration by the Planning Inspectorate alongside the Core Strategy or as soon as is practicable afterwards. It is not mandatory that the two documents must be examined at the same time.		
Recommendation	Include wording "and inform the core strategy" in relation to the role of the IDP.		

cspo-660	Ms Judith Nelson	English Heritage		
Plan Ref	8.4	Policy Area CS14: Developer Contributions		Observations
Summary	This policy should include a bullet point covering developer contributions relating to the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment. is also important that the definition of green infrastructure acknowledges the important contribution of the historic environment. (S)			
Response	Given the amount of varying pieces of infrastructure that can be considered within each of the infrastructure typologies, it is intended to place the detail within the IDP and make broad reference to infrastructure types within the policy. This will ensure what is considered infrastructure is not limited, thus reducing the flexibility of the policy which must last 15 years.			
Recommendation	No action required to Core Strategy, expand IDP			
cspo-667	Mr Simon Artiss	Planning Manager Bellway Homes Ltd		
Plan Ref	8.4	Policy Area CS14: Developer Contributions		Observations
Summary	Policy CS14 - we refer you to recent appeals in respect of policies that pursue a tariff, where Inspectors conclude that CIL is the appropriate mechanism. As for the scope and amount of developer contributions, this needs to accord with national advice on proportionality and relevance, etc, as well as needing to respect viability considerations in order to deliver new homes, especially in the Borough's priority locations.			
Response	A full viability assessment will be carried out in order to inform the CIL charging schedule. This will ensure that rates set for each type of development and geographical area are affordable and do not stifle the delivery of development.			
Recommendation	No action required			
cspo-708	Ms Rose Freeman	Planning Assistant The Theatres Trust		
Plan Ref	8.4	Policy Area CS14: Developer Contributions		Object
Summary	Please include leisure facilities in the brackets for Community Infrastructure which will be essential for Skelmersdale.			
Response	Given the amount of varying pieces of infrastructure that can be considered within each of the infrastructure typologies, it is intended to place the detail within the IDP and make broad reference to infrastructure types within the policy. This will ensure what is considered infrastructure is not limited, thus reducing the flexibility of the policy which must last 15 years.			
Recommendation	no action required			
cspo-399		Wirral to Wyre Team Natural England		
Plan Ref	Chapter 9	Core Strategy Preferred Options: Sustaining the Borough's Environment and Addressing Climate Change		Support
Summary	We are pleased to see one of the five broad topic areas include "Sustaining the Borough's Environment and Addressing Climate Change".			
Response	Comments noted			
Recommendation	No action required			
cspo-619	Mr Alan Hubbard	Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust		
Plan Ref	Chapter 9	Core Strategy Preferred Options: Sustaining the Borough's Environment and Addressing Climate Change		Support
Summary	The decision not to adopt alternative approach 1 is fully supported. (S)			
Response	Comments Noted			
Recommendation	No action required			
cspo-260	Mr Francis Williams	member Ormskirk Friends of the Earth		
Plan Ref	Policy CS15	Renewable Energy Development		Support
Summary	We welcome this policy, but believe that there should be a presumption in favour of renewable energy projects, whether they be in the Green Belt or not. (F)			
Response	Comments noted			
Recommendation	No action required			

cspo-725 Plan Ref	Crompton property developments David Crompton Renewable Energy Development		Object
Summary	Concerns over duplication of national policy and the use of an SPD to provide detail on policy. (s)		
Response	The Council accepts that it is the governments intention for CSH and BREEAM to be driven through the changes to building regulations. However, the changes to the building regulations only go so far in acheiving the various levels of the CSH and BREEAM and it is vital that planning policy goes that step further to create a supportive framework for the delivery of low carbon development. The Policy builds in a certain degree of flexibility in that it requires the latest up to date national standards in the event the current standards are superceded. The Council also considers it appropriate to deal with a policy area that is so fluid and changeable within a SPD as this has often been the case for other policy areas and is indeed supported by Central Government. The SPD is likely to be used to draw out the threads from the Core Strategy and set out how low carbon design may be achieved locally and in accordance with any up to date national development policies. It will not replace or re-write the existing Core Strategy Policy. All other comments noted		
Recommendation	The list of requirements set out in paragraph 9.1.6 has been removed and reference is now made to the validation checklist for planning applications.		
cspo-185 Plan Ref	Joanna Thompson 9.1	Development Manager - North of England RWE Npower Renewables Ltd Policy Area CS15: Low Carbon Development and Energy Infrastructure	Observations
Summary	We feel that there are a number of discrepancies within the chapter wording and that Policy CS15 is not sufficiently robust to deliver the scale of renewable energy generation targets specified in the regional and city regional evidence bases. A number of discrepancies need to be resolved (S).		
Response	Comments noted. There will be a further review of the renewable energy evidence base which has developed further since the drafting of this document. Also, at this stage, the most up to date evidence is still being devised and therefore it would be innappropriate to include areas least constraint most suitable for wind development. The Council does not consider that this will disadvantage developers seeking spatial direction as the process used to identify constraints is one which is widely used by many renewable technology developers when scoping areas of search for possible developments. Targets will als be removed from the justification, pending the most up to date evidence base work currently being produced by SQW which will set out the amount of deployable renewable energy in the Borough. The policy justification will make reference to the reliance upon evidence base studies in assisting the decision making process. . Comment regarding viability noted.		
Recommendation	Relate the policy to national targets for renewable energy. Remove the targets in the policy justification, pending the results of the most up to date evidence base work currently being produced by SQW which will set out the amount of deployable renewable		
cspo-186 Plan Ref	Joanna Thompson 9.1	Development Manager - North of England RWE Npower Renewables Ltd Policy Area CS15: Low Carbon Development and Energy Infrastructure	Support with conditions
Summary	Support for Policy CS15. However, additional information should be supplied within the justification to demonstrate how the local targets set out relate to national targets and how they will be delivered. Information relating to wind turbine types, scale and output within the justification is factually incorrect. The Policy should be clear that targets are a minimum and exceeding them should not be discouraged. A more comprehensive criteria-based policy would therefore be supported. Financial viability is a matter of consideration for developers and not planning. The wording of the policy should be changed as detailed above.		
Response	Duplication of CSPO-185		
Recommendation	Duplication of CSPO-185		
cspo-237 Plan Ref	Mr Shaun Taylor 9.1	Planning Associate Director G L Hearn Property Consultants Policy Area CS15: Low Carbon Development and Energy Infrastructure	Object
Summary	Renewable Energy targets are not realistic for housebuilders and will impact on delivery. (S)		
Response	The Government intends to drive low carbon development and design through scheduled changes to the building regulations. However, these amendments do not go far enough in order to meet the targets for zero carbon by 2016 (2019 for non-domestic). Furthermore, it could be problematic to simply grant planning permissions for development without any real understanding of its carbon footprint, thus leading to a difficulty in achieving the required building regulation standards. Therefore, the Core Strategy must create a supportive framework which will assist in the delivery of the building regulation requirements in relation to carbon and add to the building regulations to ensure the gap between regulation requirements and zero carbon may be achieved.		
Recommendation	No action required		
cspo-339 Plan Ref	Mr Roger Clayton 9.1	Policy Area CS15: Low Carbon Development and Energy Infrastructure	Support with conditions
Summary	If, as stated, "compliance with the energy hierarchy is essential" the policy should not include an escape clause which allows developers to claim that it is not viable. We suggest "that it would be prohibitively expensive" would be a better form of wording (F)		
Response	Comments noted although the outcome would not be entirley different and the evidence required to support both statements would be the same.		
Recommendation	No action required		

cspo-414		Wirral to Wyre Team Natural England	
Plan Ref	9.1	Policy Area CS15: Low Carbon Development and Energy Infrastructure	Observations
Summary	Natural England welcomes policy support for renewable energy, but would want to see a commitment to developing an evidence base to understand the landscape and environmental capacity of the district to accept such development. (s)		
Response	Some evidence base constraint work has already been carried out within the Liverpool City Region Renewable Energy Capacity Study. This and other more up to date evidence will be reviewed in order to ascertain the appropriate targets and capacity for renewable and low carbon development in the Borough and to identify the areas of least constraint. The Council currently utilises evidence from the Natural Areas and Areas of Landscape History Importance SPG. This will be referenced in the justification to the policy. Comments regarding PPS9 noted.		
Recommendation	Make reference in the justification to the use of Natural Areas and Areas of Landscape History Importance SPG in assessing acceptability of renewable energy proposals. Ammend the wording of the policy so that proposals must demonstrate that they will not r		
cspo-455		Strategic Land Manager Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd	
Plan Ref	9.1	Policy Area CS15: Low Carbon Development and Energy Infrastructure	Observations
Summary	More evidence is required to justify current policy approach. (S)		
Response	Contrary to the submission, Policy CS15 was informed by the evidence base document "Liverpool City Region Renewable Energy Capacity Study" which is available for viewing on the website and referenced within the justification for the policy. Additional evidence has since been produced and a review of both of these will be carried out in order to inform the future iterations of this policy. Comments regarding the financial burden of renewable technologies noted.		
Recommendation	The latest evidence base documents are referenced within the policy justification		
cspo-457		Strategic Land Manager Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd	
Plan Ref	9.1	Policy Area CS15: Low Carbon Development and Energy Infrastructure	Object
Summary	Taylor Wimpey UK Limited objects to Policy CS15 as the inclusion of low carbon development requirements such as the Code for Sustainable Homes Standards and BREEAM are outside planning control and this overall approach and policy is flawed. (S)		
Response	The Government intends to drive low carbon development and design through scheduled changes to the building regulations. However, these amendments do not go far enough in order to meet the targets for zero carbon by 2016 (2019 for non-domestic). Furthermore, it could be problematic to simply grant planning permissions for development without any real understanding of its carbon footprint, thus leading to a difficulty in achieving the required building regulation standards. Therefore, the Core Strategy must create a supportive framework which will assist in the delivery of the building regulation requirements in relation to carbon and build on the building regulations to ensure the gap between regulation requirements and zero carbon may be achieved. The purpose of an SPG would be to give greater detail and clarity to developers and to provide guidance rather than set new policy. This approach is supported by Government and is in line with national policy. Comments regarding viability are noted.		
Recommendation	Review the policy in relation to viability and contribution sto ensure it fits with the latest national guidance on Allowable Solutions and Zero Carbon.		
cspo-46		McAteer Associates Ltd	
Plan Ref	9.1	Policy Area CS15: Low Carbon Development and Energy Infrastructure	Object
Summary	The Council should not seek to impose a higher requirement than nationally without evidence to support such an approach. Higher requirements could compromise development targets being achieved. (S) than that set out in national policy without having any evidence base to support it. (S)		
Response	Comments noted		
Recommendation	Set standards for low carbon development in line with national guidance until more localised guidance provides evidence to allow and improvement on these standards.		
cspo-564		Mrs Cath Ibbotson	
Plan Ref	9.1	Policy Area CS15: Low Carbon Development and Energy Infrastructure	Support with conditions
Summary	The Policy wording is too stringent and not in accordance with PPS22. The targets set should be a minimum and this should be written within the text. There is no link between the targets within the document and national targets. there are no maps relating to the Renewable Energy Study showing the constraints considered when considereing delivery of onshore wind. These should be available for transparency.Areas of least constraint for wind energy should be set out in order to provide direction and guidance for developers.		
Response	1) Comments noted and consideration to be given to the wording including the need to balance harm with benefits. 2) Comments noted. Reference to targets as a minimum will be considered. 3) Comments noted. Targets require reviewing to ensure they are in keeping with the existing and latest evidence which has been developed since the drafting of this policy. 4) Maps illustrating constraints and supporting the Arup study are available on the Council website in the LDF evidence base and identified as Appendix G to the Stage 2 report. 5) Comments regarding spatial policies are noted but may be reviewed in line with the latest evidence.		
Recommendation	Amend wording of policy from "mitigation" to "addressed". Remove the targets in the policy justification, pending the results of the most up to date evidence base work currently being produced by SQW which will set out the amount of deployable renewable e		

cspo-596	Mrs Margaret Wiltshire	Planning Volunteer, Treasurer CPRE (West Lancs Group)	
Plan Ref	9.1	Policy Area CS15: Low Carbon Development and Energy Infrastructure	Observations
Summary	9.1.3 It is good to read of "the Council's commitment in delivering energy security and climate change initiatives" and their aim to seek "to create a proactive and supportive environment" in these matters. We hope that this attitude may extend to overcome the extreme caution evident in other parts of the local planning system.		
Response	Comments noted		
Recommendation	No action required		
cspo-668	Mr Simon Artiss	Planning Manager Bellway Homes Ltd	
Plan Ref	9.1	Policy Area CS15: Low Carbon Development and Energy Infrastructure	Observations
Summary	Policy CS14 - we refer you to recent appeals in respect of policies that pursue a tariff, where Inspectors conclude that CIL is the appropriate mechanism. As for the scope and amount of developer contributions, this needs to accord with national advice on proportionality and relevance, etc, as well as needing to respect viability considerations in order to deliver new homes, especially in the Borough's priority locations.		
Response	Comments noted		
Recommendation	No action required		
cspo-119		Charnwick Ltd	
Plan Ref	Policy CS16	Preserving and enhancing green infrastructure and biodiversity	Support with conditions
Summary	The policy should reflect the fact that there may be situations where a loss or partial loss of biodiversity or nature conservation sites could be regarded as appropriate. (S)		
Response	Comments noted. The Policy changes suggested may be more suitable to consider in the Development Management Policies DPD		
Recommendation	No further action required		
cspo-157	Mr Philip Carter	Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency	
Plan Ref	Policy CS16	Preserving and enhancing green infrastructure and biodiversity	Support with conditions
Summary	Although we support Policy CS16 in principle, we would recommend expanding the support for strategic green links and wildlife corridors to include the retention of river and wetland habitat corridors alongside associated bankside habitats. (S)		
Response	Comments noted.		
Recommendation	Additional text will be included to include making reference to river and wetland habitat corridors alongside associated bank side habitats.		
cspo-216	Mr Martyn Coy	Planner British Waterways	
Plan Ref	Policy CS16	Preserving and enhancing green infrastructure and biodiversity	Support with conditions
Summary	Suggest an amendment to paragraph 9.2.1 to identify the role of the inland waterway network in providing open spaces and natural assets. (S)		
Response	Comments noted		
Recommendation	Additional wording will be added to include inland waterways and canal network		
cspo-262	Mr Nick Sandford	The Woodland Trust	
Plan Ref	Policy CS16	Preserving and enhancing green infrastructure and biodiversity	Object
Summary	The policy on ancient woodland protection which is currently in the West Lancashire Local Plan, should be carried forward into the Core Strategy. The Core Strategy should refer to the specific benefits provided by trees and woodland as a key component of green infrastructure. It is imperative that the Core Strategy makes a commitment to significant new tree planting and creation of new woodland. (S)		
Response	Comments noted regarding strengthening wording. However some of the comments are too detailed for the Core Strategy which is a strategic document. Some of the comments may be more appropriate a development management dpd		
Recommendation	Additional wording will be added to strengthen the policy 'Development will not be permitted that would directly or indirectly damage existing mature or ancient woodland, veteran trees or species-rich hedgerows.'		
cspo-117		Skelmersdale College	
Plan Ref	9.2	Policy Area CS16: Preserving and Enhancing Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity	Support with conditions
Summary	The policy does not recognise there may be situations where a loss of green space is appropriate in terms of development proposals. The policy and justification wording should be altered to reflect situations where loss of green space can be regarded as acceptable subject to suitable safeguards.		
Response	The Policy makes reference to the delivery of a Green Infrastructure and Open Space Strategy. It is within this document that the relevant deficiencies and surpluses in green space will be identified. The role of the policy would then be to manage development in consultation with this strategy so the appropriate outcomes are delivered in all spatial areas.		
Recommendation	No action required		

cspo-261	Mr Francis Williams	member Ormskirk Friends of the Earth	
Plan Ref	9.2	Policy Area CS16: Preserving and Enhancing Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity	Support with conditions
Summary	A range of policies should be adopted to promote a more diverse flora and fauna across West Lancashire as a whole, both in urban and rural areas, rather than just in isolated pockets - a more holistic approach (S)		
Response	Policy CS16 seeks to provide a network of green corridors that will provide habitats to support biodiversity and prevent fragmentation and prevent fragmentation of the natural environment. The Core Strategy is a strategic document and as such provides overarching policies. Although the comment has been noted this level of detail is not appropriate in the Core Strategy.		
Recommendation	No action required.		
cspo-340	Mr Roger Clayton		
Plan Ref	9.2	Policy Area CS16: Preserving and Enhancing Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity	Support with conditions
Summary	We support the policy but wish to have our network of public footpaths given due recognition and support through the inclusion of an appropriate statement (F)		
Response	Comments noted		
Recommendation	Include footpaths as Green Infrastructure		
cspo-415		Wirral to Wyre Team Natural England	
Plan Ref	9.2	Policy Area CS16: Preserving and Enhancing Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity	Observations
Summary	Natural England believes that Green Infrastructure policies in Core Strategies should commit to developing a delivery framework for an integrated network of multi-functional green infrastructure, with specific sites identified for conservation, enhancement or inclusion in the network. Policies should also seek to realise the potential of greenspace for multi-functional use and benefits.		
Response	Comments noted with reference to biodiversity and geodiversity. Additional wording to be included including including SAC's		
Recommendation	Additional comments regarding biodiversity/geodiversity and SAC's will be added to the Policy.		
cspo-430	Ms Judith Nelson	English Heritage	
Plan Ref	9.2	Policy Area CS16: Preserving and Enhancing Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity	Observations
Summary	CS16 The section of the policy on GI should include a bullet point on the contribution of the historic environment as set out above.		
Response	Contribution of the historic environment is set out in Policy CS17		
Recommendation	No action required		
cspo-613	Mr Alan Hubbard	Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust	
Plan Ref	9.2	Policy Area CS16: Preserving and Enhancing Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity	Observations
Summary	Policy should be amended to make reference to 'enhancement', in addition to 'protect' and 'safeguard'. (S)		
Response	Comments noted		
Recommendation	Policy is amended to make reference to 'enhancement', in addition to 'protect' and 'safeguard'		
cspo-661	Ms Judith Nelson	English Heritage	
Plan Ref	9.2	Policy Area CS16: Preserving and Enhancing Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity	Observations
Summary	The section of the policy on GI should include a bullet point on the contribution of the historic environment as set out above. (F)		
Response	Comment noted		
Recommendation	We will include include a reference to the historic environment and its contribution to GI.		
cspo-726	Crompton property developments		
Plan Ref	David Crompton	Enhancing West Lancashire's Distinctive Character and Ensuring Quality Design	Observations
Summary	Land at Ormskirk Strategic Development Site (non-preferred option) has a strong countryside character whereas Burscough Strategic Development Site (Yew Tree Farm) is of an urban fringe character. (s)		
Response	Comments noted		
Recommendation	No action required		

cspo-342	Mr Roger Clayton		
Plan Ref	9.3	Policy Area CS17: Enhancing West Lancashire's Distinctive Character and Ensuring Sustainable Design	Support with conditions
Summary	Recommendations for re-wording. (S)		
Response	Comments noted and changes will be considered.		
Recommendation	Change text to accord with above suggestion and ensure positive contribution to landscapes.		
<hr/>			
cspo-416		Wirral to Wyre Team Natural England	
Plan Ref	9.3	Policy Area CS17: Enhancing West Lancashire's Distinctive Character and Ensuring Sustainable Design	Observations
Summary	Natural England welcomes specific Core Strategy policies for conservation and enhancement of landscape character and quality in general for all landscapes in support of the European Landscapes Convention (ELC), along with specific features and character areas identified as particularly sensitive to development. Detailed policies that are informed by locally specific evidence through a Landscape Character Assessment. Unfortunately we do not consider that the policy does any of this. The policy is weak, and unspecific. We would welcome further research into baseline information and a re-write of the policy.		
Response	Comments noted		
Recommendation	All policies in Chapter 9 will be reviewed to ensure they are in line with PPS7, PPS9, PPG17 and locally specific.		
<hr/>			
cspo-431	Ms Judith Nelson	English Heritage	
Plan Ref	9.3	Policy Area CS17: Enhancing West Lancashire's Distinctive Character and Ensuring Sustainable Design	Observations
Summary	Policy CS17 is supported however it is suggested that it could benefit from being more place specific and proactive. (s)		
Response	Comments noted . Consideration given to including a statement explaining how the local authority will respond to English Heritage Building's at Risk register		
Recommendation	Include in the justification of this policy that the Council maintains an "At Risk Register" which it will continue to monitor and keep up to date.		
<hr/>			
cspo-617	Mr Alan Hubbard	Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust	
Plan Ref	9.3	Policy Area CS17: Enhancing West Lancashire's Distinctive Character and Ensuring Sustainable Design	Support
Summary	Support the encouragement of good quality design. Support the section of policy relating to recognising heritage assets. Support promotion of the active use of the Borough's landscapes. (S)		
Response	comments noted		
Recommendation	Registered Historic Parks and Gardens is included in the list in the first bullet point under Cultural and Heritage Assets.		
<hr/>			
cspo-662	Ms Judith Nelson	English Heritage	
Plan Ref	9.3	Policy Area CS17: Enhancing West Lancashire's Distinctive Character and Ensuring Sustainable Design	Observations
Summary	The policy is supported however it is suggested that it could benefit from being more place specific and proactive. Consideration needs to be given to existing heritage strategies and area appraisals (S)		
Response	Comments noted Consideration given to including a statement explaining how the local authority will respond to English Heritage Building's at Risk register.		
Recommendation	It is stated within the justification that the Council's At Risk Register will be maintained up to date.		
<hr/>			
cspo-751	David Sherratt	Local Development Framework Lead United Utilities	
Plan Ref	9.3	Policy Area CS17: Enhancing West Lancashire's Distinctive Character and Ensuring Sustainable Design	Observations
Summary	United Utilities encourages the use of water efficient designs and development wherever this is possible. LPA and developers should consider the total carbon impact of future developments; not only the footprint of the development but also the carbon impact for additional infrastructure assets; their associated treatment processes and their future maintenance and operation requirements.		
Response	Comments noted		
Recommendation	No action required		

cspo-77	The Coal Authority		
Plan Ref	9.3	Policy Area CS17: Enhancing West Lancashire's Distinctive Character and Ensuring Sustainable Design	Support with conditions
Summary	The Coal Authority would suggest that the 6th bullet point in the policy should be amended to read: "minimise the risk from all forms of pollution and contamination and land instability" Reason "In order to comply with the national policy advice in PPG14 in relation to development on unstable land this requires both a strategic and development management policy framework. (S)		
Response	Change of wording request noted		
Recommendation	Amend the 6th bullet point to include land instability.		
cspo-211	Escalibur Ltd		
Plan Ref	Chapter 10	Delivery and Risk in the Core Strategy - a "Plan B"	Object
Summary	Plan B should identify that Appley Bridge is capable of delivering sustainable residential development without harm to the overall purposes and openness of the green belt.		
Response	The Council's current evidence base work suggests that, whilst Appley Bridge may benefit from reasonable proximity to Wigan, service infrastructure in general is not the most sustainable within Appley Bridge. Furthermore, the draft Green Belt study did not identify any parcels which do not fulfill at least one purpose of the Green Belt as set out within PPG2.		
Recommendation	No Action Required		
cspo-244	Mr Andrew Taylor	Planning Director David Wilson Homes	
Plan Ref	Chapter 10	Delivery and Risk in the Core Strategy - a "Plan B"	Object
Summary	Plan B needs to be part of the main residential strategy, as it will definitely be required. It should be considered on a wider basis than currently proposed. (S)		
Response	Comments noted		
Recommendation	Housing targets for Skelmersdale to be reduced to a more deliverable level. A more robust and detailed "Plan B" to be set out to ensure flexibility.		
cspo-300	Mr Alexis De Pol		
Plan Ref	Chapter 10	Delivery and Risk in the Core Strategy - a "Plan B"	Object
Summary	Plan B is not the most appropriate or sustainable as it relies on further Green Belt release. Alternative non-Green Belt opportunities should be explored, including the development of land on the urban fringe of the Key/Rural Sustainable Villages.		
Response	Comments noted		
Recommendation	A more robust and detailed "Plan B" to be set out to ensure flexibility.		
cspo-47	Mr Tony McAteer	McAteer Associates Ltd	
Plan Ref	Chapter 10	Delivery and Risk in the Core Strategy - a "Plan B"	Object
Summary	The Council's approach is contrary to national planning policy by having a 'Plan B' from the outset. The Northern Parishes, especially Banks, can take more development than suggested in the draft Plan. The plan should recognise that the Northern Parishes and Banks in particular can play an important role in delivering the Council's objectives. (S)		
Response	The Council considers that it is appropriate to include within the Core Strategy a variation in the course of action, should the original preferred course of action prove impossible to deliver within the plan's timescales. Although labelled 'Plan B', it is not a completely different plan, but a variation of the strategy. Building such flexibility into the plan would avoid the need for "frequent updating", contrary to the claims of the Objector. The approach set out in the Core Strategy is considered to be in line with paragraphs 4.14 and 4.15 of PPS12. However, the Council agrees with the Objector that, as far as is possible at present, any doubts should be resolved in the Core Strategy whilst it is being prepared. With regard to the Northern Parishes, the Core Strategy recognises the potential for development in this area. If the Dispersal option were chosen, Banks would have an extra 100 dwellings. However, given infrastructure constraints, the settlement of Banks is not appropriate for significant amounts of development, certainly not enough to deliver the equivalent of a 'Plan B'. Northern Parishes residents have tended to express the view that significant amounts of development should not be directed to this area.		
Recommendation	A more robust and detailed "Plan B" should be proposed within the Core Strategy, including in what circumstances the "Plan B" may be triggered.		
cspo-533	Hesketh Estate		
Plan Ref	Chapter 10	Delivery and Risk in the Core Strategy - a "Plan B"	Object
Summary	Plan B is not sound enough as the option has not been tested.		
Response	Comments noted.		
Recommendation	A more robust and detailed "Plan B" to be set out to ensure flexibility.		

cspo-58	Church Commissioners For England		
Plan Ref	Chapter 10 Delivery and Risk in the Core Strategy - a "Plan B"		Observations
Summary	Flexibility is important (S)		
Response	Comments noted. It is considered that the Core Strategy has scope for flexibility, as suggested.		
Recommendation	No action required		
<hr/>			
cspo-614	Mr Keith Keeley		
Plan Ref	Chapter 10 Delivery and Risk in the Core Strategy - a "Plan B"		Observations
Summary	Generally this section is difficult to understand and may be improved by addition of flow diagram/s		
Response	Comments Noted		
Recommendation	A more robust and detailed "Plan B" to be set out to ensure flexibility.		
<hr/>			
cspo-669	Mr Simon Artiss	Planning Manager Bellway Homes Ltd	
Plan Ref	Chapter 10 Delivery and Risk in the Core Strategy - a "Plan B"		Observations
Summary	Chapter 10 (Plan B) - in our experience Inspectors seek greater detail on alternative delivery scenarios than you provide here, and we hope that the above comments assist in this.		
Response	Comments Noted		
Recommendation	A more robust and detailed "Plan B" to be set out to ensure flexibility.		
<hr/>			
cspo-727	Crompton property developments		
Plan Ref	David Crompton Delivery and Risk in the Core Strategy - a "Plan B"		Support
Summary	Generally supports need for a fall-back position for development. (s)		
Response	Comments Noted		
Recommendation	No Action Required		
<hr/>			
cspo-734	Bickerstaffe Trust		
Plan Ref	Chapter 10 Delivery and Risk in the Core Strategy - a "Plan B"		Object
Summary	The Council should revise its fall-back policy in order to provide sufficient flexibility and ensure delivery of housing. If not chosen as the strategic development site, Alty's Farm should be included in a formal policy which deals with 'Plan B'. (S)		
Response	Once a preferred location(s) for Green Belt release have been selected for the Core Strategy, the Council will be reviewing its "Plan B" for the Core Strategy and ensuring that it is consistent with the latest Government policy and advice. The Alty's Farm site, along with all other sites previously considered or put forward through representations to the CSPO consultation, will be considered for inclusion in an improved "Plan B".		
Recommendation	A more robust and detailed "Plan B" to be set out to ensure flexibility.		
<hr/>			
cspo-158	Mr Philip Carter	Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency	
Plan Ref	10.1 Maintaining Flexibility in the Core Strategy		Observations
Summary	Plans A and B are equally constrained by sewage capacity issues at New Lane. Widespread use of private treatment plants, septic tanks, etc is not supported in a sewerage area. If considering any growth at Banks, a Level 2 SFRA would first be required. (S)		
Response	Comments noted. It is agreed that failure to secure the upgrading of the New Lane WWTW (or to secure increases in capacity elsewhere) needs to be taken into consideration when considering a 'Plan B'.		
Recommendation	The "Plan B" should incorporate sites that are not affected by the constraint issue at New Lane WWTW, to generate flexibility if infrastructure improvements are delayed.		
<hr/>			
cspo-238	Mr Shaun Taylor	Planning Associate Director G L Hearn Property Consultants	
Plan Ref	10.1 Maintaining Flexibility in the Core Strategy		Object
Summary	Plan B should be fully integrated into the Core Strategy to ensure delivery of core objectives, it should not be a back up plan. (S)		
Response	Comments noted		
Recommendation	Housing targets for Skelmersdale to be reduced to a more deliverable level. A more robust and detailed "Plan B" to be set out to ensure flexibility.		

cspo-615	Mr Keith Keeley		
Plan Ref	Chapter 11	Next Steps in the Local Development Framework	Observations
Summary	No mention of Community Infrastructure Levy DPD?		
Response	At the time of going to press the Council had not taken any formal decision to prepare a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) charging schedule. Since then, the Government have lent their support to CIL and so the Council have now begun exploring the preparation of a CIL Charging Schedule. The CIL Charging Schedule is not itself a Development Plan Document (DPD) but will be informed by other DPD's and evidence with the LDF.		
Recommendation	No Action Required		
cspo-597	Mrs Margaret Wiltshire	Planning Volunteer, Treasurer CPRE (West Lancs Group)	
Plan Ref	Glossary		Observations
Summary	Glossary should include L.E.P and update the entry on RSS (also perhaps on 4NW and GONW).		
Response	At the time of publication the Council had not formally entered into a L.E.P. The RSS is still formally in place and must be referred to in this context. The exact situation regarding the RSS was explained at the time of publication in Appendix C . The references to 4NW and GONW are accurate as they they were in place in when the evidence base was being formed.		
Recommendation	Include and update references to LEP, RSS, 4NW and GONW in Glossary		
cspo-616	Mr Keith Keeley		
Plan Ref	Glossary		Observations
Summary	There is no explanation of Infrastructure Delivery Plan or Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)		
Response	Comments noted		
Recommendation	Add definitions of IDP and CIL into Glossary		
cspo-598	Mrs Margaret Wiltshire	Planning Volunteer, Treasurer CPRE (West Lancs Group)	
Plan Ref	Appendix B: The Spatial & Strategic Objectives		Observations
Summary	Various comments about correcting or removing certain areas of Appendix B.		
Response	Comments noted. 1. The "Building for Life" standard is different from the Lifetime Homes standard, although its purposes overlap. The 10 unit threshold is not a threshold below which the standard does not apply, but has been chosen to make monitoring easier. There is no policy requirement in the Core Strategy to meet the BfL standard, but as achievement of this standard is measured anyway, it makes sense for the Core Strategy to "piggyback" on this current monitoring. 2. It is considered that the suggested wording has a different meaning from that in Objective 6. Objective 6 is alluding to links between settlements and all parts of neighbouring areas, not just city centres. So for example, in terms of the Central Lancashire City Region, links are encouraged between Tarleton and Longton /Leyland /Chorley, not just the centre of Preston. 3. NVQ levels are used to monitor educational attainment levels, but do not refer solely to NVQ qualifications themselves. Rather, they refer to equivalent levels of attainment - eg a Degree is equivalent to an NVQ level 4 or above. Subsequently, they provide a good way of monitoring education across all qualification types and levels.		
Recommendation	No change.		
cspo-206	Mrs Anne-Sophie Bonton	Planning Officer	
Plan Ref	Appendix C: Planning Policy Background		Observations
Summary	References to LTP should be updated as LTP3 (2011-2021) was adopted by the Full Council Thursday 28th May 2011. (S)		
Response	Comments noted		
Recommendation	LTP3 and other emerging policy background documents will be reviewed and included within the next stage of the Core Strategy.		
cspo-601	Mrs Margaret Wiltshire	Planning Volunteer, Treasurer CPRE (West Lancs Group)	
Plan Ref	Appendix C: Planning Policy Background		Observations
Summary	p.168 Revise, replace or remove the section on Regional Plans. p.170 Revise, now LTP3 is out.		
Response	Comments noted		
Recommendation	The Planning Policy Background section will be revised and updated through the next stage of the Core Strategy. This will reflect the most up to date planning policy background and in particular the status of Regional Planning.		

cspo-245	Mrs EA Broad	Parish Clerk Lathom South Parish Council	
Plan Ref	Appendix D: Setting Locally-determined Targets		Observations
Summary	Query as to allocated land on Cobbs Clough Road (S)		
Response	Under the Preferred Options Cobbs Clough is being considered as a non employment area i.e an area for housing. Despite marketing, Cobbs Clough has failed to deliver as an employment site and the Council believe that an employment site adjacent to the M58 would be more attractive to developers given its improved transport connections to the motorway network. Regardless of this fact if Cobbs Clough was maintained as an employment area Green Belt release would still be required in skelmersdale for housing.		
Recommendation	No action required.		
cspo-343	Mr Roger Clayton		
Plan Ref	Appendix D: Setting Locally-determined Targets		Object
Summary	More explanation and justification required for supporting evidence. (S)		
Response	Acknowledged.		
Recommendation	Evidence explained in detail throughout the various supporting studies (eg JELPS & SHLAA). No action required.		
cspo-345	Mr Roger Clayton		
Plan Ref	Appendix D: Setting Locally-determined Targets		Object
Summary	Target should be reduced. (S)		
Response	Comments acknowledged.		
Recommendation	Target reviewed but proposed level of housing is required. Selection of sites to minimise loss of agricultural land and impact on rural character.		
cspo-603	Mrs Margaret Wiltshire	Planning Volunteer, Treasurer CPRE (West Lancs Group)	
Plan Ref	Appendix D: Setting Locally-determined Targets		Observations
Summary	p.177 How/why/when did Conbbs Clough employment area (DE5.1.18) become "non-employment"? Is it now considered a nice place to live? If these 9.82 ha were still employment land, maybe the 8ha of green belt release south of the M58 would not be needed. p.182 What is meant by "the derived energy trajectory for the Borough?"		
Response	Under the Preferred Options Cobbs Clough is being considered as a non employment area i.e an area for housing. Despite marketing, Cobbs Clough has failed to deliver as an employment site and the Council believe that an employment site adjacent to the M58 would be more attractive to developers given its improved transport connections to the motorway network. Regardless of this fact if Cobbs Clough was maintained as an employment area Green Belt release would still be required in skelmersdale for housing.		
Recommendation	No Action Required		
cspo-301	Mr Alexis De Pol		
Plan Ref	Appendix E: Delivery & Risk in the Core Strategy		Object
Summary	It is inappropriate for Appendix E to impose a presumption against the further granting of permission for market housing within the Key Sustainable Villages, Rural Sustainable Villages and Smaller Rural Villages if housing permissions or completions exceed the targets for these areas set out in Policy CS1. This aspect of Appendix E should be deleted. (S)		
Response	Comments noted. The possibility of, and mechanism for, restraint will be revisited. It is considered prudent to have some means whereby restraint can be applied at a future point in the Core Strategy period, should a genuine need for restraint arise, therefore Appendix E should not be deleted altogether. However, the Council accepts that restraint is unlikely to be required for the foreseeable future in terms of housing land supply, especially given the current government "growth agenda". In terms of rural settlements, the possibility of restraint may be more real, given that settlements tend to have an "environmental capacity" which, if exceeded, could result in harm to the settlement, its function, amenity and environment, contrary to the principles of sustainable development. This is especially the case given infrastructure (utilities /roads, etc.) constraints in a number of the rural settlements in West Lancashire. Therefore, it is considered appropriate for there to be some means by which restraint could be justified, if necessary, at some point in the future. However, the wording of Appendix E will be amended, so that restraint 'may be considered' rather than automatically applied, and that it will only be considered if the targets are exceeded by a significant amount, and if there is robust evidence that more housing would cause demonstrable harm. (Please note that settlement targets are not minima.)		
Recommendation	Tone down the section of the residential development policy regarding the possibility of restraint once settlement (or spatial area) development targets are exceeded by a significant amount. Remove the section on the mechanism for restraint in Appendix E.		

cspo-347	Mr Roger Clayton		
Plan Ref	Appendix E: Delivery & Risk in the Core Strategy		Observations
Summary	Recommendations for re-wording (S).		
Response	Comments Noted. The reference about low demand is referring to developer interest as Appendix E is about deliverability and this is dependent upon developers bringing land forward. The Council is maintaining a focus on Skelmersdale throughout the document in order to facilitate much needed regeneration by creating a supportive framework for actions which may well be driven by processes outside of planning.		
Recommendation	No Action Required		
cspo-602	Mrs Margaret Wiltshire	Planning Volunteer, Treasurer CPRE (West Lancs Group)	
Plan Ref	Appendix E: Delivery & Risk in the Core Strategy		Observations
Summary	p.199 Enabling sustainable transport choice Why not enlist the help of Parish Councils to elicit what transport the rural community needs (rather than would like occasionally)? In some cases a local minibus service would fit the bill on, if more people can be persuaded out of their cars onto buses, the LCC subsidy and hence the rural bus services would be less at risk.		
Response	The Borough Council have consulted Parish Council's as part of this consultation process and are happy to continue to work with parish Council's. However the Core Strategy is a strategic document and cannot address individual local schemes. It should also be noted that Lancashire County Council are the transport authority for West Lancashire who implement individual scheme and these comments may be more relevant aimed at Lancashire County Council.		
Recommendation	No Further Action Required		
cspo-618	Mr Keith Keeley		
Plan Ref	Appendix E: Delivery & Risk in the Core Strategy		Observations
Summary	The delivery strategy is inadequate and does not meet the minimum soundness requirements as set out in PPS12. (s)		
Response	comments noted		
Recommendation	Review Appendix E and ensure it is consistent with the latest advice on the Delivery Strategy.		